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This dissertation considers the ways in which Jusepe de Ribera (1591-1652) fashioned his artistic identity and sought to elevate his social status in Spanish Naples. My dissertation studies alternative ways of understanding the social status of Spanish painters.

Organized in five chapters, my dissertation examines the methods Ribera used to shape his artistic identity as a Spanish painter working in viceregal Naples. In chapter one, I consider the outward markers of Ribera’s success: the practical strategies he took to ensure his economic success and to elevate his social position. The second chapter deals with Ribera’s intellectual self-fashioning and the cultivation of his “learned naturalism.” A systematic study of the artist’s signatures in his paintings, drawings, and prints forms the core of the third chapter of this dissertation. In this same chapter, I analyze extant early modern portraits of the artist, both accurate and fanciful, in assessing an approximate likeness of the painter. I analyze Ribera’s critical fortunes and biographies in the fourth chapter to see how early modern art biographers virtually “painted” varying literary portraits of Ribera as portrayed in early modern Italian and Spanish art treatises and biographies. Chapter five focuses on how Ribera’s image was further cultivated by early modern Spanish and Neapolitan Baroque poets and playwrights.
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Introduction and Review of the Literature

This dissertation explores Jusepe de Ribera’s (1591-1652) self-fashioning and artistic identity in early modern Italy and Spain. A central issue in the history of Spanish art, the continuing struggle of seventeenth-century painters to achieve higher status deeply shaped Ribera’s artistic practice, the artist’s profession and his critical reputation. My dissertation examines this issue by concentrating on the career of one of the major artists of the Spanish Golden Age, Jusepe de Ribera. Ribera sought to fashion his identity and achieve social recognition in both seventeenth-century Spain and Spanish Italy through varied strategies: the way in which he signed his works, his introduction of innovative subject matter in his religious and mythological paintings, his affiliations with academic institutions, his knighthood, and his role as an art appraiser. In addition, his distinctive professional diversification as a painter, draughtsman, and printmaker not only allowed him to move between different media but also to obtain a broader range of commissions, which conferred on him greater social prestige and enhanced his artistic reputation.

Most past studies on the status of the artist have centered primarily on court painters in Madrid, especially Diego de Velázquez (1599-1660), the painter par excellence of the Golden Age. By focusing instead on Ribera, a successful artist, who, while in contact with Velázquez, worked in other geographic centers in Spain and Spanish Italy, my research broadens the current state of literature to show how differing perceptions of the artistic profession might coexist at a given moment. Ribera spent most of his career in Naples, serving as the court painter to the Spanish viceroys.

Key to this phenomenon were the theoretical writings of painters, such as Francisco Pacheco (1564-1644) and Jusepe Martínez (1600-1682), who aimed at transforming public opinion of the status of painting. Furthermore, celebrated poets and court playwrights in Madrid such as Lope de Vega (1562-1635) and Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681), who commanded...
respect and recognition for their chosen literary professions, wrote in defense of the painter’s aspiration to improve his social standing. My dissertation thus extends the prevailing scope of inquiry from Velázquez to another leading figure of the period in order to illuminate contemporary but different models for Spanish artistic identity and demonstrate Ribera’s important contribution to the elevation of the status of the Spanish painter in artistic centers other than the court in Madrid.¹

**The Artist in Early Modern Spain: The State of the Literature**

The challenges painters faced in elevating their profession from a lowly craft to a creative endeavor is well documented by contemporary scholars. Three important studies have previously addressed theoretical aspects of the social and legal status of painters in the Golden Age. Julián Gállego’s fundamental study *El pintor de artesano a artista* (1976) chronicles the changing social status of the painter in Spain from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment. In his seminal study, *Images and Ideas in Seventeenth-Century Spain* (1978), Jonathan Brown discusses the historiography of seventeenth-century painting and relates Spanish painters to their intellectual, religious, and social milieu. Juan José Martín Gonzalez’s book *El artista en la sociedad española*, published in 1984, expands on Gallego’s and Brown’s previous research by including a broader and more inclusive discussion of the changing status of the artist which addresses not only painters but also sculptors and architects as well as tapestry designers, goldsmiths, and jewelry designers.

Carmen Ripollés’ recent doctoral dissertation, “Constructing the Artistic Subject in Golden Age Spain,” (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 2010) builds on this body of important scholarship. Her thesis considers the development of artistic identity in Golden Age Spain by examining the cultural, social, and economic frameworks that shaped concepts of

¹ For studies that consider the status of the painter in major Spanish artistic centers, namely Cordoba and Seville, see Mindy N. Taggard, “Ut pictura poesis: artists’ status in early modern Cordoba,” *Artibus et*
artistic identity in the period. In doing so, Ripolles advances a critical reassessment of Spanish artistic identity that takes into account alternate forms of artistic self-fashioning other than Velázquez’s. She re-examines the construct of artistic identity by considering the broader discourse of nobility in Spanish seventeenth-century society in literary and visual sources, in particular, plays by Lope de Vega and the still-lifes of the court painter Juan van der Hamen y León.

In addition, important studies of the social status of the artist in Renaissance Italy have provided me important methodological models that have allowed me to reframe questions about early modern Spanish artistic identity: Bram Kempers’ *Painting, Power and Patronage: The Rise of the Professional Artist in the Italian Renaissance* (1987), Joanna Woods-Marsden’s *Renaissance Self-Portraiture: The Visual Construction of Identity and the Social Status of the Artist* (1998), Francis Ames-Lewis’ *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist* (2000), and Rona Goffen’s *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian* (2002). These studies explore the ways in which fifteenth- and sixteenth-century painters and sculptors earned recognition for the intellectual foundations of their art. They trace the social and intellectual concerns of painters in Italy who brought about the elevation of their work as a liberal art pressing for their recognition as intellectuals, not as artisans and craftsmen. Sixteenth-century painters and sculptors pushed for the recognition of the artist as a genius and, in the case of Michelangelo, as divine. We see the growing self-confidence and self-awareness (as well as the rivalry and competition which existed among artists) manifested in literary sources, artists’ biographies, poetry and in visual evidence such as portraits in different media and different formats along with the investigation of the classical past as part of the erudition of artists. In terms of art theory, the systematic treatment of artistic biography, the elevation of artistic status,

discussions of technique, and the discourse of the *paragone* (or rivalry among the arts) discussed in Giorgio Vasari’s *Lives of the Artists* (1550 and 1568) would prove influential in Spain.

The literature on the rise and development of academies in seventeenth-century Europe is rich and diverse and is a useful resource for understanding the social status of artists in Spain. Nikolaus Pevsner’s fundamental study *Academies of Art, Past and Present* (1940, reprinted with a new preface, 1973, and Spanish edition, 1982) describes the rise of the academy, tracing its development from the fifteenth century, from Leonardo’s theories on artistic practice to the rise of the Accademia di Disegno in Florence and the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, the establishment of the French Academy in the seventeenth century, and concluding with the progressive “institutionalization” of the academy in the nineteenth century. Pevsner, more importantly, discusses how cultural, social, and political factors within a given historical period shaped the formation of the academy. However, he omits a discussion of the art produced in the very academies he analyzes so closely and thus leaves out a consideration of style. Carl Goldstein’s book *Teaching Art: Academies and Schools from Vasari to Albers* (1996) studies issues overlooked by Pevsner and raises questions concerning artists’ education, both practical and intellectual, and the role that academies, such as the Accademia di Disegno in Florence and the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, played in shaping style.

In an epilogue to the Spanish translation of Pevsner’s book, Francisco Calvo Serraller notes that Pesvner’s study of the academy was limited in scope and that Pesvner overlooks early attempts by Spanish artists to form academies, as was the case of Murillo’s short-lived drawing academy, and the larger historical problem of the belated development of artistic academies in both Spain and Naples.² Jonathan Brown describes the problem of the academy in Spain and chronicles the plight of the seventeenth-century Spanish artists and failed attempts by artists in

---

² Nikolaus Pevsner, *Academias de arte, pasado y presente*, trans. Francisco Calvo Serraller (Madrid: Catedra, 1982). Calvo Serraller notes that Pevsner’s study of the Spanish academy is based on one primary
establishing art academies in his erudite essay, “Academies of Painting in Seventeenth Century Spain” (1987). Andrés de Ubeda de los Cobos’ article, “Consideración social del pintor y academicismo artístico en Madrid en el siglo XVII” (1989), engages the reception of Alberti’s, Vasari’s and Leonardo’s theories in Spain in light of the development of the academic ideals of Golden Age painters such as Vicente Carducho (1568-1638) and Francisco Pacheco. In examining Spanish art treatises, Ripollés has rightfully noted that Spanish artistic theory was not merely derivative from Italian models but that it also contained ideas and concepts that were relevant to a specifically Spanish context.¹

Recent studies have also focused on the practical and intellectual education of artists in Spain such as Zahira Véliz’s essay “Becoming an Artist in Seventeenth-Century Spain” in the *Cambridge Companion to Velázquez*, edited by Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt (2002) and Peter Cherry’s essay “Artistic Training and the Painters’ Guild in Seville” in the 1996 exhibition catalogue *Velázquez in Seville*. While not explicitly stated, both authors define “artistic practice” in terms of the training of painters. These publications investigate aspects of traditional artistic practice in seventeenth-century Spain (which took place through the guilds), analyze the conditions and describe the different stages of apprenticeship, and consider the “enterprise” of painting in seventeenth century Spain. However, these studies do not address more practical questions concerning the early education of painters: what was the education received by young boys before they entered an apprenticeship? What type of schools did they attend? Did they learn Latin? Were they taught in the vernacular? Charles Dempsey’s essay “Some Observations on the Education of Artists in Florence and Bologna during the Later 16th Century” (1986) outlines a useful methodology that can be employed in the study of Spanish Golden Age painters in order to gain further insights into their academic and intellectual life. Social histories of early modern

¹ Ripollés, 8-9.

source, José Caveda’s *Memorias para la historia de la Real Academia de San Fernando y de las Bellas Artes en España, desde el adventimento al trono de Felipe V* (Madrid, 1867), 209.
Spain such as James Casey’s *Early Modern Spain* (1999) offer a cursory analysis of education and literacy. Richard Kagan’s *Students and Society in Early Modern Spain* (1974) remains the fundamental work on primary and secondary schooling in Spain. Despite the paucity of documents and autobiographies related to the education of individuals in seventeenth-century Spain, Kagan’s landmark study of primary and secondary education focuses primarily on Castile, with some attention to Seville and Valencia. Maxime Chevalier’s important study, *Lectura y lectores en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII* (1976), also discusses literacy and the literati in Golden Age Seville, furthering our understanding of early modern Spanish educational systems.

Javier Portús’ book *Pintura y pensamiento en la España de Lope de Vega* (1999) looks specifically at the art and cultural developments that occurred during Lope de Vega’s lifetime. As Portús notes, our ideas regarding Spanish art theory and artistic practice have been primarily defined by Vicente Carducho’s and Francisco Pacheco’s treatises. In addition, Portús notes that the presence of painters as subjects in Golden Age plays is a measure of their visibility in Spanish society. Karen Hellwig’s insightful study on Spanish art theory, *Die spanische Kunstliteratur in 17. Jahrhundert* (1996), traces the general development of Spanish art theory in the seventeenth century. The chapters of her study concentrate on major theoretical topics such as the drawing-color debate, the *paragone* between painting and sculpture, and the hierarchy of the genres; she also devotes an entire chapter to Pacheco’s and Palomino’s concerted efforts in fashioning Velázquez’s artistic *persona*. These studies have helped me to develop my approach to Ribera’s artistic identity by placing the issue of his status within the broader context of contemporary debates about artistic practice and theory.

**Constructing Ribera: The State of the Research on the Artist**

The art historical literature on Ribera has consistently and healthily grown, especially in the past two decades. Until recently, most studies of the painter have principally focused on defining the corpus of autograph works, the chronology of his career, and his influence in Naples
and Spain. I shall provide a brief overview of the critical literature on Ribera that has fundamentally reshaped our knowledge of the painter’s art and career.

August Mayer’s dissertation on Ribera, published in 1923 and entitled *Jusepe de Ribera: Lo spagnoletto*, was one of the first systematic studies of the painter’s art and career. It was preceded by Elias Torno y Monzo’s monograph of 1922, which was the first Spanish monograph of the artist. These publications were followed by Georges Pillement’s important study of the painter in 1929. Spanish art historical studies of Ribera of the 1940s, though, were shaped by the quasi-Romantic, staunchly nationalist, and Catholic ideology of the Franco Regime that is reflected in monographs by José María Santa Marina (*El españoleto*, published in 1943) and Bernardino de Pantorba’s error-ridden monograph of 1946.

Ulisse Prota-Giurleo’s assessment of his archival findings on Ribera in 1953 provided an important corpus of documents that remains a standard reference. Elizabeth du Gué-Trapier’s first English language monograph followed these studies in 1952. Craig Felton’s dissertation of 1971 was the first English-language catalogue raisonné of Ribera. Felton’s study identified major literary references and documents, placed Ribera’s work within the context of Neapolitan Baroque painting, and provided a full catalogue with accepted, doubtful, and unaccepted attributions. However, Felton’s findings and attributions have been revised in recent literature.

Jonathan Brown’s major exhibition and catalogue of Ribera’s drawings and prints at the Princeton Art Museum in 1973 (republished and expanded in a bilingual English and Spanish catalogue of 1989 to accompany a subsequent exhibition in Valencia) made important

---

4 Mayer’s significant contribution to the study of Spanish painting has been recently studied by Teresa Posada Kubissa, *August L. Mayer y la pintura española* (Madrid: Centro de Estudio Europa Hispánica, 2010).
5 Bernardino de Pantorba, *José de Ribera: ensayo biográfico y crítico* (Barcelona: Iberia-Joaquin Gil, 1946).
7 Elizabeth du Gué-Trapier, *Ribera* (New York: The Hispanic Society of America, 1952)
contributions to the study of the painter’s graphic oeuvre by providing the first systematic study of Ribera’s drawings and prints.8 Alfonso E. Peréz Sánchez and Nicola Spinosa jointly published a catalogue raisonné of Ribera’s painted and graphic oeuvre in 1978.9 In 1982 Craig Felton and William B. Jordan organized the first major exhibition of Ribera’s paintings at the Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth and this was accompanied by an important catalogue.10

Among the first art historians to approach Ribera’s career following a thematic method was Fernando Benito Doménech.12 Doménech’s 1991 study of the painter organized the painter’s career according to vice-regal tenures. Although the catalogue narrowly defined Ribera’s career, it considered important aspects of Ribera’s patronage that built on Jonathan Brown’s significant article on the patronage of the Spanish viceroys in Naples.13

Major monographic exhibitions organized in Madrid, Naples, and New York in honor of the fourth centenary of Ribera’s birth in 1991 and 1992 and their accompanying catalogues further defined the corpus of Ribera’s art and also raised significant questions about Ribera’s early career. Gabriele Finaldi’s documentary appendix of 1992 assembled a fundamental corpus of documents that included all the published archival documentation known to that date.14 It incorporated sources previously published by Prota-Giurleo and other Ribera specialists along with Finaldi’s own findings.

14 Finaldi, 1992b, 231-55.
Gabriele Finaldi’s important dissertation on Ribera focused on four major aspects of the artist’s life and career.\textsuperscript{15} He formulated a systematic biography that was based on extant documents and newly-discovered archival material, reconsidered the context of Ribera’s early works, offered a reappraisal of the painter’s relationship with his vice-regal patrons, and established a fuller corpus of Ribera’s drawings.

Ribera’s early career has been the focus of scholarly attention in recent years given the number of new works attributed to the painter. These new attributions have significantly revised the chronology of the painter’s early career. In 2003 Justus Lange published his doctoral dissertation that focused on Ribera’s early years in Parma and Rome from 1611 to 1616 to the year 1626 when the painter had long established himself in Naples.\textsuperscript{16} The last monographic exhibition of the painter held in 2005 in Salamanca, \textit{José de Ribera: bajo el signo de Caravaggio (1613-1633)}, continued to identify Ribera as a successor of Caravaggio. Papi’s 2007 study re-attributed a small corpus of paintings formerly given to the Master of the Judgment of Solomon to Ribera.\textsuperscript{17} Published in a series of articles, Papi’s initial findings were initially contested by Nicola Spinosa in his recent catalogue raisonnés of the artist, first published in 2003 and revised in 2006.\textsuperscript{18} Spinosa accepted Papi’s findings in the 2008 Spanish edition of his catalogue raisonné. Spinosa’s recent catalogue has also incorporated a number of new attributions to Ribera, raising the autograph works by the painter to a total of 364 (compared to 307 in the 2003 monograph).\textsuperscript{19} A recent exhibition at the Prado and its accompanying catalogue have also specifically focused on Ribera’s early years in Rome.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Gianni Papi, \textit{Ribera a Roma} (Soncino (CR) : Edizioni dei Soncino, 2007).
\item Nicola Spinosa, \textit{Ribera: la obra completa} (Madrid : Fundación Arte Hispánico, 2008).
\item José Milicua and Javier Portús Peréz, eds., \textit{El joven Ribera} (Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 2011).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
While much work has been done to establish the corpus of Ribera’s oeuvre (which remains in progress) and a good deal of scholarly attention has been given to Ribera’s early career in recent years, fewer studies have specifically focused on Ribera’s artistic identity. James Clifton’s scholarship on Ribera has rightly disputed the traditional view that practice presided over theory in Neapolitan Golden Age painting and challenged the long-held assumptions about Ribera’s erudition as a painter. Based on a close reading of the inscription in Ribera’s *Bearded Woman* (*Magdalena Ventura and Her Husband*) (fig. 9), Clifton extrapolated an art theory that centers on different theoretical concerns, namely the critical debate about the merits of idealization versus realism in Baroque painting.\(^{21}\) Ronald Cohen’s series of articles presented “an alternate view” of Ribera’s biography and career that makes interesting but circumstantial claims about Ribera’s nobility and a dubious attribution of a still-life painting to Ribera.\(^{22}\)

My dissertation builds on a large and growing corpus of literature on the painter. In this dissertation, I specifically focus on the ways in which Ribera was concerned with elevating his social status. In light of recent research that has undoubtedly improved our knowledge of the problematic social status of artists in seventeenth-century Spain, my case study of Ribera will allow for a more specialized and in-depth examination of a rich and complex topic in the history of Spanish art by taking into account the efforts of one artist, other than Velázquez, to nuance our understanding of the shaping of artistic identity in the Golden Age.

Organized in five chapters, this dissertation examines the ways in which Ribera sought to fashion his artistic identity as a Spanish painter working in viceregal Naples. In chapter one, I consider the outward markers of Ribera’s success: the practical strategies he took to ensure his economic success and to elevate his social position. The major approaches Ribera took to


become a successful painter were 1) to become a court artist, 2) to work in different media, 3) to work for dealers as a young a painter and to dabble in art appraising as a mature artist, 4) to purchase property and subsequently to rent it, and 5) to employ marketing strategies that guaranteed the competitive pricing of his work.

The second chapter deals with Ribera’s intellectual self-fashioning. Here I contend that Ribera, although usually thought to be an artist who had few intellectual inclinations, did cultivate a kind of “learned naturalism” in his art. I shall consider how the traditions of northern and Italian Renaissance art are reflected in Ribera’s images. Ribera also painted representations of the antique, most famously his philosopher series. He radically re-interpreted the genre of philosopher portraits and created an innovative and influential model in the seventeenth century. His concern with art education is reflected in his animated representations of human anatomy that comprise his “drawing manual.”

Ribera’s signatures signal the painter’s life-long preoccupation with fashioning his artistic and national identity. Ribera’s inscriptions also reflect his attitudes towards artistic practice and his profession. This dissertation assembles a systematic study of the painter’s signatures in his paintings, drawings, and prints, which forms the core of the third chapter. Despite Ribera’s efforts in fashioning his identity by means of his signature, no extant self-portrait of the painter shows us what he looked like. In this same chapter, I analyze extant early modern portraits of the artist, both accurate and fanciful, in assessing an approximate likeness of the painter.

I consider Ribera’s critical fortunes and biographies in the fourth chapter to see how early modern art biographers virtually “painted” varying literary portraits of Ribera as portrayed in early modern Italian and Spanish art treatises and biographies: Giulio Mancini’s Considerazione sulla pittura (c. 1617-21), Jusepe Martínez’s Discursos practicables del nobilísimo arte de la
Chapter five focuses on how Ribera’s image was further cultivated by early modern Spanish and Neapolitan Baroque poets and playwrights. Part of a trilogy on the theme of honor, Calderón de la Barca’s famous play El pintor de su deshonra (The painter of his dishonor) (c. 1649) features an older, successful Spanish painter residing in Naples as its protagonist, who might be based on Ribera. Calderón was court painter to Philip IV and would have indubitably known Ribera’s paintings installed in the royal complexes of the Alcázar and the Escorial. The Spanish poet Pedro Soto de Rioja wrote a brief ode to the painter in the same year he died. Ribera’s works came to the attention of Girolamo Fontanella and Giuseppe Campanile, poets who were both members of the Accademia degli Oziosi, Naples’ foremost literary academy. Campanile, in particular, praised the painter and called him the “Spanish Zeuxis.” While these poems have been published in modern editions, they have been little studied by art historians. When read together in context, these poems provide further insight into Ribera’s posthumous fame and the critical reception of his art.

The subsequent fascination with Ribera as a painter of bloody and cruel scenes of martyrdom was fueled by the writings of famed English and French poets such as Lord Byron and Théophile Gautier. Ribera’s influence in nineteenth-century French art has been well studied by art historians. While pioneering studies of the responses to Ribera’s art in nineteenth-century France have been written by scholars such as Ilse Lipschutz and Pierre Rosenberg and culminated with the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s groundbreaking exhibition, Manet/Velázquez: The French Taste for Spanish Painting (2003), the reception of Ribera’s art and personality in
nineteenth-century Spain remains to be understood better.\textsuperscript{23} In comparison to French poems and history paintings on Ribera, the writings of Spanish nineteenth-century art critics and playwrights and monuments dedicated to the painter, which have been less studied, are shaped by staunchly nationalist, academic ideas. In examining Ribera’s critical fortunes in nineteenth-century Spain, I shall thus consider how Ribera’s artistic identity was conditioned by the paradoxes that shaped Spain’s construction of its artistic canon and by the broader project of nation-building.\textsuperscript{24}


Chapter 1 – Ribera’s Outward Markers of Success

Introduction

In analyzing Ribera’s strategies for success in Rome and Naples, this chapter considers the outward markers of Ribera’s success: his emigration from Spain to Italy, his work for and reliance on a network of dealers, exhibitions, marriage to his mentor’s daughter, his rank as official painters to the Spanish viceroys, property acquisition, knighthood, and accumulation of wealth.¹ In fact, Ribera’s eldest daughter eventually married Leonardo Sersale, the judge of the Tribunale della Vicaría in 1644, which constituted a considerable rise in social status for the painter. Ribera also offered a substantial dowry of 5,000 ducats, which attests to the wealth and social prominence he achieved.²

Ribera’s Formative Years in Spain and Early Career in Italy

Ribera left his native Spain as an ambitious young artist seeking a profitable and fruitful career in Italy. Recent publications, mostly notably book-length studies by Justus Lange and Gianni Papi and an exhibition at the Museo Nacional del Prado, have focused their attention on Ribera’s formative years in Valencia and early career in Rome.³ Despite the wealth of archival

¹Most studies of the “business” of Italian Baroque art have dealt mainly with patronage and the art market. Recent research has reevaluated how painters were active in marketing and promoting their art, earned their income, set pricing, and established marketing strategies. Moreover, art historians have begun to ask how the socio-economic conditions of painters related to that of artisans and professionals such as lawyers and writers. For recent publications on the economic aspects of art production in Seicento Rome, see Richard E. Spear, “Scrambling for Scudi: Notes on Painters’ Earnings in Baroque Rome,” Art Bulletin 85 (June 2003): 310-21; Patrizia Cavazzini, Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth Century Rome (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008); and Richard E. Spear and Philip Sohn, eds., Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010).


evidence and art historical literature, little is still known about Ribera’s early artistic training in his native city of Játiva (near Valencia) and the reasons why he might have left Spain for Italy altogether. In order to get a sense of the events and circumstances that informed and shaped Ribera’s strategies for achievement as a young artist, this section shall briefly consider Ribera’s early years in Valencia before considering the reasons why Ribera might have left Spain for Italy and then examining his early years in Rome and Naples.

Ribera was born in 1591 in Játiva (also spelled Xátiva) in the region of Valencia to Simon Ribera, a shoemaker, and Margarita Cuco. Little is known about Ribera’s formative years there in terms of his early education and possible apprenticeship to another artist. Based on historical studies of education and literacy in early modern Spain, one can extrapolate that Ribera was taught how to read and write at a young age. According to the eighteenth-century Spanish art biographer Antonio Palomino, Ribera trained with the Valencian painter Francisco Ribalta (1565-1628). At first glance, Palomino’s statement is plausible because Ribalta had moved to Valencia in 1599 and was active there until his death. Before his arrival in the city, Ribalta had worked in Madrid and at the royal complex and monastery of the Escorial. He was enormously receptive to the work of other artists; he studied the paintings in the royal collection, came in

---

4 Primary accounts present different dates and places of birth for Ribera as well as divergent accounts of his family’s origins. According to the eighteenth-century Neapolitan art biographer Bernardo De Dominici, the artist “was born in 1593 in Gallipoli, a city in the province of Lecce, to D. Antonio Ribera, a native of Valencia, principal city of Tarraconese Spain, where he was an officer.” (“Nacque Giuseppe l’anno 1593, in Gallipoli, Città della Provincia de Lecce, da D. Antonio Ribera, nativo di Valenza Città principale della Provincia della Spagna Tarraconese, il quale era Ufficiale in quel Castello...”) (De Dominici, 1742-5 (1979), III, 2; translation mine). The eighteenth-century Spanish art biographer Palomino offered a distinct account of Ribera’s origins: “José de Ribera, a Spaniard, was a native of Játiva in the Kingdom of Valencia, even though his origins were in Murcia, as is attested to by the last name Ribera, which is Castilian and of a very well-known illustrious family in the kingdom.” (idem, Lives of the Eminent Spanish Painters and Sculptors, trans. Nina Ayala Mallory (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 121. Modern art historians have also disagreed on Ribera’s origins. Shaping his observations, in part, based on De Dominici’s and Palomino’s accounts, Ronald Cohen maintains that Ribera hailed from a noble Spanish family. Other Ribera specialists, including Gabriele Finaldi and Justus Lange, contend that Ribera came from a modest family, based on the information gleaned from Jativan parish records that include Ribera’s baptismal certificate and those of his two brothers, Visent Miguel and Juan. See Finaldi, 1992b, 231.


6 “He was a pupil of Francisco Ribalta, an outstanding painter.” Palomino, 1987, 122.
contact with Spanish and Italian artists such as Romulo Cincinnato, Juan Fernandez de Navarrete “El Mudo,” Federico Zuccaro, Pellegrino Tibaldi, and Luca Cambiaso who were carrying out the decoration of the royal complex of El Escorial and developed his early style, which was strongly influenced by Italian Mannerism. There is documentary evidence for Ribalta’s activity in Madrid, including his earliest known work, the signed and dated *The Preparation for the Crucifixion* (1582, Saint Petersburg, Hermitage, fig.1), which was painted in Madrid and which shows his interest in luminous, Venetian color and use of dusky lighting. While the style of Ribalta’s painting is radically different from the dramatic Caravaggesque forms that Ribera favored in his early years, Ribalta’s formulation of his regional identity as a Catalan painter in his signature of *The Preparation for the Crucifixion* might have served as an important model for Ribera.\(^7\) While no firm proof supports the claim that Ribalta taught Ribera, the plausibility of Palomino’s claim – that Ribera apprenticed with Ribalta – will be further considered in chapter four of this dissertation.

The exact date of Ribera’s departure for Italy remains uncertain. It has been suggested that Ribera might have departed Valencia for Northern Italy between 1607 and 1609, at the young age of fifteen or seventeen. The trajectory of Ribera’s early travels and sojourns in Northern and Central Italy are still in question. The long-standing itinerary of the young painter’s travels suggests that he left Spain through the port of Alicante (which at that point in time was a major point of entry from Italy into Southern Spain), either alone or in the company of his two brothers. He arrived directly in Naples and thereafter traveled to Rome, before he left for Parma in about 1610. In 1611, his presence was recorded in Parma, where he painted a *St Martin and the Beggar* for the church of San Prospero, the original now lost but known through a painted replica (Parma, Galleria Nazionale, fig. 2) and a reproductive engraving by Francesco Rosaspina (fig. 3), which

---

\(^7\) I will address the topic of Ribera’s signatures in chapter three.
was regarded at the time as an important work by the painter.\textsuperscript{8} Ribera then left for Rome where he resided from about 1612 to 1616. In July 1616, he departed Rome and permanently settled in Naples.\textsuperscript{9} A second theory has proposed that Ribera did not leave through the port of Alicante to Naples, but that he instead arrived in Genoa, a city which historically had close political ties to the Spanish crown. He then traveled through Lombardy, possibly visiting the cities of Cremona and Milan, and then possibly taking a quick trip to Venice before arriving in Parma in 1611. In 1612, he left Parma for Rome, as Michelle Cordaro has suggested based on Mancini’s biography of the painter, because he had antagonistic relations with local painters.\textsuperscript{10} He then left Rome in 1616 and moved to Naples.\textsuperscript{11} Of the two hypotheses, the first is more plausible because it is better supported by extant documentary evidence.

An important question, though, remains to be addressed: why did Ribera leave Spain for Italy in the first place? I contend that the socio-economic conditions of painters who worked and resided in Valencia played an important role in shaping Ribera’s decision to leave for Italy. Artistic practice in the city was largely controlled by a college (Sp. colegio) of painters, which functioned much like a guild: it educated and trained young artists, guarded their interests to some extent, and ensured the quality of artistic production within the city. The Valencian college was established in 1520 but it was short-lived. By the early seventeenth century, there was a renewed


\textsuperscript{9} Spinosa, 2008, 26-30.


\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
attempt to create a new “academy.” Among the surviving documents that attest to its organization are its ordinances of 1616. In order to protect their interests, local painters imposed restrictions on foreign and amateur painters. They established rules that comprised mandatory membership for painters and a requisite masters’ exam upon the completion of apprenticeships.

In seventeenth-century Valencia, the artistic profession was dominated by the colegio of painters for a short period. In 1607, the painter Francisco Ribalta supported other leading Valencian painters in a move to form the Colegio de Pintores (College of Painters) to safeguard the interests of the profession. In April 1607 the city of Valencia ordered the creation of this organization after approving their ordinances. These included several laws that “favored their monopoly over the production and marketing of painting.” Some of the measures taken by the colegio were: 1) advising or limiting the rising number of painters and 2) requiring painters to become members of the institution and to pass an exam in order to practice painting. The prices of exams were “fixed” so that certain artists were favored. The rules of the college also prohibited artists from producing works that were solely intended for the purposes of re-sale. In December 1607, many painters who were not members of the colegio objected to twenty eight of the organization’s rules, which were then suspended until August 1616. At that point in time, Ribalta once again took an active role in its management and signed a petition to Philip III seeking support for the college. A ruling from the Royal Audience then declared in favor of the

---

Although certain amendments were introduced in the statutes, disagreements about them continued.\textsuperscript{15}

In September 1616, the city of Valencia received a petition that the ordinances of the colegio be reformed. Complaints were not only presented by the same painters who protested in 1607 but also by average citizens who could be identified as potential art buyers. They included a glove maker, an organ player, a wool processor, a notary, and a priest. Three major objections were raised about the colegio’s laws: 1) they disallowed many men (and women) who were not officially trained and licensed by the college from selling works. These artists were secretly painting their works at home and sold them at cheaper prices; 2) they made it difficult for foreign artists to settle and work in Valencia; and 3) in an effort to curb foreign competition, it prohibited the sale of paintings from other parts of Europe, mainly from Italy, France, and the Northern countries, which were cheaper than those created in Valencia.\textsuperscript{16}

The interesting yet ironic element in all this is that the plaintiffs justified their demands by appealing to the status of painting as a liberal art, and, thereby used this argument against the interests of painters.\textsuperscript{17} If painting was in fact a liberal art, as painters had wished it to be recognized, then artists should be paid according to their “work and ability.”\textsuperscript{18} The plaintiffs’ aim was apparent: greater supply meant lower prices. The plaintiffs perhaps sought to position paintings as commodities within a growing economic market so that people of all social classes could afford to purchase them. The authorities ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, but the college later appealed to the Royal Audience. This appeal created a rift between royal and local jurisdictions and was not resolved until Philip III intervened in 1617 when he sided with the local

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 152-53.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 153.
\textsuperscript{17} In defense of painting as a liberal arts, the organist Alonso Sanchís claimed, “It is important that all should learn and exercise any other liberal art, and each will be paid according to his work and ability […] In this way, no one shall be offended, for painting is something that is seen with the eye and each buys what he likes and spends on it what he wishes and can, for not everyone is to own costly pictures.” Cited in and translated by Falomir Faus, 2002, 249.
authorities and against the interests of the colegio, which ultimately marked the failure of the institution.19

In addition, the colegio also passed regulations in 1607 related to the painter’s heritage and religious background that restricted admission into the academy. It required limpieza de sangre (purity of blood) thus prohibiting the teaching of painting to Jews and Moors.20 Ribera might not have been qualified to train in the colegio, because of possible evidence of either Jewish or Moorish heritage.21 Compounded by the severe economic crisis affecting Valencia at the time, these dire circumstances certainly could have prompted Ribera to seek training and work elsewhere.

Ribera was an ambitious and versatile young artist who became a prolific painter and draftsman, and a talented printmaker. Such diversification was rare for an early modern Spanish artist. In Spain, professional specialization tended to be rigid and well controlled by confraternities, guilds, or colleges. Most Renaissance Spanish painters such as Fernando Yañez de Almedina, Pedro Machuca, Alonso Berruguete and Gaspar Becerra who also worked as either architects or sculptors were all trained in Italy.22 Interdisciplinary artistic activity encountered enormous obstacles in Spain, especially because a painter’s training did not conceive of drawing or disegno as the common means and basis for all arts and, in many instances, was reduced to slavish copying of models. Furthermore, the legal situation encouraged and protected

---

18 Falomir Faus, 2002, 249.
20 Ibid., 159.
21 In the early seventeenth century, Játiva had a population of about 8,000 to 12,000 Jews and converted Muslims (or Moriscos). Shoemaking was an occupation associated with the Morisco community. As evidenced in parish records, Ribera’s father was a cobbler. Conditions in Valencia for these two communities worsened when systematic expulsions were enforced by the Spanish crown during the reigns of Philip II and Philip III, most infamously the expulsion of 1609: José Milicua, “From Játiva to Naples,” In Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652, ed. Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez and Nicola Spinosa (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 10-11. For evidence of Ribera’s possible Jewish heritage, see Giuseppe De Vito, “Segni e disegni (possibilità che Ribera fosse di lontana origine ebraica),” Richerche sul ’600 napoletano (2003): 41-46.
specialization. Even within the category of painting, the ordinances of the colegio distinguished between painters of images, banners, panel, and guilders. I thus believe that Ribera might have moved to Italy because artists there were afforded training that encouraged interdisciplinarity (in terms of learning and practicing the related disciplines of drawing and painting) and enjoyed a better economic and professional status.

Recent research by Gianni Papi, Valentina Macro and Silvia Danesi Squarzina has put forward that when Ribera went to Rome he not only came into contact with Spanish residents of the city but also prominent political and religious figures who provided him with letters of recommendation or introductions to important art patrons and collectors. The trajectory of Ribera’s early career in Italy, as he moved from Parma to Rome to Naples, further supports the notion that Ribera availed himself of every possible strategy to market his work as a young painter working in Italy – to sell works on the art market and to cultivate relationships with prestigious patrons and established artists, both Italian and Spanish. While he was in Parma in 1610 or 1611, Ribera might have spent time with Luis Tristán, the renowned Toledan painter, as their trips in Parma overlapped. Tristán was El Greco’s most accomplished follower. In fact, Ribera’s Saint Martin and the Beggar (figs. 2 and 3) is compositionally similar to El Greco’s depiction of the same subject that was painted for the Chapel of San José in Toledo in 1597-99

\[\text{23} \quad \text{Ibid., 236.}\]
\[\text{24} \quad \text{When the painter and theorist Jusepe Martínez visited Naples in 1625, he interviewed Ribera. When Martínez questioned Ribera the about the reasons for his extended residence in Naples and his unwillingness to return to Spain, Ribera commented on the low status of painters in Spain in a famous and often-cited reply: “My dear friend, I desire it very much, but through the experience of many well-informed and sincere persons I find it an impediment [to that extent], which is, to be received the first year as a great painter, but upon the second year to be ignored because, once the person is present, respect is lost; and this has been confirmed to me by having seen several works by excellent masters of [those kingdoms of] Spain held in little esteem, and I thus judge that Spain is a merciful mother to foreigners but a most cruel stepmother to her own children.” Martínez, 1950, trans. Finaldi, 1992b, 240.}\]
\[\text{26} \quad \text{Ronni Baer, “El Greco to Velázquez: Artists of the Reign of Philip III,” In El Greco to Velázquez (New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 43.}\]
(fig. 4). One can speculate that Ribera might have become better acquainted with El Greco’s art and career by means of his contact with Tristán.

According to documents recently uncovered by Danesi Squarzina, Ribera was already residing in Rome as early as June 5, 1612. Ribera’s youthful works in Rome entered into the collections of important art connoisseurs and patrons such Cardinal Scipione Borghese and the Giustianini family. He was also retained in the household of the Giustianini and painted fourteen works for them. In addition to the relations Ribera cultivated with aristocratic families, research has shown that prominent ecclesiastics such as Cardinals Francesco Maria del Monte, Federico Savelli, and Scipione Cobelluzzi were also among Ribera’s earliest collectors in Rome. Ribera also produced works for Spanish patrons in Rome, most famously a series of the *Five Senses* (c. 1611/13-1616) for the agent and collector Pedro Cussida.

---

27 For Ribera’s engagement with the art of El Greco, see Lange, 2003, 46-8.
28 Squarzina, 2006, 244. Danesi Squarzini recently discovered the lease between Ribera and his landlord Giovanni Battista di Antenore Levarinus. See ibid., Appendix I, 250.
29 One of Ribera’s beggar-philosopher is identified in an entry in the inventory of Borghese’s collection (which dates to about 1615-1630): “Un quadro d’un Mendicante cornice di noce alto 4 1/3 largo 3 Spagnoletto.” Sandro Corradini, “Un antico inventario della quadreria del Cardinale Borghese,” in *Bernini scultore: La nascita del Barroco in Casa Borghese*, eds. Anna Coliva and Sebastian Schütze (Roma: De Luca, 1998), 454.
30 Danesi Squarzina, 2006, 244.
31 Ibid., 244, no. 6.
33 Dated February 3, 1650, the inventory of Savelli’s paintings records only one work by Ribera, his *Saint Athanasius* (now untraced): “Un S.Attanasio del Spagnoletto cornice simil [nera].” (Laura Testa, “Presenze caravaggiesche nella collezione Savelli,” *Storia dell’Arte* 93/94 (1998): 352; Lange, 2003, 87).
In addition, to the reasons enumerated by the art biographer Mancini, Ribera’s motives for leaving Rome for Naples, I believe, have more to do with gaining the lucrative patronage of high-ranking patrons and his aspirations in becoming the official court painter to the Spanish viceroys. Art biographers such as Mancini, however, insist that Ribera’s financial troubles, especially with recurring debt as a result of his overspending, motivated him to leave for Naples:

Finally, he departed for Naples. And in truth one could say he acted in bad faith, because when he wanted to work he earned five or six scudi a day, so that if his expenses were normal, he could quickly and easily have paid everyone. But with the many wastrels he kept he needed no less than such a wage, even though made do with few household furnishings…  

Although Mancini observes that Ribera led an extravagant lifestyle and claims that Ribera left Rome for Naples because of recurring debt, documents suggest that Ribera’s financial affairs upon arriving in Naples quickly improved and that he had achieved a modicum of success. On November 10, 1616, Ribera married his mentor Bernardo Azzolino’s daughter, Caterina. Ribera received a dowry of 600 ducats, which was ratified close to a year later on November 7, 1617. A notarial document dated August 13, 1619 shows that Ribera paid part of the annual mortgage he owed for a house he bought in the Strada di Santo Spirito. Shortly thereafter, Ribera made repairs to his home and paid fifty ducats to the Della Trinità brothers, from whom he bought a house.

37 The complete Latin transcript of the marriage contract appears in ASN, Notai del Cinquecento, Damiano di Forte, Scheda 252, Protocollo 34, fols. 436r-438v). It has been transcribed and published by Delfino, 1987, and Finaldi, 1992b, 234.
38 Finaldi, 1992b, 234.
40 According to a bank document, Ribera bought stone and paid for renovations made to his house in the Strada di Santo Spirito two months after he acquired it. ASNB, Banco dello Spirito Santo, Giornale del 1619, Matr. 145, 26 ottobre. Cited in Nappi, 1990, Finaldi, 1992b, 236.
41 “A Giuseppe de Ribera D. 50 E per lui ad Andrea e notar Pietr’Antonio della Trinità a compimento di ducati 81,50 per una paga finite a 4 maggio 1620 dell’annui 163 quali li rende per causa de una casa che a
Ribera also quickly procured the patronage of the Spanish viceroys soon after his arrival in Naples in 1616. While De Dominici propagated the legend that the Duke of Osuna, then viceroy of Naples and his wife “discovered” Ribera while he was painting *The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew* (fig. 5), it is well documented that Ribera’s first commission for the Osuna was a *Crucifixion* fashioned for Osuna’s wife that was eventually shipped to Spain and hung in the Colegiata (collegiate church) of Osuna in Seville (fig. 6).

Aside from his early ties to Osuna and other Spanish grandees such as the Duke of Osuna, Ribera was also admired by Italian artists such as Ludovico Carracci and collectors such as Mario Farnese. The letter written by Ludovico Carracci to the Roman collector Ferrante Carlo in 1618 describes him as a follower of the school of Caravaggio and that Mario Farnese was a protector of Ribera. Although not famous as his other relatives, Farnese was the Duke of Latera, “a soldier, collector, and protector of Francesco Mochi and a friend of Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani, also a collector of Ribera’s works” – a collector who had an interest in then-contemporary art. Farnese also sponsored and paid a salary to both the Dutch painter Leonard Braemer and Ribera. In all likelihood, it was Mario Farnese who facilitated Ribera’s travel between Parma and Rome and who even initiated Ribera’s contact with the Giustiniani, if Mancini’s account of Ribera’s journeys is correct. Ribera benefited from the protection given to him by a member of a prominent Roman family who had such a sophisticated taste for art and he comprato.” ASBN, Banco del Popolo, Giornale del 1620, Matr. 146, 4 luglio, Cited in Nappi 1990; Finaldi, 1992b, 237.


43 “Mi è stato di grandissimo gusto sentire dalla sua lettera, copiosa d’avissi, intorno alli quadri di V.S….e sentire li pareri di quelli pittrici che hanno un gusto eccellentissimo, particolarmente quel pittoresco, Spagnuolo, che tiene dietro alla scola di Caravaggio. Se è quello che dipinse un S. Martino in Parma che stave col signor Mario Farnese, bisogna star lesto che non diano la colonia al povero Lodovico Carracci: bisogna tenerisi in piedi con le stringhe. Lo so bene che non trattano con persona addormentata…Il signor Bartolommeo Dolcini salute V.S., e mostrò di avere questo particolare delle parole dello Spagnuolo. Disse: Io vorria poterli mostrare le mie pitture per vedere quello che dicesse Ma bisogna scusare il signor Bartolomeo che è inamorato delle sua cose.” Finaldi, 1992b, 236.
would have open doors to other important Italian collectors and their collections. As Danesi Squarzina rightly observes, “The sojourn in Rome, the association with French, Dutch, and Franco-Flemish painters, and the stimulation provided by a cultivated person were of inestimable importance in the Spanish artist’s career.”

Along with fellow painters Massimo Stanzione and Aniello Falcone, Ribera also sought to be represented in contemporary art collections not only in Rome, Naples and Madrid, but also in other major artistic centers such Genoa and Florence. In order to sell and promote his work within local and international circles, Ribera relied on a network of agents such as the Genoese Lanfranco Massa and Florentine Cosimo del Sera who acted as intermediaries on behalf of the painter and their respective clients.

Lanfranco Massa was a well-known and well-established agent who facilitated a good deal of artistic commerce between Naples and Genoa. He acted on behalf of Prince Marcantonio Doria and protected the grandee’s commercial and cultural interests. Massa was renowned for being “vigilant and efficient.” With respect to facilitating artistic commissions, he was known for promptly locating the appropriate painter for a given project, establishing contact with him, clearly stipulating the conditions of the contact (including specific deadlines for the completion of work), and following up on projects with due diligence. Numerous records of payment found in the Banco di Napoli attest to Massa and Ribera’s close ties between 1616 and 1628. In fact, Massa himself owned two paintings by the artist. On March 23, 1620, Massa paid Ribera

---

44 Danesi Squarzina, 2006, 249.
47 For all individual transactions between Massa and Ribera (which are too many to enumerate herein), see Eduardo Nappi, “Un regesto di documenti editi ed inediti, tratti prevalemente dall’Archivio Storico del Banco di Napoli riguardanti Giuseppe Ribera e una conferma della presenza a Napoli del November 1630 di Velázquez,” Richerche sul’600 napoletano 9 (1990):177-86.
twenty-five ducats for *A Guardian Angel* and *Pietà* for Marcantonio Doria.\(^{48}\) The painter received the remaining balance of payment of twenty ducats out of fifty for the *Guardian Angel* on August 26, 1620 from Massa, and the agent also lent Ribera thirty ducats.\(^{49}\)

In Florence, Cosimo Del Sera was active as an intermediary for the grand-duke in Naples.\(^{50}\) On January 23, 1618, Del Sera wrote to the duke’s secretary, Andrea Cioli, about contemporary painters working in Naples. While Cioli wrote about a painting he commissioned from Fabrizio Santafede and made general comments about the treatment of religious subjects in Neapolitan painting, the letter’s importance lies in the fact it introduces Ribera’s name in Florence for the first time, and, more importantly, celebrates him as a talented young painter who “was envied by all” and whose sense of “invention” was admired by art connoisseurs (who are unnamed in the missive).\(^{51}\) Less than a month later, Del Sera communicated to Cioli that Ribera was to paint a work for the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosimo II.\(^{52}\)

In addition to the works Del Sera obtained from Ribera for the Medici collection, the agent also assisted the Capponi family and Vincenzo Vettori in acquiring works by the painter.

---

\(^{48}\) “A Lanfranco Massa D. venticinqu et per lui a Gioseppe ribera disse jn conto del prezzo di dui quadric ciò è uno di un angelo custode et l’altro di una pieta li ha da fare per servitio del signor marcantonio doria.” ASBN, Banco del Popolo, Giornale di cassa, Matr. 1620, f. 377, Published in Finaldi, 1992b, 237. *The Guardian Angel* and *Pietà* were identified in a post-mortem inventory of Massa’s belongings of June 13, 1630.

\(^{49}\) “A Lanfranco Massa D. 50 E per lui a Giuseppe de Ribera, dite sono cioè D. 20. E per un quadro dell’Angelo Custode l’ha fatto e consignato per servitio di Marcantonio Doria di Genua e ducati 30 per impronto per doverli restituire frat ermine d’un mese.” ASBN, Banco dello Spirito Santo, Giornale del 1620, Matr. 157, 26 agosto, Published in Finaldi, 1992b, 237.

\(^{50}\) Elena Fumagalli, *“Filosofico umore e maravigliosa speditezza:” Pittura napoletana del Seicento dalle collezioni medicee* (Florence: Giunti, 2007), 52.


\(^{52}\) A letter dated February 13, 1618, Del Sera told Cioli: “Ho visto quanto S.A. comanda circa le pitture, che devo far fare a suggetti avvisatimi sentendo sieno molto eminent, et allo Spagniolo dirò che metta il quadro
On October 26, 1618, the Capponi family and Del Sera paid Ribera fifty ducats for an unidentified painting. The family and the agent would continue to support Ribera and purchased his *Saint Jerome in the Desert* for thirty ducats on consignment. Ribera’s forays into the Florentine art market were also facilitated by his brother-in-law, Gabriele Azzolino, who helped him to sell a *Saint Bartholomew* to Vettori. In late 1620, he painted a “portrait of Saint Peter [the] Apostle” and other related works for the Florentine agents Pier Caponi and Cosimo Sforza. He charged twenty ducats to Barreo del Popolo, an agent for the Florentines in Naples. Even though Ribera was able to establish an elite clientele in Genoa and Florence by means of agents, his principal patrons were the Spanish viceroys who governed Naples.

**Ribera as Court Painter to the Spanish Viceroys in Naples**

Ribera was the court painter to eleven Spanish viceroys in Naples, a position which helped to establish him as the city’s leading artist and which accorded him a certain level of prominence and prestige. Ribera’s status at court shaped his artistic identity in various ways and aided him in gaining social recognition within Naples, and, by extension, his native country, Spain.

This section considers the functions of viceregal patronage and collecting. Fundamental studies by Alfonso E. Peréz Sánchez, Jonathan Brown and Richard Kagan, Gabriele Finaldi, Marcus Burke, and most recently, Justus Lange and Katrin Zimmermann have shed light on many

---

53 The document reads: “A Pier Capponi e Cosmo del Sera D.20 Et per loro a Giuseppe Ribera a complimento di ducati 50 per lo prezzo de uno quadro di pittura che a a istanza loro.” ASBN, Banco della Pieta, Giornale del 1618, Matri. 93, 26 ottobre) Published in Nappi, 1990 and Finaldi, 1992b, 236.
54 “A Pier Caponi e Cosmo del Sero: D. trenta e per lui a giuseppe ribera per il prezzo d’uno ritratto de Santo Geronimo nel desert che li ha venduto, consegnato.” ASBN, Banco dello Spirito Santo, Giornale di cassa, Matr. 157, 2 ottobre, 1620, f. 183, Published in Finaldi, 1992b, 237.
56 Finaldi, 1992b, 234-35.
complex issues related to Ribera and his relation with the Spanish viceroys. As these scholars have attested, the viceroys acted both as important patrons for Ribera in Naples and agents who helped to export his work to the court in Madrid.

I shall examine Ribera’s status as the court painter to the viceroys, briefly discuss the origins of his royal patronage, and then specifically consider Ribera’s involvement and ties to nine viceroys: the Duke of Osuna, the Duke of Alba, the Duke of Alcalá, the Count of Monterrey, the Duke of Medina de las Torres, Juan of Austria, the Admiral of Castile, the Duke of Arcos, and the Count of Oñate. Ribera had a distinct relationship with each of these grandees. Throughout this section, I shall focus on how the viceroys were diplomatic agents who were instrumental in commissioning works from Ribera that were destined for export to the royal collections in Madrid.

The Position of Court Painter in Spanish Viceroyalty of Naples

Many elements or aspects of the position of official painter in the Spanish viceregal court continue to elude scholars. In stark contrast to the wealth of information about how artists worked

---

within the hierarchy of the Habsburg court in Madrid, only scant documentary evidence exists about the position of court painter in Spanish Naples and the role that painters played in the organization of the Neapolitan viceregal court. It is known that that royal appointments for the Chief Architects to the Kingdom of Naples were made in Madrid and held by the father-son architects Domenico Fontana (from 1592 until1607) and Giulio Cesare Fontana (until 1628), by the architectural engineer Bartolomeo Picchiatti (until 1644) and by the architect, sculptor, and interior designer Cosimo Fanzago (from 1645-47). To my knowledge, such evidence does not exist for the appointment of painters in the viceregal court: the selection of a painter or painters largely depended on the viceroy who was in power at the time. It is entirely feasible that Ribera’s appointment might have been an informal one at first. However, later references to Ribera as de familia suae eccellentiae commorans in Regio Palatio (residing with his family in his Excellency’s palace) indicate that he was in the official employment of the Spanish viceroys.

While recent research has focused on the intricacies of the formal etiquette of the Neapolitan viceregal court, little is known about the duties of official painters in the viceregal court during the seventeenth century and how they worked within it. A brief description of Ribera’s prominent position at court can be gleaned from Giovanni Pietro Bellori’s short biography of the painter. According to Bellori’s account, Ribera and his family were living in the viceregal palace: “Moving to Naples he progressed and made many pictures for the Viceroy, who sent them to Spain; and he became exceedingly rich, a nobly resplendent figure in that city, 58 For the court in Madrid as a comparative model and for an examination of its complex workings, see Jonathan Brown, *Velázquez: Painter and Courtier* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986); 36-68; Jesús Escobar, *The Plaza Mayor and the Shaping of Baroque Madrid* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 17-60, 61-83, 115-142.


60 Ibid; The role played by these architects in the Spanish Neapolitan court has been recently studied by: Sabina de Cavi, *Architecture and Royal Presence: Domenico and Giulio Cesare Fontana in Spanish Naples (1592-1627)* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009).

61 Finaldi, 1995, 56.

62 For viceregal ceremonial and etiquette, see De Cavi, 212-45.
where he lived with his family in the palace."\textsuperscript{63} Ribera’s wealth and residence in the viceregal court are also reiterated later in the eighteenth century by the Spanish biographer Palomino.\textsuperscript{64}

Writing in the early 1740s, De Dominici provides a very general description of Ribera’s duties as court painter: he explains that the Duke of Osuna first appointed Ribera to the post, gave him a monthly salary of sixty doubloons [120 ducats], and that “he was in charge of all that was painted, carved, and sculpted for the royal palace.”\textsuperscript{65} Extant financial records also indicate that Ribera was paid 300 ducats when he was in Osuna’s employ but do not specifically state for which paintings or duties.\textsuperscript{66}

Ribera’s ties to some viceroys such as the Count of Oñate were distant and tenuous at best. Gabriele Finaldi has rightly noted that, “Ribera’s association with the viceregal court in Naples seems to have been a rather loose one and the traditional models of the court painter’s relationship with the court which we know from Spain and other Italian courts make uninformative comparisons.”\textsuperscript{67} Because the viceroys were administrators who tended to have short tenures (their terms in office were usually a minimum of two to three years), Ribera might


\textsuperscript{64} Palomino wrote: “vivió pues [Ribera], en dicha ciudad de Nápoles, donde no sólo floreció en la fama, sino que abundó en riquezas, y llegó a tener quarto dentro del mismo palacio del virrey, con toda su familia.” (Palomino, 1986, 136). The English translation follows: “He thus lived in the city of Naples, where he not only flourished in fame but also prospered in riches, and he and his whole family came to have an apartment within the very palace of the Viceroy,” idem, 1987, 123.

\textsuperscript{65} “lo dichiarò pittore di corte, assegnandoli provvisione di sessanta doble il mese, con la sopraintendenza di tutto quello che in pittura, intaglio, e sculture si lavorasse per lo real palagio: e col tempo accrebbe la provvisione fino a doppie ottanta, benché molti vogliono insino a cento.” De Dominici, III, 1742-5 (1979), 4; cited in Finaldi, 2003, 381.

\textsuperscript{66} On February 12, 1618, Apparitio d’Orive, Osuna’s secretary, withdrew 300 ducats from the duke’s secret account to pay Ribera: “Alla Cassa Militare D.300 E per essa al presidente Apparitio d’Orive per spese secrete del servitio di Sua Maesta dei quale n’ha da dar conto. E per esso a Giuseppe de Ribera di sua volontà.” ASBN, Banco do San Giacomo, Giornale, del 1618, Matr. 46, 12 febbraio, Published in Finaldi, 1992b, 235.

\textsuperscript{67} Finaldi, 1995, 64.
not have forged close relationships with some of them. However, Ribera’s good ties and close relationships with some rulers such as the Dukes of Alcalà and Monterrey proved to be the exceptions.

Ribera’s Earliest Viceregal Patrons: The Duke of Osuna and The Duke of Alba

The Duke of Osuna

The Duke of Osuna, Don Pedro Téllez Gíron (r. 1616-1620), was the first viceroy to commission works from Ribera and to name the artist as official painter. The Duke of Osuna was appointed as Viceroy in 1615, and his arrival in Naples on August 21, 1616 was marked by a ceremonial entry. Ribera assiduously sought to secure the patronage of both Spanish grandees and the viceroy upon his arrival in the city. Before procuring the support of Osuna, Ribera painted four banners for four of the Duke of Lerma’s galleys in 1617. Although untraced, the commission for such decorative works from Lerma, who was King Philip III’s chief minister and favorite (or valido), represented an important early commission from a Spanish noble.  

Shortly thereafter, Ribera procured the support of the Duke of Osuna. While the art biographer Mancini does not mention the Duke by name, he wrote that the painter had letters of introduction from Rome to the Duke (“hebbe introduttion appresso il Vicerè”). Nicola Spinosa has proposed different theories on how Ribera came into contact with Osuna: that the painter either “…followed the viceroy, the Duke of Osuna, or perhaps having come at the duke’s invitation (he may have known the duke in Rome, where Osuna was Spanish ambassador to the

68 Ribera received two payments for the banners. One document dated August 18, 1617 states: “A Loyse Gauditore D. 100 E per lui a Giuseppe Ribera a compimento di ducati 250 et a buon conto della pittura che va facendo per servitio delli stendardi delle Quattro galere del signor duca dell’Elma.” A second record of payment records: “A Loyse Gauditore D. 50 E per lui a Giuseppe Ribera a compimento di ducati 300 per saldo della pittura che va facendo per servitio delli stendardi delle Quattro galeere del signor duca dell’Elma.” Finaldi, 1992b, 234. According to Spinosa, the Italian scribe who wrote the documents misspelled the Duke of Lerma’s name as “dell’Elma.” Spinosa, 1992, 21.

69 Finaldi, 1995, 55.
In any case, Ribera was able to obtain the protection of the Duke of Osuna a year after his arrival in Naples as attested by a documented dated to September 16, 1617 in which he is named as “Spanish painter to his His Excellency the Duke of Osuna (“Jusepe de Rivera español pintor de Su Ex[celenci]a el S[eño]r Duque de Osuna”).”

The eighteenth-century biographer De Dominici was the first to propagate the legend that the Duke of Osuna, then viceroy of Naples, and his wife “discovered” Ribera while he was painting *The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew* (fig.5). However, it should be noted that Ribera’s first large-scale commission in Naples, the *Crucifixion*, that has been identified in the Colegiata in Seville (fig. 6), was made for Osuna’s wife, the vicereine, Catalina Enríquez de Ribera, who was the daughter of the second duke of Alcalà and the sister of the third Duke, who was appointed viceroy of Naples from 1629-31.

---


72 “[Ribera] espose con occasione di non so qual festa press oil Reggio Palazzo, che rappresentava un S. Bartolomeo scorticato, ove nella; e in quella de’ Carnefici la perfida, e la crudeltà; e fecevi sopra due amoretti divini, che con bellissimo scherzo recavano la Corona del Martirio al Santo Appostolo. Questo quadro tirò a se gl’occhi de’ diletanti, così per lo soggetto tragic ben rappresentato, come per la nuova maniera, e tale, che non solo ammutolì que’ Pittori, che lo schernivano, ma gli confuse, vedendo essi da ogni ceto di Persone celebrarsi quella rara pittura; Ma qui non si fermòla prosperitàdel Ribera dopo tante sua angustie. Il Vicerè D. Pietro Giron, Duca di Ossuna, che dal balcone del Regal Palazzo osservò la molta gente che miravano il quadro curiosamente domandò, che cosa fussesse, ed essendogli risposto, che miravano la pittura di un S. Bartolomeo scorticato, che pareva cosa vero, s’invogliò di vederlo; il perché fatto venire il quadro in presenza sua, incontrò in quella tal piacere, che fecesi chiamare anche il Pittore, e tanto più che il Riberaaveva inv scritto il suo nome in cifra, come far solea, e vi aveva aggiunto Español, forse per far quell colpo, che gli riuscì, imperciò che venne più gradito dal Vicerè, che dielli molta laude, e volle per se la pittura, e pochi giorni lo dichiarò Pittore di Corte, assegnandoli provvisione di sessanta doble il mese, con la sopraintendenza di tutto quello in pittura, intagli, e sculture si lavorasse per lo Regal Palaggio, e col tempo accrebbe la provenzione fino a doppie ottanta, benchè molti vogliono infino a centro,” De Dominici III, 1742-5 (1979), 4.

73 A letter written by Cosimo Del Sera to Andrea Cioli dated March 6, 1618 records that Ribera could not begin work on a commission for Grand Duke because he was painting a *Crucifixion* for the vicereine of Naples “Lo Spagniuolo e dattorno a un Crucifisso della S.a V Regina et compiuto dara di mano a server S.A.S. sperando che questo sara molto puntuale, perché si diletta del suo mestiero et e un huomo di molte buone parte,” Finaldi, 1992b, 235. See also idem, “The Patron and Date of Ribera’s *Crucifixion* at Osuna,” *The Burlington Magazine* 133 (1991): 445-6; Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez, “Ribera and Spain. His Spanish Patrons in Italy and Spain; The Influence of His Work on Spanish Artists,” in *Jusepe de Ribera, 1591-1652*, eds. idem and Nicola Spinosa (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 36. The role the Spanish vicereines played in assembling seventeenth-century art collections remains to be studied more fully.
A total of five works by Ribera that were critical in establishing him as a painter in Naples been identified in Osuna’s collection: *Saint Peter Weeping* (1616-17, oil on canvas, 179 x 130 cm, Osuna, Colegiata); *Saint Sebastian* (1616-17, oil on canvas, 179 x 139 cm, Osuna, Colegiata); *Saint Jerome and the Angel of Judgment* (circa 1617, oil on canvas, 179 x 139 cm, Osuna, Colegiata); the *Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew* (1616-17, oil on canvas, 179 x 130 cm, Osuna, Colegiata), and the *Crucifixion* (1618, oil on canvas, 336 x 230 cm, Osuna, Colegiata, fig. 6). The compositions of these paintings represent full-length figures that depart from the half-length model Ribera most notably employed in his Roman works such as *The Five Senses* (1611/13-1616).

Of the five canvases for the Osuna, the *Crucifixion* (fig. 6) is one of Ribera’s earliest, large-scale altarpieces for a Spanish patron and is striking and novel in terms of the painter’s style and treatment of the subject-matter. Unsigned and undated, the *Crucifixion* shows a monumental, life-size depiction of the living Christ at the center of the composition. The Virgin Mary and Saint John the Evangelist both stand to his right while Mary Magdalene is shown kneeling at the foot of the Cross to Christ’s left. The dramatic effects of the composition are enhanced by the darkened background, which casts the figures’ pale, anguished faces in relief. While Christ is placed centrally, the kneeling figure of Mary Magdalene disrupts the symmetry and balance of the figures in the foreground. The monumental treatment of Christ’s body derives from Michelangelo’s famous drawing for Vittoria Colonna (fig. 7), which was at the time widely known through a number of engravings.

---

74 The painting measures 11 ft. 4 1/8 in. x 90 1/2 inches (336 x 230 cm).
76 Pérez Sánchez, 1992, 72-3. For copies of the Colonna drawings, see Bernadine Ann Barnes, *Michaelangelo in Print: Reproductions as Response in the Sixteenth Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 69-84.
Osuna played an instrumental role in helping Ribera to establish himself as a painter in Naples and assisted Ribera in his capacity as an agent for the Spanish crown. He might also have been instrumental in facilitating Ribera’s earliest commission of a series of philosopher portraits for the Genoese prince Marcantonio Doria in Naples.77 However, when Osuna’s tenure came to an abrupt end in 1620, Ribera found himself without a viceregal patron.78 The next viceroys to be appointed were the ecclesiastic Cardinal Borja, who ruled by proxy (r. 1620), and his successor Cardinal Zapata (r. 1620-1622) who resided in Rome and briefly traveled to Naples.79 Both were art collectors but there is no direct evidence, to my knowledge, of them supporting Ribera or commissioning works from other artists in Naples.80

Despite finding himself without the protection or sponsorship of the viceroy in 1620, Ribera was able to procure commissions during this time. Aside from the viceroys, the painter relied on a network of contacts in Naples that included his own father-in-law, foreign agents, the local aristocracy, and private collectors. Thus Ribera had independently cultivated a network of patrons, both private and ecclesiastical, that allowed him to work without solely relying on the viceroys. Such was Ribera’s financial success that he was able to purchase a house on the Strada di Santo Spirito in Naples in 1619.

---

78 During Osuna’s tenure, attempts were made to reform the Neapolitan government. One of the aims of the reform movement was to create a government in which the nobility and commoners were equally represented. While this seems to be a local and limited objective, it would have had serious ramifications on the political organization of Naples and repercussions with the Spanish crown. Osuna tried to adopt this program and carry it out with the support of a large popular movement led by the jurist Giulio Genoino. Osuna’s attempts were derailed by the government in Madrid and were met with considerable resistance in Naples itself. The Duke of Osuna was recalled from Naples for Madrid in 1620. He was tried for abuse of power and poor administration and was subsequently barred from all government and political activities at home and abroad. See Rosario Villari, “Naples in the Time of Ribera,” in Jusepe de Ribera Lo Spagnoletto 1591-1652, eds. Craig Felton and William B. Jordan (Fort Worth, TX: Kimball Art Museum, 1982), 41-2.
79 Borgia stayed in Naples for six months (from June to December 1620). Zapata remained in the city from 1620 to December 1622. Finaldi, 1995, 153.
80 Brown, 1984, 142; Lange, 2009, 259.
Ribera and the Duke of Alba

In 1622, Antonio Álvarez de Toledo, the Duke of Alba, was appointed as viceroy in Naples. He was an avid supporter of both poets and painters. In 1627, Giambattista Basile dedicated a collection of odes known as the *Pentamerone* to the Duke. The anthology contained poems in praise of the painter-sculptor Giovan Bernardino Azzolino and Giulio de Grazia, a sculptor and medallist. Both men were closely connected to Ribera: the former his father-in-law and the latter a good friend. De Grazia made two portrait medals of the Duke of Alba, one of which dates to 1623. As Gabriele Finaldi notes, “Alba is known to have made gifts to the King since the 1636 inventory of the Madrid Alcázar records that on his return from Naples (in 1629) the Duke gave Philip IV five framed slabs of Calabrian marble.”

While literary sources attest to the Duke’s avid interest in letters, unfortunately no inventory of the Duke’s art collection exists. What is known of Alba’s patronage of painters has been culled from De Dominici’s writings and from the post-mortem inventory of the Duke of Alcalá, who was Alba’s successor. As for Ribera’s ties to the Duke of Alba, these have been the subject of very recent art historical literature. According to De Dominici, the Duke “favored Belisario Corenzio as much as Ribera.” But, Alba appointed Ribera, not Corenzio, as court painter.

The only painting by Ribera that was thought to have been in the Duke of Alba’s possession was *The Preparations for the Crucifixion* (fig. 8), a unicum in Ribera’s oeuvre and a subject infrequently depicted by early modern painters. The painting was given as a diplomatic gift by Alba to the Duke of Alcalá, who was at the time Ambassador to the Holy See and visiting

---

81 Finaldi, 2003, 383.
82 Ibid.
83 Ibid.

The painting shows Christ undressed before he is nailed to the Cross. This subject is unusual in Italian Baroque painting but it does appear in Spanish sixteenth-century altarpieces. A retable by Juan Correa de Vivar in the Convent of San Pablo in Toledo (1550-1556, in situ) illustrates the subject. Francisco Ribalta produced an extraordinary representation of this subject in 1582 (fig. 1).

While the scene of Christ’s undressing or disrobing is not described in the Gospels, non-biblical and extracanonical textual sources for the subject indicate that it could have served for the purposes of devotion and meditation. Ribera might have consulted or known three extracanonical sources in devising the subject: Ignatius of Loyola’s \textit{Spiritual Exercises} (1548) and Jerome Nadal’s \textit{Evangelicae Historiae Imagines} and \textit{Adnotationes et meditationes}, published 1593-94. In turn, Nadal’s description is based on Fray Bernandino’s text \textit{Subida al Monte Sion} (1535).\footnote{Lange, 2009, 263.}

Apart from the painting’s iconography and the murky circumstances of its patronage, Justus Lange raises an important question about the commission: why would Alba present the work to Alcalá as a gift? Both men had notoriously bad relations. Lange himself has connected the gift of the painting to a different set of historical circumstances. The fact that Alba gave the painting to Alcalá as a gift in 1626 makes Lange’s proposal plausible that there might have been a relationship to the naming of Ribera as a knight of the Order of Christ the same year.\footnote{Ibid.}
On January 29, 1626, Ribera was made a knight of the Order of Santiago.\(^{87}\) The naming of Ribera to the Order of Christ was based on the recommendation of Antonio de Aragón-Moncada, VI duque (duke) of Montalto, which is recorded on the back of a *supplica* of the artist dated on that day. A letter written by Cristoforo Papa, the Protonotary of the Kingdom of Sicily, to Ribera on November 3, 1641 makes an inference that Ribera painted a scene of the *Assumption* for the Duke of Montalto’s son, Luis Guillermo.\(^{88}\) No such painting can be traced. While the painting’s whereabouts remain unknown, the letter does support arguments that have been made by Sebastian Schütze that a nobleman’s or grandee’s support of an artist’s knighthood came with the assumed provision that a painter had to make a work for him as a token of thanks and appreciation.\(^{89}\) Ribera’s painting thus might have functioned as a special gift offered by Alba to Alcalá to secure his support of the painter’s knighthood.

The Duke of Alba was associated with the Duke of Montalto by means of the Order of the Golden Fleece. Montalto’s son married the daughter of the duke of Alcalá. Alcalá himself was Ambassador to the Holy See at that time. It is plausible that Alba’s gift to Alcalá was a token of appreciation or gratitude on Alba’s behalf for Alcalá’s recommendation of Ribera to Order of Christ. The year before in 1625 Alcalá had been able to procure a title for his chamber painter Diego de Rómulo Cincinnato. As a token of appreciation, Cincinnato painted a portrait of the pope.

The cardinal who invested Ribera as a knight, Cosimo de Torres, hailed from a Spanish family. During the ceremony in Saint Peter’s, Ribera very likely wore the habit of the Order. The picture showing the preparations for the Crucifixion could be thematically connected to

---


\(^{88}\) Lange, 2009, 263.

\(^{89}\) Schütze, 1992, 342.
Ribera’s knighthood in terms of the official ceremony of robing and disrobing that took place during the ceremony.\textsuperscript{90}

In 1631, Alcalá commissioned Ribera to paint the portrait of \textit{The Bearded Woman} (\textit{Magdalena Ventura and Her Husband}) (fig.9), which is the only painting that mentions Ribera’s knighthood in its lengthy Latin inscription, thus serving as a formal acknowledgement of Alcalá’s efforts in helping the painter achieve such recognition. Lange has proposed that Ribera’s nomination to the Order of Christ had to do with the network of contacts he established. The Duke of Alba knew both Montalto and Alcalá and was perhaps able to convince both men to support Ribera’s knighthood. It is important to note that Alcalá not only owned the aforementioned works (\textit{Preparations for the Crucifixion} and \textit{Magdalena Ventura}) but also purchased or directly commissioned philosopher portraits from Ribera. Alcalá would also continue to commissions works from Ribera when he was appointed as the viceroy of Sicily in 1631.\textsuperscript{91}

The Duke of Alba might have also commissioned a work directly from Ribera during his tenure, one which he sent to the Spanish king, Philip IV. Another painting is also described in the same aforesaid letter of 1641 from Cristoforo Papa to Ribera. According to Papa, the painting, a scene of the \textit{Nativity}, was made for the occasion of the Infanta Maria’s visit to Naples in 1630. While Alba might have facilitated this commission, the original work remains untraced. Lange has tentatively proposed that the \textit{Adoration of the Shepherds} (oil on canvas, 1629, Aquisgrán, Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum) can be identified as the work or at least represents a related subject.\textsuperscript{92} The painting in question was once considered to be a work of the painter Juan Dó. Most recently, Nicola Spinosa has suggested that it is a lost work by Ribera.\textsuperscript{93} Unfortunately,

\textsuperscript{90} Lange, 2010, 264.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{93} Spinosa, 2003, 348.
there is no precise documentation for the provenance of the work in Spain. It can only be traced to 1838, when the painting was in the collection of King Louis Philippe in Paris.\textsuperscript{94}

In sum, Alba most likely commissioned \textit{The Nativity} in order to bring Ribera’s art to the attention of the Spanish king, and, in fact, as Finaldi has rightly argued, might have been “responsible for arranging Ribera’s earliest commissions for the King.”\textsuperscript{95}

**The Duke of Alcalá**

Alba’s successor as viceroy, the Duke of Alcalá (r. 1629-1631) was an important patron of Ribera and a major collector of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century painting, and ancient sculpture. In 1637 an inventory was made in Seville of the paintings that he left in his home, the Casa de Pilatos, when he was appointed as viceroy of Naples and those he entrusted to his majordomo in 1631, when he traveled to Madrid.\textsuperscript{96} The latter paintings were shipped in crates, and detailed entries in the inventory show precisely in which crate each work arrived attesting to the exact date of arrival in Spain.

Ribera’s art was well represented in the collection of the Duke. Six paintings by the artist are listed in the inventory of the Duke’s collection in Seville: \textit{The Preparation for the Crucifixion} (fig. 8), \textit{Magdalena Ventura}, (fig. 9) and four Philosopher portraits.\textsuperscript{97} Ribera was also involved

\textsuperscript{94} Lange, 2010, 264.
\textsuperscript{95} Finaldi, 2003, 384.
\textsuperscript{97} Brown and Kagan, I.6 “Otro lienço grande desnudando a xpo nuestro Señor y disponiendole la cruz. sin guarnicion. es de la mano de Joseph de R[iber]a Valenc[ian] que viven en Napoles el ano de 1626.”; III.24, “Dos Philosofos de mano de Joseph de Ribera que el uno tiene avierto un libro y el otro tiene dos libros cerrados torcidos los ojos del uno ambos sin g[on] y vinieron en el caxon nº. 13.”; IV.12, “Un lienço grande de una mugger Barbuda con su marido de mano de Joseph de rivera vino en el enrrollado primo del caxon nº. 9.”; VI.9, “Dos Philossophos el uno escribiendo y el otro con un compaz de joseph de Rivera vinieron en el arrollado prim’o del caxon nº. 7.”.
in making printing plates for the Duke of Alcalá when he was appointed as Viceroy of Sicily, an aspect of Alcalá’s patronage of Ribera that has been less studied to some extent.

Alcalá’s support of the painter continued after he left Naples in 1631 and was appointed to the post of Viceroy of Sicily. The Duke gave Ribera two commissions in the mid-1630s: one for a painting of a *Madonna* that remains untraced and a second for an etched and engraved plate (fig. 10) that was ultimately published in *Pragmaticum Regni Sicilae*, a book of the Duke’s decrees that was published in Palermo in 1635 and 1637. The letters the Duke exchanged with Sancho de Cespedés, his Neapolitan agent, reveal that he provided specific instructions for the painting and monitored the progress of both the production of the painting and the print plate at different intervals and stages. Alcalá’s commission of a *Madonna* from Ribera is also known from a postscript to a letter he wrote to Cespedés on October 3, 1634.

In another communication of November 1, 1634, the Duke wrote to Cespedés asking him how Ribera’s painting was progressing. Alcalá was expressly concerned that Ribera’s image of

---

98 The study of this print has raised many questions regarding its authorship, dating, and heraldry. Jonathan Brown has argued that Ribera produced the etched and engraved plate in collaboration with another artist because Ribera’s manipulation of the burin for engraving was limited. To the contrary, Gabriele Finaldi has suggested that Ribera was the sole engraver responsible for its production as the artist did have a firm command of engraving techniques. The heraldry on the print was correctly identified by Delphine Fitz Darby who recognized that the coat-of-arms illustrated on the sheet did not belong to Alcalá but to his son, Marquis of Tarifa who tragically died at the age of nineteen in 1633: his death date serves as the *terminus post quem* for the date of the engraving. Unfortunately the destiny of the plate ordered by Alcalá remains unknown. The correspondence cited herein does not provide a description of the actual plate. See Jonathan Brown, *Jusepe de Ribera: grabador 1591-1652*, Exh. cat. Sala de Exposiciones de la Fundación Caja de Pensiones, Valencia 23.2-28.3.1989. Calcografía nacional, Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando (Valencia: Fundación Caja de Pensiones, 1989), 105-6; Gabriele Finaldi, “A Note on Ribera as an Engraver,” *Print Quarterly* 13 (1996): 287-91.


100 The margin of the letter reads, “La memoria que se remitió a Sancho de Cespedes con el despacho de 3 de 8obre 1634.” The full text reads, “A Joseph de Ribera se ha de encargar de parte de su Excelencia, que pinte una imagen de Nuestra Señora que esté trabada las manos y el rostro mas angustiad que pueda. El rostro ha de mirar hacia la mano izquierda como si puesta en el altar al lado del Evangelio mirase a la parte de la Epístola, porque ha de corresponder a otra imagen de San Francisco que está al lado de la Epístola. La medida del claro del lienzo es la que va aquí y Sancho de Cespedes del dinero de Su Excelencia satisfará el trabajo a Joseph de Ribera.” / “También Sancho de Cespedés mandará hacer una figura de Madera del tamaño del natural de las que llamen los pintores manequines, dicen que las hacen bien en Nápoles y para esto lo comunicará con el mismo Joseph de Ribera que él dirá quien lo hará mejor y se le dirá que acuda alguna vez a ver como se hace por que tenga toda la perfección que sea posible…La cinta blanca es la
the Virgin emulate the model or mannequin he had sent him. He was also worried that Ribera might not complete the painting on time.\textsuperscript{101}

In a letter dated to June 17, 1635, the Duke of Alcalá instructed Cespedés to have Ribera prepare a printing plate for a book of laws to be issued in Sicily.\textsuperscript{102} Less than a month later on July 12, 1635, Ribera is said to have etched and engraved a plate for the publication.\textsuperscript{103} On August 20, 1635, the Duke wrote to Cespedés telling him that the plate had arrived.\textsuperscript{104}

In all likelihood, Ribera shared a close relationship with Alcalá. The duke’s son-in-law, Luis Moncada, whose own father might have facilitated Ribera’s knighthood, acted as godfather at the baptism of Ribera’s daughter, Margarita.\textsuperscript{105}

The Count of Monterrey

The tenure of Don Manuel de Zuñiga Acevedo y Fonseca, Count of Monterrey (r. 1631-37), is significant in terms of the art and politics of the period.\textsuperscript{106} The brother-in-law of Philip IV’s foreign minister and valido, the Count-Duke Olivares, he was an eminent diplomat,
art patron, and collector. During his six-year tenure as viceroy, Monterrey employed and implemented a range of complex, political strategies. As an avid supporter of the arts, Monterrey favored Ribera and was a “generous protector” of the Spanish-Neapolitan painter, who received important commissions from Monterrey, as he did with previous viceroys such as Osuna, Alba, and Alcalá. Furthermore, the tenure of the Count of Monterrey coincided with the most active phase of Ribera’s career.

Eighteen original works and a copy are documented in the post-mortem inventory of the count’s collection. Among the significant commissions Ribera received from Monterrey are the canvases for the decoration of the Convent of the Discalced Augustinians in Salamanca: the high altar is outfitted with Ribera’s extraordinary *Immaculate Conception* (oil on canvas, 1635, 502 x 329 cm) and *Pietà* (oil on canvas, 1634, 172 x 121) and the convent also contains Ribera’s *Saint Januarius in Glory* (oil on canvas, c. 1636, 276 x 199 cm) and *Saint Augustine* (oil on canvas, 1636, 213 x 106 cm). Monterrey’s patronage of Ribera for this project has been succinctly examined by art historian Ángela Madruga Real.

Monterrey is the viceroy for whom there is firm evidence that he was responsible for directly commissioning works from artists working in Naples for the King Philip IV of Spain. Among the works Monterrey commissioned were a cycle of thirty-four history paintings of ancient Roman life by Domenichino, Lanfranco, Paolo Finoglia, Andrea de Lione, Romanelli, and François Perrier made for the decoration of the Buen Retiro (currently housed in the Museo

---

107 Zimmermann, 280.
108 The post-mortem inventory of Monterrey’s collection is published in Pérez Sánchez, 1974, 425-69 and Burke and Cherry, doc. 58, 510-20. The works include 1) *Saint Francis*, 2) *The Martyrdom of Saint Lawrence*, 3) *Saint Peter Liberated by the Angel*, 4) *Venus and Adonis*, 5) a portrait of *Saint Peter*, 6) a full-length of *Saint Peter*, 7) *Saint Peter and Saint Paul*, (8-14) Six heads by Ribera, 15) *A Monstrous Child*, 16-17) Two paintings of *Tantalus* and *Tityus*, and 18) a copy of a *Saint Jerome*.
Nacional del Prado) and a cycle of paintings illustrating the life and death of Saint John the Baptist commissioned from Massimo Stanzione and Artemisia Gentileschi.\textsuperscript{110}

It has also been suggested that Ribera’s \textit{Teoxenia, or Fable of Bacchus}, as it is known, might have been made for Philip IV.\textsuperscript{111} While this painting has been thought to have been commissioned by the Duke of Alcalá, who left Naples in 1631, Gabriele Finaldi has recently suggested that it might date closer to the mid-1630s and might have been commissioned as a “companion” to Massimo Stanzione’s \textit{The Triumph of Bacchus} (oil in canvas, 1633-34, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid). Finaldi’s argument is convincing because both paintings are the same size and related in subject.\textsuperscript{112}

Some of Ribera’s paintings from the Monterrey collection were purchased for the royal collections three years after the Duke’s death. A large \textit{Venus and Adonis} entered the collection of the Buen Retiro as well as the portrait of a grotesque child (which remains untraced).\textsuperscript{113}

\textbf{The Duke of Medina de las Torres}

Ramiro de Guzman, the Duke of Medina de las Torres, ruled Naples from 1637 to 1644.\textsuperscript{114} He was an important client of Ribera during his tenure as viceroy. Based on documentary


\textsuperscript{111} Only four fragments of this painting survive: \textit{Bacchus-Dionysus} (oil on canvas, c.1635, 55 x 46 cm, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid); \textit{Head of a Youth Crowned with Ivy} (oil on canvas, c. 1635, Collection of the Marquesa de Torres); \textit{Silenus} (oil on canvas, c. 1635, 55 x 40 cm, Colección Laserna, Bogota); and \textit{Head of a Woman} (Sibyl) (oil on canvas, c. 1635, 67 x 59 cm, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid). The work was originally recorded in the 1666 inventory of the Madrid Alcázar. See Spinosa, 2008, 400-2.

\textsuperscript{112} Finaldi, 2003, 384-5.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 385.

evidence, one can surmise that Ribera and the Count had a favorable relationship. The viceroy was known to have granted Ribera extraordinary favors such making Ribera’s son an *hombre de armas* (man-at-arms) in 1638 when the child was only five years old so that he could “enjoy the income and other perquisites and attendant honors.” A year later, Ribera issued power of attorney to his son so that he could obtain a commission.

The viceroy commissioned and owned nine important works by the painter. The inventory and *tasacion* (appraisal) of the Duke’s estate were taken after his death in December 1668. The appraisal of works was performed by the court painter Juan Carreño de Miranda nearly a year later in November 1669. The post-mortem inventory records the Duke’s ownership of Ribera’s *Jacob’s Dream* (1639, oil on canvas, 179 x 232 cm, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, fig. 127) and its pendant *The Liberation of Saint Peter* (1639, oil on canvas, 179 x 233 cm, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid). In the inventory, the paintings are listed as “Saint Peter when the angel released him from prison” and “another picture of the same size, of Jacob.” Both are identified as “originals by Jusephe de Rivera [sic] evaluated at 3,000 reales each.”

Other works in the inventory are also attributed to Ribera: a large *Nativity* and a *Venus*. Marcus Burke tentatively identified four other works in the inventory as ones by Ribera based on their subject matter: *Prophet and a Sibyl*; a rounded *Holy Family; Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John and Saint Bernard*; a medium-sized *Adoration of the Magi*; and a large *Deposition*.

As was the case with Ribera’s paintings in Monterrey’s collection, various works by Ribera from Medina de las Torres’ tenure were also acquired for King Philip IV. One striking

---


Pérez Sánchez, 1992, 37.

Prota-Giurleo, 108; Finaldi, 1992b, 245.

Burke, 133.

Ibid.
example is Ribera’s *Martyrdom of Saint Philip* (dated 1639), which was not recorded in Medina de la Torres’s post-mortem inventory but appears instead in the 1666 inventory of the Alcazár. Finaldi has rightly suggested the viceroy might have presented the work as a gift to the King. According the inventory, the painting hung in a prominent location, in the room where the king gave audience.\(^{120}\)

**The Admiral of Castile**

Like Medina de la Torres, Don Juan Alfonso Enríquez de Cabrera, the duke of Medina de Río Seco and the ninth Admiral of Castile (Almirante de Castila) was a celebrated art connoisseur and avid collector. He assembled much of his collection during the first half of Philip IV’s reign. He served as mayordomo to the Spanish king and was appointed Viceroy of Sicily in 1641. He then served as Viceroy of Naples from 1644 to 1646, and was “temporary ambassador to Rome in 1646.”\(^ {121}\) When he was in Rome, he lived at the Palazzo Colonna, as his mother was Vittoria Colonna, the Countess of Módica and the Duchess of Medina de Río Seco, daughter of Marcantonio II and Felice Orsini. The Admiral had inherited many of his paintings from his mother who herself had amassed a sizeable collection of 200 works.\(^ {122}\)

The inventory of the Admiral’s collection discloses one of the richest art collections of paintings of the seventeenth century, and, in particular, sizeable holdings of Ribera’s paintings.\(^ {123}\) He owned sixteen canvases by the renowned Spanish-Neapolitan painter.\(^ {124}\) The paintings mostly

---

\(^ {119}\) The *Nativity* is listed as no. 232 and was appraised at a value of 6,600 reales and the Venus as no. 233 at 500 reales. It has proven to be difficult to identify these paintings with extant works by Ribera. See Felton and Jordan, 1982, 178-81.

\(^ {120}\) Finaldi, 2003, 385.

\(^ {121}\) Burke, 1997, 170.

\(^ {122}\) Ibid. The inventory of Colonna’s collection lists 255 paintings, all of which were left unattributed to any artist, and the majority represented religious subjects, with the exception of a few landscapes and a cycle depicting the Seasons. See Burke and Cherry, 1997, doc. 18, 292-300.

\(^ {123}\) The paintings were appraised on August 17, 1647 by the painter Antonio Arias. Burke and Cherry, 1997, 408.

\(^ {124}\) Burke and Cherry, 1997, doc. 43, 407-34. The citation here provides the English translation of the work’s title with the original Spanish and provides the number of the item within the inventory itself: 1) *Hecate (A Scene of Witchcraft) (Echiçera)* (no. 37); 2) *Saint Andrew (San Andres)* (no. 85); 3) *Portrait of a Drunkard (Retrato de un borracho)* (no. 138); 4) *Saint Paul (Caveza de S’ Pablo)* (no. 140); 5) *Saint Paul*
depicted religious images, namely depictions of the Virgin Mary (most famously the Immaculate Conception) and representations of martyred and penitent saints such as Saint Andrew and Saint Jerome. Works that proved to be exceptions were genre paintings such as The Portrait of a Drunkard, mythological themes such as Venus and Adonis, and a scene of witchcraft that can be identified as Ribera’s Hecate (oil on copper, 330 x 630 cm, Apsley House, London).

The duke gave Philip IV a large number of paintings, many which furnished the Escorial. The duke’s son, Don Juan Gaspar (the tenth almirante) founded the Convent of San Pascual Bailón in Madrid and decorated it with five paintings by Ribera: The Immaculate Conception on the high altar (currently Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado); the Martyrdom of Saint Andrew (Budapest Museum of Fine Arts); Saint Paul the Hermit (Paris, Musée du Louvre); The Baptism of Christ (Nancy, Musée des Beaux-arts); and the Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (destroyed, formerly Berlin, Kaiser Friedrich Museum). Other canvases from the royal collection that are presently in the Prado might have come from the collection of the admiral, but the estate inventory failed to mention the dimensions of these works which complicates or even precludes the task of identification.

The Duke of Arcos

Unlike the collecting activities of the Duke of Alcalá and the Count of Monterrey, the collecting activities of the Duke of Arcos (Rodrigo Ponce de Leon) have been little studied. Ribera received some commissions from the Duke of Arcos, who served as viceroy from 1646 to

\(\text{Retrato de sanct Pº de medio cuerpo} \) (no. 182); 6) \text{Saint Jerome (Sanct Geronimo)} \) (no. 183); 7) \text{Dead Christ (Cristo muerto)} \) (no. 268); 8) \text{Saint Joseph (Sanct Joseph de mas de medio cuerpo)} \) (no. 327); 9) \text{Saint John the Baptist (S° Ju° bap\textsuperscript{t}o)} \) (no. 348); 10) \text{Venus and Adonis (La diosa Venus con adonis muerto)} \) (no. 350); 11) \text{The Virgin and Saint Joseph (Nra s\textsuperscript{su} y sanct Joseph)} \) (no. 354); 12) \text{Saint Sebastian (San sebastian)} \) (no. 361); 13) \text{Saint Anthony of Padua (Sanct antonio de padua)} \) (no. 383); 14) \text{Martyrdom of Saint Andrew (Martirio de Sanct Andres)} \) (no. 387); 15) \text{The Immaculate Conception (Nra s\textsuperscript{sa} De la concepcion)} \) (no. 411); and 16) \text{Saint Jerome (Medio cuerpo es, Sanct geronimo)} \) (no. 586).

125 Bonaventura Bassegoda i Hugas, El Escorial como museo: La decoración pictórica mueble en el monasterio de El Escorial desde Diego Velázquez hasta Frédéric Quilliet (1809) [Bellaterra (Barcelona): Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2002].

1648. Ribera worked on projects for the Palazzo Reale chapel in Naples among them a representation of the *Immaculate Conception*, which was later shipped to Spain. Aside from Ribera, the Duke owned works by Velázquez which included a *bozzetto* of Velázquez’s *Las Meninas* (c. 1656).

**Juan of Austria**

While Ribera worked for eleven viceroys, he made only one official portrait of one of them: Don Juan José of Austria. Juan of Austria, who was the illegitimate son of Philip IV and an actress, Ana Calderona, was sent as interim ruler to quell the 1648 revolt led by Tomasso Aniello, best known by his nickname, Masaniello. Ribera was painter to Juan of Austria, who was then living in the viceroy’s palace with his family during this time of unrest and instability in Naples.

That same year Ribera received the commission to paint a state portrait of Juan of Austria (fig. 11). As Ribera was residing in the palace, one can safely say that he was still working as a court painter to the Spanish viceregency. In fashioning the image of the young prince, Ribera chose the format of the equestrian portrait, which had long-standing associations with imperial might and majesty since Roman antiquity. Juan de Austria is depicted young: he was then nineteen years old and is shown seated stiffly upon a rearing, dappled-grey horse. He is elegantly dressed with a plumed hat and a suit of armor. The figures of both rider and horse are silhouetted

---

127 Arcos’ tenure was disputed by the civil revolts led by Masaniello in 1648. See Finaldi, 1995, 192-93.
128 María Cruz de Carlos Varona, “Sobre el supuesto boceto de *Las Meninas* y otros Velázquez que poseyó el Duque de Arcos,” in *Simposion Internacional Velázquez* (Seville: Junta de Andalucia, Consejería de Cultura), 329-40.
129 Ribera was paid 600 ducats for the *Immaculate Conception*. For related documentation, see Finaldi, 1992b, 249.
130 Reference is made to Ribera as a resident in the Palazzo Reale in January 1646: Finaldi, 1992b, 248. Juan of Austria’s artistic patronage and collecting activities have been extensively studied by Elvira González Asenjo, *Don Juan José de Austria y las artes (1629-1679)* (Madrid: Fundación de Apoyo a la Historia del Arte Hispánico, 2005).
against a landscape that overlooks the Bay of Naples: the building in the distance can be identified as Castel Sant’Elmo.

Ribera also made a reproductive etching (fig. 12) of the same portrait which circulated the image of the prince to a wider audience. In contrast to the youthful and idealized visage of the prince illustrated in the painted portrait, the image of Juan de Austria in the print is by far sterner and more commanding in appearance. It has also been noted that the foreshortened, front hooves of the horse appear as if they were about to trample the Piazza Mercato, the main, geographic center of the riots, indicating the viceroy’s successful quelling of the revolt.\footnote{Andrea Bayer, cat. no. 86, 189 in Pérez Sánchez and Spinosa, 1992.}

Ribera’s representations of Juan of Austria were thus assertions of the painter’s allegiance and support of the Spanish faction in Naples, and, by extension, of the Spanish Crown, with which he wished to cultivate a further rapport.\footnote{Legend has it that Ribera’s daughter or niece possibly had a romantic liaison with Juan of Austria: Carlos José Hernando Sánchez, “Teatro del honor y ceremonial de la ausencia, La corte virreinal de Nápoles en el siglo XVII,” in vol. 1, Calderón de la Barca y la España del Barroco, eds. José Alcalá-Zamora and Ernest Belenguer (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales / Sociedad Estatal España Nuevo Milenio, 2003), 617.} Ribera’s alliance with Juan of Austria might have created antagonistic relations with the incoming viceroy, the Count of Oñate.

The Count of Oñate

The last viceroy whom Ribera served was the Count of Oñate, whose tenure started in 1648 and ended in 1653, one year after the painter’s death. Oñate’s tenure as viceroy and as a patron and collector of art has been most recently studied by Alessandra Anselmi and Ana Minguito Palomares.\footnote{See Alessandra Anselmi, “I ritratti di Iñigo Vélez e Tassis VIII conte di Oñate ed un ritratto di Ribera,” \textit{Locus amoenus} 6 (2002/3): 293-304; Ana Minguito Palomares, “Linaje, poder, y cultura: el gobierno de Iñigo Vélez de Guevara, VIII Conde Oñate, en Napoli,” (Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad de Complutense}
inauguration of the Palazzo degli Studi in November 1650 which was reproduced in an engraving published in the *Theatrum Omnium Scientarum* (Naples, 1650).\textsuperscript{134}

The long-standing theory has held that the viceroy favored the painter Massimo Stanzione for his state, equestrian portrait among other commissions. But archival evidence shows that Ribera in fact also painted an official portrait of the Count of Oñate on horseback. The inventory of the estate of the Duke’s mother, Doña Catalina Vélez de Guevara, Countess of Oñate and Villademediana, lists *The Count of Oñate Entering Naples* that is clearly attributed to Ribera but remains untraced.\textsuperscript{135}

Nevertheless, political rivalries between the Count of Oñate and Juan of Austria might have been the reason why Ribera was not completely favored by Oñate, given the painter’s prior association with the latter.\textsuperscript{136} Instead, Ribera, perhaps by means of his affiliation with Juan of Austria, sought the protection of Philip IV himself. As will be discussed in chapter four, Ribera might have had closer personal ties to the young Habsburg as he might have been the grandfather or grand-uncle of a child begotten by Juan de Austria and his daughter or niece. Between August 31, 1651 and September 1, 1652, Ribera had directly petitioned the king to grant some benefice to his daughter, Margarita, who was recently widowed and whom he could not afford to support as a result of the debt he incurred to pay for her husband’s funeral.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{134}Minguito Palomares, 2002, 937.
\textsuperscript{135}The works in the Countess’s collection were appraised in 1685 by the court painter Juan Carreño de Miranda (Burke and Cherry, doc. 112, no. 31, 880). The entry reads: “Mas Un Retratto del Sr Conde de Oñatte de cavallo quando entro en Naples Con marco dorado de Joseph Rivera de quarto baras de Alto y dos y media de ancho en quarto mill y quatrocientos Reales 1400.” While the painting’s whereabouts remain unknown, the inventory entry records its subject as the viceroy’s entry into Naples, possibly the *possesso*, the official rite of entry during which the viceroy “took possession” of the city’s government. The ritual of the *possesso* and the visual culture associated with it has been recently examined by Sabina de Cavi, “El *Possesso* de los virreyes españoles en Nápoles (siglos XVII – XVIII)” in *El legado de Borgoña: fiesta y ceremonia cortesana en la Europa de los Austrias (1454-1648)* (Madrid: Fundación Carlos Amheres, 2010), 323-57.
\textsuperscript{136}Minguito Palomares, 937.
\textsuperscript{137}Proto Giurleo, 1953; Finaldi, 1992b, 251.
Ribera served almost all the Spanish viceroys from Osuna to Oñate. Once the painter was established at the viceregal court under Osuna, subsequent viceroys turned to him for commissions. The viceroys also acted as artistic agents for the Spanish crown. There was considerable favor and prestige to be made from supplying the king with first-rate works by Ribera. “Ribera’s Spanish origins and close association with the viceregal administration [also] meant that he was consistently as much represented in Spanish aristocratic collections as in [Italian] ones.”

Ribera’s ability to procure viceregal patronage consistently not only allowed for him to create a reliable network for himself but also helped him to establish himself as the preeminent painter of Naples. Furthermore, Ribera’s title as court painter aided him in acquiring a knighthood, an honor which Spanish painters rarely received in the Golden Age.

**Ribera’s Knighthood**

Ribera was accepted into the religious and military Order of Christ of Portugal on January 29, 1626. Ribera’s knighthood is indeed significant for the raising of the status of

---


Spanish painter. Knighthoods were rare honors for Spanish artists. Only one other Spanish painter – Diego de Velázquez – was knighted in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{140}

The Order of Christ was established in 1317 by Dionysus I, King of Portugal. It was led by Pope John XXII who issued a bull of approbation reserving the right for himself and his successors to confer knighthood. During Ribera’s lifetime, the Spanish king, Philip III, headed the Order from 1598-1621 when he was succeeded by Philip IV who was in command from 1621 to 1640. Other artists who became members of the Order of Christ included the Italians Battistello Caracciolo and Massimo Stanzione, Francesco Maria Vanni, Francesco Borromini, Sebastiano Conca, and Carlo Maratti.\textsuperscript{141}

Ironically Ribera mentioned his knighthood in just one signature and never referred to himself by the Latin term “eqeus” or the Italian title “cavaliere.” He mentioned his knighthood in only one signature, the Magdalena Ventura (fig. 9), that he painted for the Duke of Alcalá in 1631. It has been said that Ribera perhaps did not highly regard this title and sought a Spanish knighthood which he deemed more prestigious.\textsuperscript{142} Ribera possibly attempted to petition for a knighthood in the Order of Santiago without much success. The Council Order of Madrid required solid evidence of one’s nobility and Ribera may have petitioned it from a most unlikely source. According to the Roman document that confirms that Ribera was admitted into the order
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\textsuperscript{141} Chenault, 1976, 306; Schütze, 1992, 323.

\textsuperscript{142} Finaldi, 1992. Martin Warnke mentions that Ribera was made a knight of the Order of Saint John in Rome in 1644. This fact remains unsupported as no archival evidence maintains it. (idem, \textit{The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist}, trans. David McLintock (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 171.)
of Christ, he was of noble birth (de nobili genere procreatus). In his Abecedario, the famed art collector Pierre-Jean Mariette had seen a letter that the painter supposedly gave to a certain Monsieur Langlois “in which he requested that he [Langlois] should find out if the diocese of Ausch [sic] there were people of the name de la Rivière so that Lo Spagnoletto could associate them with his own family to magnify his glory.”

While Mariette’s claim remains unconfirmed, other documents indicate that Ribera might have intended to pursue a more prestigious title such as one conferred by the elite Order of Santiago in Spain. Among the documents of the genealogist Salazár y Castro in the Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid, there is a genealogy of Ribera that was sent by the notary of the Holy Office in Játiva to the Inquisitor General in 1638. The document states that Ribera was a renowned painter (“pintor insigne”), was nicknamed the little Spaniard (“españoleto”), was born in Játiva, and that his father was a shoemaker from the town of Ruzafa near Valencia. Given his humble origins and lack of noble lineage, Ribera surely did not qualify for a title from one of the most exclusive Spanish military orders.

**Ribera and Art Dealing**

Aside from procuring the protection of the viceroys and the Spanish king himself, Ribera cultivated a series of very practical strategies for selling and promoting his art throughout his career. In this section, I shall consider three ways in which Ribera increased his marketability as an artist and ensured that his works would also command high sums from patrons: 1) his

---

144 Finaldi, 1992a, 6.  
involvement with art dealers; 2) his role as an art appraiser; and 3) his pricing and marketing strategies.

When Ribera arrived as a young painter in Rome around 1611 or 1612, he worked for art dealers. It has been noted in the literature that Italian and Spanish artists and art theorists who were advocates of the nobility of painting as a liberal art disparaged the practice of art dealing. The lowly aspects of a street vendor selling or “hawking” pictures can be seen Annibale Carracci’s depiction of the picture seller from his *Arti di Bologna* (fig. 13) The print shows a shabbily dressed street vendor offering second-rate, religious images for sale as part of his trade. Annibale’s print reflects some of the prejudices of the period about the economics of art: that offering paintings directly for sale is a lowly mercantile activity, with which one should be disassociated. By inference, painters should pursue the established, more elevated practice of making works on commission.

Recent research has also begun to “dispel” these negative associations and prejudices that can be traced as far back as Giorgio Vasari’s *Lives of the Artists* (1550; second edition, 1568). Aside from the prejudices held by painters, art historian Christopher Marshall writes that seventeenth-century art biographers and artists such as Giovanni Baglione, Giulio Mancini, Giovanni Battista Passeri, Giovanni Battista Paggi, and Filippo Baldinucci also perceived of art dealing as a practical matter and “a necessary evil only – something that young artists should be permitted to engage with only at the outset of their careers as an initial step toward attaining the higher honor of private and public patronage.” For example, the biographer and collector Mancini wrote that Ribera worked for dealers at an early stage in his career “having come to Rome, he worked for a daily wage for those who have workshops and sell paintings through the

---

labors of similar young men.” The markups charged by Roman dealers could be fairly high making the practice of art dealing both lucrative and profitable. However, the venture into art dealing could be a risky venture. Mancini added that this work came “with all the trials such work involves for young men.” While this quote from Mancini casts the practice of dealing in a dubious light, it is important to note, as a foreign artist working in Rome, that the network, in which Ribera participated, probably helped him to establish important contacts in the city and would also facilitate practical needs, such as the acquisition of working materials and studio space in Rome.

Furthermore, the practice of selling his work in the market raises an important question about Ribera’s self-promotion: did the painter’s ability to produce commercially successful work at this point in his career help him to establish his “trademark style and format of painting” that he was associated with for a good part of his career? Many recent studies have attempted to trace Ribera’s early career and artistic production from 1611 to 1626. While Ribera’s early compositions mostly focused on half-length figures, some of which are presumably done without commission, Gianni Papi has reattributed several, multi-figural works formerly associated with

---

149 Ibid.
153 Ribera’s youthful career has been the subject of various recent studies that have questioned or challenged claims about Ribera’s early style. See Papi, 2007; Yusuke Kawase, “Jusepe de Ribera’s Early Production and Patronage in Naples, 1616-1626.” In Aspects of Problems in Western Art History: Essays Presented to Nobotoshi Fukube (Tokyo: Department of Western Art History, Faculty of Fine Arts, Tokyo National University of Fine Arts and Music, 2005), 57-66; Lange, 2003.
the Master of the Judgment of Solomon to Ribera.\textsuperscript{154} Granted that Papi’s attributions are correct, the noted absence of signatures in Ribera’s early work might indicate the painter’s ambivalent attitude toward the work he produced for direct sale on the art market in his early years in Rome, despite the economic benefits he reaped during this period. Furthermore, in Ribera’s case, working for an art dealer and later relying on a network of artists and businesspeople to sell his work nonetheless allowed him to make inroads into local markets so it was professionally and economically advantageous for him to avail himself temporarily of this scheme.

\textbf{Ribera as Art Appraiser}

Ribera’s endeavor as an appraiser was among one of his varied strategies to achieve professional success, but is a lesser-known aspect of his career. Appraising was a common activity for artists who worked at court in Spain in the mid-seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; painters such as Velázquez, Alonso Cano, Juan Carreño de Miranda, Claudio Coello and Antonio Palomino were hired to appraise paintings in royal, aristocratic and non-royal collections in Spain. While there are only few records of the learned opinions of these painters on the works of their colleagues, artists were employed in the traditional role of expert (\textit{perito}) in the valuation of works of art. At court, it was normal for painters in the royal employ to value one another’s work when necessary. However, it is difficult to assess the degree of artists’ involvement with the collecting activities of private collectors. Painters’ appraisals did not usually provide the criteria by which individual paintings were evaluated (this was stipulated by the collector or the beneficiaries of his or her estate), nor their thoughts and opinions of the works they assessed. While the role that painters played in evaluating Spanish art collections has been

well studied, the phenomenon has not been similarly studied in relation to Neapolitan art
collections.\textsuperscript{155}

Ribera and Massimo Stanzione both appraised eighteen works by Paolo Finoglia in the
Certosa di San Martino.\textsuperscript{156} The document indicates that their methods were fairly simple. Line
by line, their appraisal of Finoglia’s paintings identifies the given number of works appraised, the
subjects in some instances, the medium, and the prices for individual works or series. They did
not provide the specific dimensions of the paintings they judged but a general description of their
sizes. The prices they assigned were modest for some works and seemed to depend on their size
and the complexity of the given subject they illustrated. For example, two large fresco history
paintings (“las dos ystorias grandes a fresco”) commanded 260 ducats in total whereas five
Virtues (“sinco virtute”) were appraised at 100 ducats (20 each).

Ribera and Stanzione’s moderate appraisal of Finoglia’s work might reflect their desire,
in part, to control the pricing of competing artists. Both men were leading painters of Naples and
among the city’s best paid. In this instance, they might have joined together to determine the
pricing of works made by their competitors.

\textbf{Pricing Strategies}

In addition to the practical measures Ribera took to ensure his financial stability by
working for dealers as a young artist in Rome, as an established artist, Ribera was also concerned
with the pricing and sale of his work to ensure he would have a steady, often sizeable, flow of

\textsuperscript{155} Cherry, 1997, 53-4, 57.
\textsuperscript{156} ASN, Monasteri Soppressi 2142, San Martino, f. 81r, In Nunzio Federigo Faraglia, “Notizie di alcuni
artisti che lavorarono nella chiesia di S. Martino sopra Napoli,” Archivio storico per la province napoletane
17 (1892): 657-78; cited in Finaldi, 1992b, 242. The document reads:
“Li quarto ystorie Magore de la lamia dusiento ducados…………………………200
le altre quatro ystorie Minore a ragon de quarenta siento y sesenta ducati… …… 160
la ystoria de lo Meso con li quatro putini otanta ducati……………………………80
las dos ystorias grandes a fresco con una con otra dusientos y sesenta…………260
par sinco virtute chento ducate………………………………………………100
li duy quadri a olio de San Martino duchento ducati luno……………………..400
yo Jusepe de Ribera he apresiado ut supra Jusepe de Ribera
income. Ribera would not accept a commission without partial or full payment in advance and commanded high prices for his paintings.\footnote{Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez, “José de Ribera.” in Veintitrés biografías de pintores. Museo Nacional del Prado, ed. Javier Portús (Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 1991), 217.} For example, he demanded 270 ducats for a Pietà commissioned in the 1640s, which would have resembled his version of the subject painted for the Certosa di San Martino (although the painting was actually commissioned for the even higher price of 400 ducats).\footnote{Christopher R. Marshall, “Markets, Money and Artistic Maneouvres: Bernardo Cavallino and the Grand Manner,” Melbourne Art Journal 7 (2004), 43.} Often these prices were calculated on the basis of a set fee for each figure. Ribera charged upwards of 100 ducats and sometimes even more for each of his figures in particularly prominent public commission of this kind.\footnote{Ibid, 44; Ribera was paid 66.5 ducats per figure for his Pietà (1637, San Martino, Naples), 100 for his Saint Januarius Escaping from the Fiery Furnace (1647, Cappella del Tesoro, Naples), and 100 for his Last Communion of the Apostles (1651, choir lateral, Church of San Martino, Naples). Compared to prices paid to other Neapolitan painters such as Massimo Stanzione and Luca Giordano, Ribera earned close to double and even more than triple the amounts they were paid per figure which was usually between twenty-five to fifty ducats. See Christopher R. Marshall, “Naples,” in Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters, eds. Richard E. Spear and Philip Sohm (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010), table 9, 121.}

**Ribera and the Secondary Art Market in Naples**

Ribera also cultivated a network of relations with high-ranking artists and architects who were also dealers, such as Cosimo Fanzago, to sell his work on the art market.\footnote{Marshall, 2000, 15-34.} Although Ribera received extensive patronage from the Carthusians, the monks, in fact, turned to Fanzago to procure two paintings of Saints Lawrence and Andrew from Ribera. Ribera’s work-load provides one possible reason why the Carthusians might have chosen to purchase paintings from Fanzago instead of acquiring them directly from the painter. Ribera was occupied with major commissions from the Duke of Alba, the Duke of Alcalá, and the Count of Monterrey, who served as successive viceroys in Naples from 1622 to 1637. As Christopher Marshall notes, “these commitments led to his over-extending himself with prospective patrons on at least one
In 1632 the painter was required to return 100 ducats paid to him by the high-ranking aristocracy and administrative functionary, Giovanni d’Avalos, the principe di Montesarchio, for a painting of Saint Lawrence that he was unable to finish.\(^\text{162}\)

It is highly likely that the Carthusians drew on Fanzago’s knowledge of the secondary art market to purchase works by Ribera in a time when they knew they could not secure commissions directly from the painter.\(^\text{163}\) However, this situation changed when Ribera began work on the decoration of the Certosa di San Martino. “The Carthusians might have had cause to then reassess their purchase since the documents record that they returned the paintings [by Ribera] to Fanzago in this same year as payment in kind to make up 400 ducats said to be owed to the architect for materials.”\(^\text{164}\) Marshall has observed that it is still difficult to assess the exact reasons why the Carthusians returned the paintings to Fanzago. He speculates that Ribera’s half-length representations of Saints Jerome and Sebastian commissioned for the Prior’s new picture gallery were replacements for the two pictures returned to Fanzago. He also suggests Ribera himself might have offered to replace his saints with two paintings that had similar subject matter.

Aside from these measures, Ribera also employed numerous assistants to carry out commissions which he was too busy to execute or too ill to complete, which paid little, or were not prestigious enough to demand his attention.\(^\text{165}\) Marshall observes that it was common in Naples

\(^{161}\) Ibid., 19.
\(^{162}\) Ibid., 19, 31 no. 28. The litigation concerning Ribera’s repayment to D’Avalos was originally published by Eduardo Nappi, “Un regesto di documenti inediti, tratti preventemente dall’Archivio Storico del Banco di Napoli, riguardanti Giuseppe Ribera e una conferma della presenza a Napoli nel novembre 1630 di Velázquez,” Ricerche sul ’600 napoletano (1990), doc. 63, p. 185; reprinted by Finaldi, 1992b, 243.
\(^{163}\) Marshall, 2000, 19.
\(^{164}\) Ibid.
\(^{165}\) Ribera was brought to trial for his failure to complete a commission for Cristoforo Papa. See Vicenzo Pacelli, “Processo tra Ribera e un committente,” Napoli Nobilissima: rivista di arti figurative, archeologia e urbanistica 18 (1979): 28-36.
for a leading artist, such as Ribera, to sell “independently painted work from the studio” which he
maintained in his home.\textsuperscript{166}

\textbf{Property Acquisition and Rental Properties}

Owning a house was a major symbol of status for a seventeenth-century artist.\textsuperscript{167} In
1619, Ribera purchased a house and garden for his family in the Strada di Santo Spirito for the
large sum of 1,900 ducats. Twenty-two years later in 1641, at the height of his career, he bought
a small villa with an adjoining garden in the fashionable neighborhood of the Borgo di Chaia on
the outskirts of Naples for 3,100 ducats. In order to recover the costs of purchasing this property,
Ribera rented it for 100 ducats, an amount which was double the annual rent payable on a
painter’s studio in Naples itself.\textsuperscript{168}

Ribera also supplemented his income through rental properties.\textsuperscript{169} Ribera’s real estate
ventures later in his life raise questions or issues about his financial status, and, by extension, his
commercial success as a painter. During a time when Ribera was contending with a long-term
illness that precluded his ability to paint and supervise his workshop regularly, the income
generated from rental properties would have provided a steady income. In addition to his
sporadic activities as an art appraiser and his dealings with other artists to sell his work on the
market, Ribera also made additional income through renting property. Extant financial records
attest to Ribera’s rent collecting activities. A receipt dated May 27, 1639 records that a tenant in

\textsuperscript{166} Marshall, 2000, 23. The painters Agostino Beltrano and Enrico Fiammingo have been identified as
students of Ribera and Stanzione respectively. Ribera’s workshop is the topic of a forthcoming doctoral
dissertation by Yusuke Kawase, Institute of Fine Arts, New York.

\textsuperscript{167} Precedents for an artist owning a large villa or home as a status symbol existed in Italy in the sixteenth
dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1982; KelleyThomas Helmstutler, “To Demonstrate His Greatness:
Leone Leoni and the Casa degli Omenoni” (Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey,
2000).

\textsuperscript{168} Marshall, 2010, 71.

\textsuperscript{169} This economic strategy was common in Spain, namely in Seville. For example, Zurbarán rented
properties to generate additional income in his later career when his success as a painter began to decline.
311.
Ribera’s house named Iacinto de Selva paid rent to the painter.\textsuperscript{170} Notarial documents also indicate that once Ribera bought a large house in the Chiaia quarter of Naples, he paid taxes on it.\textsuperscript{171} One can speculate that, in all likelihood, Ribera rented the house in the Chiaia quarter when he took up refuge in the Palazzo Reale in January 1646.\textsuperscript{172} A baptismal certificate dated December 17, 1651 refers to another house owned by Ribera in the neighborhood of Santa Maria degli Angeli.\textsuperscript{173} However, two months before his death, Ribera rented a house in Mergellina. Ribera was ill at the end of his life and perhaps wanted to stay closer to the heart of the city by residing in its Spanish quarter.\textsuperscript{174}

**Conclusion**

The picture of Ribera that emerges from this evaluation of his marketing strategies is one of a shrewd and astute artist who knew how to “navigate” both the Italian and Spanish art markets. The painter was involved in the practices of art dealing, appraising and selling as common ones along with stocking his workshop with pictures made by his apprentices. While seventeenth-century painters such Denis Calvaert or Giovanni Battista Paggi and art institutions such as the Accademia di San Luca disparaged these practices, dealing or having his work sold by well-established artists such as Cosimo Fanzago helped to facilitate the sale of Ribera’s work and enabled him to “strengthen and diversify [his] audience” and “increase[d] the viability and marketability of [his] career.”\textsuperscript{175} Ribera’s commercial endeavors as an art dealer and appraiser

\textsuperscript{170} “A Iacinto de Selva D.50.E per esso a Giuseppe de Rivera per l’uscita de una casa dove al presente habita nella strada de Chiaia a ducati 100 l’anno, dichiarando essere soddisfato del passato per insino a 13 de maggio.” (ASBN, Banco di San Giacomo, Giornale del 1639, Matr. 192, 27 maggio), Nappi 1990, Finaldi, 1992b, 245.
\textsuperscript{171} Nappi 1990, Finaldi, 1992, 246. Ribera also paid 400 ducats to Giovanni Gerolamo de Crezenzo on behalf of the heirs of Giovanni Gerolamo Paduano, who had sold him the house in Chiaia, Nappi 1990; Finaldi, 1992b, 247.
\textsuperscript{172} “Joseph de Ribera Hyspanus de familia suae eccellentiae commorans in Regio Palatio…” Pacelli, 1979; Finaldi, 1992b, 248.
\textsuperscript{174} Nappi 1990; Finaldi, 1992b, 253; Finaldi, 1995, 81.
\textsuperscript{175} Marshall, 2000, 27.
and his reliance on a network of artist and art dealers attests to the diversified artistic milieu of seventeenth-century Naples. Ribera’s forays into dealing and the commercialization of his art are wholly compatible with his quest for greater status, i.e., seeking a knighthood and similar honors or working for powerful patrons such as the viceroy of Naples. In addition, Ribera’s practical strategies for self-promotion exerted a good deal of influence on a younger generation of Neapolitan artists including Bernardo Cavallino, Salvator Rosa and Luca Giordano. In sum, Ribera’s success was exceptional in early modern Naples. In striving to pursue artistic success and excellence, he cultivated practical and resourceful tactics to meet the on-going and continuous challenges of how to develop and sustain his career.
Chapter 2 – Ribera’s Intellectual Self-Fashioning

Introduction

The practical strategies that Ribera relied upon to increase his wealth and enhance his social status were complemented by the ones that he employed, moreover, as part of his intellectual self-fashioning. Studies by Ronald Cohen, James Clifton, and Christopher Marshall have demonstrated some of the ways in which Ribera presented himself as an ambitious and successful painter.¹ Other art historians such as William Jordan, Yusuke Kawase, and Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez have also made compelling arguments about the learned aspects of Ribera’s naturalism.² Among these scholars, Clifton has systematically outlined an art theory for Ribera based on a close reading of the painter’s striking portrait of Magdalena Ventura (fig.9). His critical methodology is useful in constructing an art theory for Ribera whose art and career have not been examined with a more theoretical approach, and for whom we lack critical texts such as an autobiography or a post-mortem inventory of his estate and possessions. As Clifton has rightly noted, the painter’s works remain as the principal “texts” from which we can construct an art theory for Ribera.³

In my overview of Ribera’s self-fashioning, I shall broaden the scope of the current literature to consider the varied ways in which the artist sought to present himself as learned and as one who was in close contact with erudite patrons and collectors. First, I shall examine Ribera’s engagement with the art of the Renaissance. While the powerful and dramatic art of Caravaggio provided an important model that Ribera re-interpreted as a young painter, as part of his self-fashioning, Ribera also formulated a kind of “learned naturalism” in which he also

³ Clifton, 1995, 111-12.
borrowed, quoted or refashioned images and ideas from Northern European and Italian Renaissance painters, namely Albrecht Dürer, Leonardo da Vinci, and Titian among others.4

This chapter will also analyze Ribera’s philosophers within the context of the painter’s depiction of ancient subject-matter. His thirty-two philosopher portraits encompass the most extensive series in his oeuvre. Ribera’s innovative presentation of famed Greek thinkers such as Heraclitus, Democritus, and Diogenes in a half-length format and in a variety of poses makes him an important interpreter of antique themes of the early modern era. Ribera was familiar with the writings of Greek and Roman philosophers by means of his association with erudite vice-regal patrons such as the Duke of Osuna and Duke of Alcalá and his possible connection to members of Naples’ foremost literary and scientific institutions, the Accademia degli Oziosi and the Accademia degli Investiganti.5 Ribera’s veristic depiction of these ancient thinkers gives us further insight into the painter’s sense of naturalism, which is based on close, empirical observation.

Ribera’s sustained interest in naturalism is also reflected in the ways in which he thought about the didactic purpose of art. His etchings of sensory organs, which were possibly designed for a more systematic drawing manual that never came to fruition, are careful studies that follow in the tradition of Renaissance drawing manuals. Although limited in number, Ribera’s didactic compositions greatly influenced late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century artists who copied and reproduced his striking compositions in their illustrative manuals.

---

Ribera’s Interpretation of Northern European and Italian Renaissance Traditions

As part of his self-fashioning, Ribera formulated a kind of “learned naturalism” in which he borrowed formal and iconographic elements from past artists. According to Jusepe Martínez’s 1625 interview with the painter in Naples, Ribera accorded a good deal of importance to the study of the art of the Italian High Renaissance, in particular, Raphael’s frescoes for the Vatican Stanze (1508-1511):

I asked him whether he had any wish to travel to Rome to see again the original paintings he had studied in the past; he heaved a great sigh, saying: ‘Not only do I long to see them, for they are such works that they demand to be studied and meditated upon many times. For although we now paint in a different way and style, the artist who does not base his foundations on these studies will easily end in ruin. He should study especially these history paintings, which are the polestar of the perfection I have told you of, and which can be seen in the stories the immortal Raphael painted in the Holy Palace: whoever studies these works will become a true and consummate history painter.’

Ribera’s comments about painting in Martínez’s text reveal that he was indeed concerned with the theoretical aspects of painting. While he acknowledges that the style of then-contemporary art had radically changed (in part, as a result of Caravaggio’s ground-breaking style), he also claims that the study of the art of the past, namely that of the High Renaissance, is an essential part of an artist’s education. Moreover, as the dialogue unfolds, he refers to the adjective “history” twice in connection with both painting and painters, signaling his awareness of the concept of the istoria [historia]. Coined in the fifteenth-century by Leon Battista Alberti in his famed treatise on painting entitled De pictura (written 1435), the term, in part, refers to a

---

6 Martínez, 1988, 100; trans. Finaldi, 1992b, 239-40. “Pregúntele que si tenía deseo de ir a Roma a ver de Nuevo las pinturas originales de sus studios pasados; echó un gran suspiro, diciendo: no sólo tengo deseo de verlas, sino de volver de nuevo a estudiarlas, que son obras tales, que quieren ser estudiadas y meditadas muchas veces, que aunque ahora se pinta por diferente rumbo y práctica, sino se funda en esta base de estudios parará en ruina fácilmente y en particular en sus historiados, que son el norte de la perfección que dije, en la que nos enseñan las historias del inmortal Rafael pintadas en el Sacro Palacio: el que estudiare estas obras hará historiador verdadero y consumado.” Throughout this dissertation I have relied on different modern editions of Jusepe Martinez’s treatise. I have consulted Julián Gallego’s 1988 edition. A recently edited version of Martínez’s treatise has been issued, in which the re-transcription of the text restores much of Martínez’s original Castilian and contains some variations in spelling and orthography; however, these textual changes have not changed the overall content and meaning of Martínez’s dialogue with Ribera. (2006 [reprint, 2008], 51-52).
painter’s representation of large-scale, historic narratives that are imbued with a sense of his visual intelligence and technical inventiveness (ingenium and invenzione respectively).\(^7\) Ribera’s concept of the istoria is specifically culled from his study of Raphael’s frescoes in the Vatican stanze.\(^8\) The rooms are painted with complex intellectual, philosophical and theological narratives that relate to the importance of the papacy as a spiritual and temporal institution and to the pope as its leader. Raphael’s erudition was not lost on Ribera, and, as we shall see, his large-scale mature works such as the Drunken Silenus (fig. 83) and The Communion of the Apostles (fig. 30) contained sophisticated, multi-figural compositions that embody Ribera’s own interpretation of the istoria.

While Ribera’s art has been rightly understood within the context of the Caravaggesque tradition, his later style incorporated the varied, formal elements of Venetian and Flemish painting. However, art historians such as Mateo Revilla Uceda and James Clifton have been circumspect of Ribera’s interest in Italian Renaissance art and have questioned the veracity of Martínez’s dialogue, and, in particular, the section about Ribera’s admiration of Raphael’s art. Both scholars have reminded us to be mindful of Ribera’s “fundamental Caravaggism.”\(^9\)

---


However, I contend that many of Ribera’s artistic practices were indeed shaped or informed by art of the Renaissance masters.

**Ribera and Dürer**

Ribera was undoubtedly familiar with the art of Albrecht Dürer. The German master’s designs were well-known in Spain, especially in Valencia, where Ribera was born and received his earliest artistic education. Early modern Spanish painters frequently relied on Dürer’s designs for developing iconography.\(^\text{10}\) While Ribera knew and quoted Dürer’s compositions, as we shall see in *The Poet* and other works, he also introduced certain innovations of his own.

Ribera’s renowned *The Poet* (c. 1620-21, etching, fig. 14) shows a male figure crowned with a laurel wreath and dressed in a long, voluminous robe standing with his left arm learning against a stone block. A budding tree is placed to the viewer’s right. The poet is completely absorbed by his thoughts: his down-turned eyes and face are darkened with densely hatched lines to convey the figure’s brooding nature. As Wolfgang Stechow and Jonathan Brown have demonstrated, the figure of the poet combines two iconographic types: the poet and the melancholic.\(^\text{11}\) His literary gifts are indicated by the laurel crown he wears, and his melancholic disposition is suggested by his pose, with his head resting on his hand and eyes downcast.

Literary parallels to Ribera’s *The Poet* have been investigated in detail by scholars who have connected the image to poems by the German medieval poet Walther von der Vogelweide (1170?-1230) and to Petrarch and Lorenzo de’ Medici. In one of his *Rime* (110), Lorenzo declared his despondent state of mind: “I often lean on a hard rock / and rest my head on my

---


cheek.” A fifteenth-century visual precedent for Ribera’s pensive poet can be seen in Sperandio’s famed portrait medal of Vesperian Strozzi (c. 1476, fig. 15). On the reverse side of the medal, Strozzi sits with his head in hand at the foot of a laurel tree that is partially withered and partially in bloom, similar to Ribera’s brooding laureate.

The figure of the Poet himself has been invariably identified as one of the great poets of the Italic literary tradition: Vergil, Petrarch or Dante. The suggestion that the poet might depict Vergil is especially compelling because the poet was traditionally thought to have been buried in Naples. The block in Ribera’s etching might be identified with a columbarium, or dovecote mausoleum, above the cave of Posilipo. According to local legend, a bay tree that grew on the top of the tomb continued to grow over the centuries, its roots forcing their way through the stone, causing fissures to form. The cracked appearance of the stone block that supports Ribera’s leaning poet might allude to that notion.

Ribera’s The Poet is visually and thematically linked to Albrecht Dürer’s Melencolia I (1514, engraving, fig. 16). The crowning of the figure with a wreath and the left hand supporting the figure’s face are identical in both sheets. However, major differences in the figure type and composition should be noted. In Dürer’s print, the image of Melancholy is a female personification, whereas in Ribera’s image, the figure is male. Dürer’s Melancholy is seated while Ribera’s Poet leans in a pensive pose that is also reminiscent of Raphael’s figure of

---

13 Chastel, 17; George Francis Hill, A Corpus of Italian Medals of the Renaissance Before Cellini, 2 (London : British Museum, 1930; Florence: Studio per Edizioni Scelte reprint 1984), pl. 73, no. 394, Bayer, 1992, cat. no, 73, 175.
14 While contending theories suggest different identities for Ribera’s poet, the lack of an inscription or a label and the generic features of the poet such as the laurel crown and robe preclude a definite identification of the figure. For the identification of the poet as Petrarch, see Stechow, 1957. Erwin Palm has argued that the poet could be the Roman poet Vergil (“Ein Vergil von Ribera, Pantheon 33 (1975): 23-27). John Moffitt has suggested that the poet could also be Dante (“Observations on “The Poet” by Ribera,” Paragone 29 (1978): 75-90).
15 Bayer, 1992, cat. no. 73, 175.
Heraclitus in the foreground of the School of Athens in the Stanza delle Signatura. Nevertheless, both Dürer’s and Ribera’s prints make the association between deep thought and melancholic thought, and the head supported by the hand, had become popular through representations of ancient philosophers and poets.

Ribera’s *The Poet* might also reflect the depiction of the intellectual situation of the artist parallel to *Melancholia I*. Dürer’s print illustrates the medieval belief that each individual was thought to be controlled by one of the four humors; melancholy, associated with black gall, was the least desirable of the four, and melancholics were considered most likely to succumb to madness. Renaissance thought, however, also linked melancholy with creative genius; thus, at the same time that this idea changed the status of this humor, it made the self-conscious artist aware of the terrible risks that came with his talent. In response to Dürer’s celebrated meditation on the status of the artist, Ribera’s depiction of *The Poet* further considers the interrelated role of theory and practice. Its possible placement as a frontispiece for his drawing manual shall be addressed later in his chapter.

Ribera’s *Holy Trinity* (c. 1635–36, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, fig. 17) was also modeled after Dürer’s example. The subject of the large canvas is God the Father supporting the dead Christ, his hands around his son’s head. Christ’s body rests on a beautifully modeled, white sheet that is placed at a slight diagonal, and is suspended in midair and supported by angels. The dove of the Holy Spirit hovers in the center of the painting. The Trinity is surrounded by groups of angels. Ribera’s formulation of this subject is drawn from Dürer’s own representation of the subject. In 1511, Dürer produced a woodcut of this subject for his *Passion Series* of 1507-1512 (fig. 18). Dürer’s representation of the Holy Trinity shows an extraordinary command of graphic effects. By using a variety of lines such as parallel strokes, cross-hatching, and dashes of differing

---

16 Ibid.
17 I shall consider Ribera’s innovative philosopher portraits later in this chapter.
degrees, the printmaker was able to represent shape and depth subtly. Dürer also used the white areas of the paper to create dramatic lighting effects. In turn, Ribera altered Dürer’s graphic effects using luminous color as seen in God the Father’s flowing red cape and a golden light that illuminates the upper left section of the painting. The carefully rendered cherubs’ heads hover in pairs and are arranged in triangular fashion around Christ’s limp body that is supported by a white shroud held by two angels set against dramatically modeled clouds.18

Ribera and Leonardo da Vinci

Ribera also turned to the example of Leonardo for his famous etched grotesque heads (engraving, fig. 53 and 54). Leonardo’s physiognomic studies, in particular his Five Grotesque Heads (fig. 19), offered significant iconographic precedents for artists working in the mid-to-late sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Grotesques after Leonardo were created by Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo (1538-92), Aurelio Luini (c. 1530-93), and members of the Accademia della Val di Blenio, the Milanese academy of scholars established in 1560 and active into the 1580s. Other renowned examples include those produced by Martino Rota (c. 1520-83), Giovanni Battista della Porta (1535? -1615) in his De Humana Physiognomia, Book III, published in 1588, Camillo Procaccini (c. 1555-1629), and Ribera himself.19

Ribera’s knowledge of Lombard artistic traditions was indubitably gathered first-hand during his travels as a young artist in northern Italy. Nevertheless, Leonardo’s designs were widely circulated through copies and productive prints, particularly the engraving The Pagan Gods (fig. 20) by Martino Rota, which had a profound influence on Ribera.20 Rota’s sheet depicts the twelve gods and goddess of the Olympic pantheon in profile view with deformed facial features such as snubbed noses, cleft lips, and bulbous tumors and warts.

18 El Greco also produced a comparable depiction of the Holy Trinity for the high altar of Santo Dominguo el Antiguo in Toledo (1577, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid). The painting’s composition is also similarly modeled after Dürer’s example.
Giulio Mancini’s biography of Ribera also mentions his trip to Lombardy, probably between 1611, when the artist is first documented in Parma, and 1615-16, toward the end of his stay in Rome. By 1622, when Ribera had been well established in Naples for six years, his work as a printmaker and draftsman was already displaying a strong interest in physiognomy. His earliest such exercises took two forms: studies of physiognomic details such as eyes, ears, noses, and mouths and drawn grotesque heads whose deformed features reflect Ribera’s fascination with the human form.21

Ribera’s depiction of individual physiognomic details is a practice grounded in Leonardo’s art theory.22 Leonardo’s description of different types of facial features (from a lengthy passage dating to 1508-10 and later recorded in his Libro di pittura) illustrates the meticulous procedure that he advised artists follow in drawing the human face:

If you want to acquire facility for bearing in mind the expressions of a face, first make yourself familiar with a variety of [forms of] several heads, eyes, noses, mouths, chins, and throats, and necks and shoulders. And to give an example, noses are of ten types: straight, bulbous, concave, prominent above or below the center [of the length], aquiline, regular, flat, round, or pointed. These hold good as to profile. In full face they are of eleven types; these are equal, thick in the middle, thin in the middle, with the tip thick and the root narrow, or narrow at the tip and wide at the root; with the nostrils wide or narrow, high or low, and the openings wide or hidden by the point; and you will find an equal variety in other details; which things you must draw from nature or in your mind. Or else, when you have to draw a face by heart, carry with you a little book in which you have noted such features; and when you have noted such features; and when you have cast a glance at the face of the person you wish to draw, you can observe in private, which nose or mouth is most like, and there make a little mark to recognize it at home. Of grotesque faces [visi mostruosi] I need say nothing, because they are kept in mind without difficulty.23

---

20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
23 Cited in Bambach, 2003, cat. no. 69, 452. Translation from Jean Paul Richter, The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci. Compiled and Edited from the Original Manuscripts, 3rd edition (London: Phaidon,1970), vol. 1, 338-39, no. 572. This passage is derived from the Codex Urbinas Latinus 1270 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome), fols. 108v-109r. Francesco Melzi assembled the Libro di Pittura based on these notes by Leonardo: the compilation was produced between 1515 and 1570. The
As we shall see later in this chapter, Ribera’s systematic approach in studying different anatomical parts is shaped by the kind of careful study advised by Leonardo.

**Ribera and Titian**

Ribera’s *Ixion* (1632, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, fig. 21) and *Tityus* (ca. 1632, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, fig. 22) reflect his engagement with the art of Titian. Titian’s model of success exerted a profound influence on Spanish artists who historically struggled to achieve greater social recognition in the early modern era. He was court painter to Habsburg kings Charles V and Philip II. Charles V named the painter Count Palatine and a knight of the Golden Spur. Titian painted a famous series of Titans for Mary of Hungary, the sister of Charles V. Only two of the pictures, *Sisyphus* and *Tityus*, survive (1548-9, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, figs. 23 and 24). Philip II’s state room in the Alcázar was named the *Hall of the Furies* (*La Sala de las Furias*) after Titian’s celebrated paintings. Philip IV later hung them in the New Room or Hall of Mirrors. The cycle thus has been interpreted within the context of Habsburg

---


26 Peter Cherry, “Collections of Paintings in Madrid,” in idem and Burke, 1997, 25.
court imagery “as political allegories signifying the punishment that was due to those who
challenged the authority of the divinely appointed ruler.”

Ribera’s paintings after Titian depict two of the Four Furies or Titans who dared to
challenge the Olympian gods and were eternally damned to suffer, as told in Ovid’s
_ Metamorphoses (IV, 457-61)._ The Titan Ixion tried to rape Juno, the queen of the gods and
Jupiter’s sister-consort, and was sentenced by Jupiter to be bound to a turning wheel, “always
behind himself, always ahead.” Tityus tried to rape Latona, Apollo and Diana’s mother, and was
chained to a rock in Hades where vultures flew down eternally to eat his innards. The other two
Titans were Tantalus, who stole food from the gods and was condemned to suffer eternal hunger
and thirst, and Sisyphus who betrayed one of Jupiter’s forbidden love affairs and was sentenced
to carry or roll a stone uphill for eternity.

Ribera’s _Ixion_ and possibly the _Tityus_ were purchased in Madrid in 1634 from the
Marchioness of Charela, the grandmother of one of the king’s illegitimate children, by Jerónimo
de Villanueva, the Protonotary of Aragon, to decorate the Buen Retiro Palace. The original
circumstances of the commission remain unclear. Scholars have noted that, while extant
documents only reflect the payment transacted between the Marchioness and Villanueva, this
does not preclude the fact that the paintings were commissioned directly from the artist in Naples
for the King. At the time Ribera painted the canvases of _Ixion_ and _Tityus_ , he was in the employ

---

29 Finaldi, 2005, 236; Brown and Elliott, 2003, 123. The paintings paid for with funds from Philip IV’s secret account for the decoration of the Buen Retiro: “Relacion de los gastos de las Pinturas…para el adorno del Buen Retiro en las fiestas de San Juan y San Pedro del ano 1634. num.o.P.o: Primeramente treynta y cinco mil noventa y seis Rs en vellon que se pagaron en esta manera cinco mill ciento y noventa y seys Rs a D Rodrigo de Tapia por un quadro de Satiro de Juesepe de Ribera, siete millquatrocientos y cincuenta Rs. que se pagaron al mismo de un quadro de Adonis y Benus y por una moldura que dio para el Satiro…y los trece mill y ducientos restantes se pagaron a la Marquesa de Chavela por el precio de quarto quadros los dos dellos de las furias y los otros dos de la fabula de Adonis.” (Madrid, BN, MS. 7797, p. 119; Finaldi, 1992b, 243).
30 Brown and Elliott, 2003, 123.
of the Spanish viceroy, the Count of Monterrey. The Count was well-aware of the King’s predilection for Titian. Monterrey was instrumental in procuring paintings for the decoration of the Buen Retiro. By means of his diplomatic connections, the Count was able to procure two significant canvases by Titian from Niccolo Ludovisi, the Prince of Venosa, for the King, the Bacchanal (c. 1523-2, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado) and Offering to Venus (c. 1518-19, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado). It is very likely that Ribera’s choice of the Four Damned, a subject that Titian had painted for Philip IV’s grand-aunt Mary of Hungary for the decoration of her palace at Binche and which later became part of the Spanish royal collection, would have greatly appealed to the king. The large dimensions and interrelated subjects of both works further indicate that these paintings were probably royal commissions. It is known that, by the 1630s, Philip IV had already acquired numerous works from Ribera for the decoration of royal complexes such as the Alcazár, the Escorial, and the then newly-built Buen Retiro.

It has been suggested that Ribera’s two mythologies were part of a complete cycle of four, but the other two paintings of Tantalus and Sisyphus in early modern collections remain untraced. One can infer that the original cycle of paintings was complete, based on the

31 Zimmermann, 284-5.
33 The Titius measures 227 x 301 cm (89.37” x 118.50”) and the Ixion (86.61” x 118.5”).
34 Fifty paintings by Ribera were in the Spanish royal collections at the time of Philip IV’s death. See Steven N. Orso, Philip IV and the Decoration of the Alcázar of Madrid (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986); Bonaventura Bassegoda i Hugas, El Escorial como museo: La decoración pictórica mueble en el monasterio de El Escorial desde Diego Velázquez hasta Frédéric Quilliet (1809) (Bellaterra (Barcelona): Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2002); and Brown and Elliott, 2003.
35 In his 1675 biography of Ribera, Joachim von Sandrart reported seeing a Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew and a complete series of the Four Damned in the Amsterdam collection of Lucas van Uffel. Almost fifty years later, the Spanish art biographer Palomino related the very same anecdote from Sandrart’s text in describing Ribera’s preference for gruesome and terrifying subjects: “Ribera did not enjoy painting sweet and devout subjects as much as he liked expressing horrifying and harsh things, such as the bodies of old men: dry, wrinkled, and lean, with gaunt and withered faces, everything done accurately after the model with extraordinary skill, vigor, and elegant technique. This is manifested by the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, in which he is being flayed and the internal anatomy of the arm is exposed, by the celebrated Titius, whose entrails are being devoured by a vulture as a punishment for wanton audacity, and by the torments of Sisyphus, Tantalus, and Ixion. In the last one of these in particular, he expressed so powerfully the pain of being tied to a wheel – where Ixion was continuously lacerated and
identification of a separate and complete series of Four Titans that were recorded in the 1701
inventory of the Buen Retiro. The pictures are identified as copies after Ribera and are currently
in the Prado (inv. P3784, P3785, P3941, and P3942). The copies are smaller in dimension than
the two extant originals. Finaldi has argued that the pictures are not copies but workshop
originals (based on the fact that no originals are known for just two of the untraced works). To
the contrary, I maintain that the pictures are copies, given that two originals by Ribera are known
and that the measurements of the works in question are much smaller than the known originals.

Ribera’s figure of Tityus is well-over life-size. He lies on back, his bound arms
dramatically positioned, as a vulture pulls a length of his intestines from an oozing gash on his
left side. Tityus’s face is contorted as he screams in utter horror and pain. Tityus’ pose is based
on Titian’s Tantalus, one of the two Titans from the celebrated Renaissance master’s series that
are now lost, but which Ribera knew from a reproductive print of 1565 by Giulio Sanuto (fig. 25).
Two reproductive engravings by Martino Rota (fig. 26) and Cornelis Cort (fig. 27) after Titian’s
Prometheus may have served as important models. Ribera, though, radically re-interprets Titian’s
composition by “revers[ing] the diagonal orientation of the figure so that his lower limbs push
into the darkness of Hades while his upper torso, head and arms project violently into the
viewer’s space.” Unlike the brighter palette of Titian’s Tityus, the dark, lugubrious browns of
Ribera’s canvas emphatically convey the murky, sinister nature of the underworld to which
Tityus is eternally condemned.

The visual source of Ribera’s Ixion remains in question since Titian’s depiction of the
subject is lost. Nonetheless, Ribera creates an infernal scene with a “a satyr-like demon” who
racked – by showing him contracting his fingers to bear his torment that when it was in the house of Jacoba
van Uffel in Amsterdam at the time that she was pregnant, she gave birth to a child with withered fingers,
much like the picture. For this reason it was taken to Italy and afterward (together with its companion and
many more) transferred to Madrid, to the Buen Retiro Palace.” (Palomino, 1987, 123). De Dominici also
quotes the same anecdote from Sandrart’s text in his vita of the painter. [1742-45 (1979), III, 16].
36 The copies measure approximately 190 x 226 cm. (74.8” x 88.98”) each.
37 Finaldi, cat. nos. 51 and 52, 236 in Úbeda de los Cobos, 2005.
appears at the lower left as he relentlessly tortures the bound Ixion, thrusting him downwards as the wheel turns. The sinister nature of this torture scene is further emphasized by Ribera’s commanding naturalism. The figures are placed close to the foreground: the restricted palette of brown and ochre conveys the lurid atmosphere of the inferno to which Ixion is destined. The orientation or format of the painting, however, has been disputed by Ribera specialists. Brown has argued that Ribera’s composition was vertically oriented.\textsuperscript{39} Even though the painting works well in that direction, as Finaldi has rightly observed, it would be odd that Ribera would make two pendant works with different formats.\textsuperscript{40} While Brown has stated that the two paintings were not pendants, the similar size and related subject matter suggest otherwise.

Furthermore, the signature on the painting also helps to ascertain the horizontal orientation of the painting. It is signed and dated in the lower right, “Jusepe de Ribera / F. 1632.” Brown has argued that the signature, if the painting is viewed vertically, was meant be seen illusionistically on the rim of wheel as it turned as a sort of visual joke or pun.\textsuperscript{41} I find this argument unconvincing as the signature is clearly oriented horizontally.\textsuperscript{42}

The locations of both the Ixion and the Tityus have been reconstructed by both Brown and Pérez Sánchez, but recently redressed and corrected by Finaldi. The Ixion was documented in the collection of the Alcázar as it is recorded there in the 1666 inventory of the palace. It was thereafter moved to the Buen Retiro Palace and recorded in the 1701 inventory. Both Brown and Pérez Sánchez related the painting to a description in the 1666 inventory, which states: “uno que atormentan (“235-3 varas de largo y 3 de ancho) [approximately 252 x 252 cm] marco dorado de vno q atormentan de Jusepe de Ribera 300. duc. de plata.” However, Finaldi has rightly noted that the subject of the painting described in this entry, which is that of “one who is being tormented,”

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid, 237.
\textsuperscript{40} Finaldi, cat. no. 52, 237 in Úbeda de los Cobos, 2005.
\textsuperscript{41} Ribera’s signing practices will be discussed at greater length in chapter three.
\textsuperscript{42} Finaldi, cat. no. 52, 237 in Úbeda de los Cobos, 2005.
does not refer to the *Ixion* but to *The Martyrdom of Saint Philip* (1639, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado). Not only has Finaldi corrected the identification of the Tityus as a work that once hung in the Alcazár but he has made the case that the two paintings of *Ixion* and *Tityus* “entered the Buen Retiro in 1634 and stayed there uninterruptedly until the end of the eighteenth century, passing to the Prado very soon after 1819.”

While much research has been devoted to reconstructing the provenance and original location of these works, the pictorial innovations and inventive nature of these works remain to be contextualized more fully. The related subjects and style simultaneously fascinate and frighten the viewer. The dark, poetic elements that Ribera incorporated into these works deem them as *poesie* that were intended for a royal or aristocratic patron, parallel to the way in which Titian’s own novel mythologies were created for Mary of Hungary and King Philip II. I would further assert that Ribera, relying on Titian’s precedent, formulated a novel poetics of painting that reflects the way in which the Spanish master, like his Renaissance predecessor, was concerned

---

43 Ibid., 236-7. Brown claimed that the Tityus was the same work described as “…one of the Furies that is *Tityus* by the hand of Jusepe de Ribera” in the 1666 inventory of the Alcazár. However, he identified the work as one that was hanging in a different room called the Pieza Inmediata de la Aurora. Finaldi has argued that, because the painting was mentioned in the same location in the Alcazár inventory of 1700, it cannot be identified with the present *Tityus*. He suggested that the work that Brown ascribed to these inventories is now untraced. The paintings, in question, can be traced without interruption in the inventories of the Buen Retiro. *Tityus* is described in the 1701 inventory as “(testamentaria 1701 [no. 91]: “Una Pintura de tres varas y media de largo y dos y media de alto de la fibula del tijco Comiendo el Buitre las entrañas Original del Grande españoletto Jusepe de Ribera con marco negro tassada en setenta doblones…4,200.” The *Ixion* is identified as “(testamentaría 1701 [no. 95]: Otra pintura de tres Uaras y media de largo y dos alto Con la Fabula de Jxion atormentándole la rueda original de Joseph de Riuera el españoletco Con su marco negro tassada en Sesenta Doblones…3.600.” The numbers painted in white on both the *Ixion* and *Tityus* that respectively appear as 800 and 801, correlate to the sequence of the 1794 Buen Retiro inventory.

44 In relation to Titian’s representation of mythological subjects, the term *poesie* refers to paintings, usually planned as pairs, with subjects derived from classical literature, namely Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* that the artist painted in the late 1550s and early 1560s for King Philip II. With respect to the application of the term to describe Titian’s cycle of the Four Damned, Thomas Puttfarken has noted that, “Titian’s paintings for Mary of Hungary constitute another set of mythological pictures, a cycle of *poesie*, although it must be said that modern art historians have not usually employed the term for these works. And they were clearly to be seen from a distance. Given modern notions of poetry mainly as evocative and lyrical, it is perhaps not difficult to understand why this cycle is hardly referred as one of the *poesie*…” Puttfarken has thus understood Titian’s *poesie* as “painted tragedies.” From *Titian & Tragic Painting: Aristotle’s Poetics and the Rise of the Modern Artist* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 79.
with cultivating royal patronage. Furthermore, Titian’s success with his royal Spanish clients and celebrated status as a knight provided an important model for Ribera, who was a painter to the Spanish viceroys in Naples and also made works for the Habsburg king Philip IV.

Titian’s art also proved to be influential on Ribera’s later style. The increased luminosity and greater formal complexity of his paintings reflect Ribera’s continued study of the Renaissance master, in a way that is paralleled in the stylistic development of another Spanish painter, Diego Velázquez.45 Recent studies on Velázquez’s style have shown that the painterly brushwork seen in mature works such as Las Meninas (The Maids of Honor) (c. 1656, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, fig. 28) and the Fable of Arachne (Las Hilanderas) (c. 1657, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, fig. 29) reflects the painter’s interest in art theory more than has been previously thought. It has been argued that Velázquez was more interested in presenting his theories or attitudes about art in the style and subjects of his paintings themselves, rather than in words.46

Like Velázquez, it could also be said that Ribera’s later, complex, large-scale paintings such as The Communion of The Apostles (1651, Choir, Certosa di San Martino, Naples, fig.30) reflect his sense of Neo-Venetianism and thus might shed further light on the painter’s attitudes and ideas about the nature of painting itself.47 Created for the choir of the Church of San Martino

With respect to Ribera’s paintings, I would contend, that, like Titian’s, they are poesie that focus on chilling and dreadful mythological subjects instead of inspired and idyllic ones.

On another related topic, that is Titian’s enduring legacy on the rulers of Spain, see Checa, 1994.

45 Finaldi, 1992, 4.

46 See Giles Knox, The Late Paintings of Velázquez: Theorizing Painterly Performance (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2010).

47 Clifton notes that the term has never been applied to the later phase of Ribera’s oeuvre: 1995, 129-30, no. 56. While Ribera tended to employ color to model his forms and figures in his early and mid-career works, he heightened the luminosity of his palette and used landscape backgrounds and architectural settings in his late works. These elements accord with those found mainly in works by Venetian High and Late Renaissance painters such as Titian, Veronese, and Tintoretto. Therefore the phrase “Neo-Venetianism” is a helpful one in describing these elements. However, it has been a contested term in studies of Seicento painting. For example, Elizabeth Cropper has argued that the concept is anachronistic because Venetian practice, by means of the art of the Carracci, had already entered Roman Seicento painting well before “Neo-Venetianism” emerged as a trend in the 1620s. See idem, The Ideal of Painting: Pietro Testa’s Dusseldorf Notebook (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1984). For compelling arguments about
in Naples and completed in 1651, *The Communion of the Apostles* is characterized by a sense of extraordinary luminosity and color that not only marked a radical departure from Ribera’s tenebrism but also illustrated a major shift in the style of mid- and late seventeenth-century Neapolitan painting. The painting is a large-scale, multi-figured composition in which Jesus, who is shown at right, is distributing communion to His Apostles. It is among Ribera’s most complex arrangement of figures, in which eleven men are shown in the foreground of the painting. Each of the apostles is given an individualized, portrait-like appearance and is set within a classicizing arcade. The background recedes to a view of a luminous sky rendered with atmospheric perspective. Furthermore, Ribera’s sense of color is resplendent with shimmering blues and bright reds painted with looser brushstrokes that are reminiscent of Titian’s *colorito*.

Ribera’s emulation of other artists demonstrated his ability to reinvent styles and compositions formulated by other artists and attested to the breadth of his visual intelligence. His paintings did not only attempt to merely compete with renowned Renaissance examples but also to reinterpret and surpass them. From these works, it is evident that Ribera had detailed knowledge of his artistic heritage. Regrettably no will or estate inventory exists that indicated what works of art Ribera might have owned – ones that would help to attest further his own awareness of the history of art and his place within it.

---

the usefulness of the term as it applies, though, to the development of Pietro da Cortona’s art, see William L. Barcham and Catherine R. Puglisi, “Paolo Veronese e la Roma dei Barberini,” *Saggi e memorie di storia dell’arte* 25 (2001): 55-87. See also Caterina Volpi, “La pittura a Napoli a metà del Seicento tra influenze caravaggesche e neovenetismo: da Caravaggio a Salvator Rosa” In *Caravaggio e il caravaggismo : dal Corso di Storia dell’Arte Moderna I tenuta da Silvia Danesi Squarzina*, eds. Giovanna Capitelli and idem
Ribera's Philosopher Portraits

Ribera’s style is informed by the artistic literature of the Italian Renaissance and visual models that reference classical subjects and themes. It can also be said that Ribera’s reputation as one of the great early modern interpreters of antiquity remains to be considered more fully. Unlike his many Spanish contemporaries, Ribera had the opportunity to study ancient buildings and sculptures in situ in Rome and Naples. Michael Scholz-Hänsel has commented that Ribera does not frequently introduce classical themes in his work. Craig Felton has also written that “classical subjects are rare in the oeuvre of Ribera.” Ribera’s varied representations of philosophers indicate the contrary.

Ribera’s art biographers noted the artist’s representations of these ancient men. Writing in 1675, Joachim Sandrart noted that Ribera made a very striking depiction of Cato of Utica, which is now attributed to Luca Giordano (c. 1660, oil on canvas, Art Gallery of Hamilton, Ontario). Antonio Palomino’s eighteenth-century biography of the painter reiterates Sandrart’s anecdote that Ribera “…painted Cato of Utica ripping out his entrails, to the wonder of those surrounding him, as he died with great effect.” In his biography of the artist, De Dominici stated that he saw these philosopher portraits “in the gallery of the Duke della Torre,” “in the house of the Duke of Mataloni,” and “in that of the Prince of Avellino.” Ribera’s philosophers in the Spanish royal collection were also identified in the eighteenth century by Andres Ximénez and Antonio Ponz respectively.

(Rome : Il Bagatto, 1995), 207-220. While a good deal of scholarly attention has focused on the artist’s early career, the transformation of his later style remains to be accessed more fully.

49 Craig Felton, “Ribera’s Hercules Resting Rediscovered,” Apollo 31 (June 1990): 374-381.
50 Palomino, 1987, 123.
It is known that the Duke of Alcalá commissioned or acquired at least four philosopher portraits by the painter during his tenure as viceroy of Naples during 1629 to 1631. Neapolitan agents acting on behalf of the Prince of Lichtenstein also commissioned Ribera in 1636 to paint a series of six philosophers. Of the thirty-two portraits he painted, at least of them five have been reasonably identified as the Pre-Socratic philosopher Democritus. In my examination of Ribera’s philosophers, I shall limit my survey to these portraits of Democritus and trace the variants that Ribera made thereof.

Ribera’s portraits depict a half- or three-quarters length male figure wearing torn and tattered clothing and engaging in some way with a book. One notable exception to this formula is the full-length depiction of Democritus (fig. 45). Each figure is presumed to represent a particular ancient philosopher, but which philosopher is often not evident or intended to be evident. The identification of individual identities for these figures has proven to be nearly impossible in many examples in which Ribera repeatedly includes standard props such as books and measurement tools such as compasses and L-square rules but inscriptions labeling the figures are infrequent. Ribera’s philosopher portraits also tend to be independent portraits of an individual thinker and are not typically conceived of as pendants or dual portraits in contrast to the established convention of paired portraits or pendants for philosopher figures. For example, the portrait of Democritus “the laughing philosopher” is usually paired with Heraclitus “the weeping philosopher” in double half-length portraits or full-length or half-length pendants famously painted by Bramante (fig. 34) in the fifteenth century and Peter Paul Rubens and Hendrick Terbruggen in the early seventeenth century (figs. 35 and 36 and figs. 37 and 38).

---

55 A possible exception to Ribera’s formula is a work that has been long associated with the painter entitled Two Philosophers (Oil on canvas, 124 x 171, Saint Omer, Musée de l’Hôtel Sandelin). Formerly attributed to the Master of the Judgment of Solomon, both Gianni Papi and Nicola Spinosa have recently attributed
Ribera’s varied representations of Greek philosophers have historical precedent in Renaissance models such as Federigo da Montefeltro’s studiolo in Urbino, the walls of which were decorated with idealized, half-length philosopher effigies by Piero della Francesca, Pedro Berruguete, and Justus of Ghent (1476, Paris, Musée du Louvre, figs. 32 and 33). The Montefeltro philosopher portraits are all shown holding a book that is either open or closed. The figures are placed behind parapets in study rooms framed by Composite columns: the curtains or drapes placed behind the figures and the niches appearing on the back walls of the rooms they inhabit imply that the figures occupy a believable sense of space. Furthermore, the identity of each philosopher is prominently inscribed in clear, majuscule Roman letters on the space of the wall that appears in the immediate foreground.

Ribera portrays his ancient thinkers in an innovative way. Rather than basing these figures on idealized models that portrayed the philosophers of the classical world according to the aesthetic ideal of the Renaissance, Ribera proposed an entirely different manner in which the subject is shown alone as a poor, humble figure. He created individualized, portrait-like likenesses of philosophers in the tattered garb of street vendors who have spent their fortunes to pursue their life-long quest for knowledge. During his early years in Rome, Ribera also became increasingly familiar with the conventions of ancient Roman portraiture: its emphasis on verisimilitude, the lack of idealization, and the bust or half-length format is evinced in Republican-era busts such *The Portrait of a Patrician* (fig. 39).

---


57 Ribera’s naturalism was shaped by the veristic tradition of Roman Republican art as he also depicted Roman portrait busts in his respective representations of the *Five Senses* (*The Sense of Touch*, c. 1615-6, oil on canvas, The Norton Simon Foundation, Pasadena; and *The Blind Sculptor, or Allegory of Touch*, 1632, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid). For the identification of Roman statues in Ribera’s paintings, see Marta Carrasco Ferrer, “Ribera y las esculturas clásicas conservadas en Roma,” *Anales de historia del arte* 7 (1997): 183-91. Moreover, both versions of Ribera’s *Sense of Touch* depicted a blind
Ribera’s own formulation of this figure type can be traced to an early work he produced in Rome, entitled *The Beggar* (1613-14, Galleria Borghese, Rome, fig. 40). This portrait contains the prototype for the painter’s formulation of the half-length “beggar” type. It depicts a balding, middle-aged man who stands holding his hat in hand. The figure takes up the entire foreground and is set again a dark, neutral foreground, a formula that Ribera repeated in depicting half-length subjects.

Among Ribera’s early depictions of the philosopher is his *Origen* (ca. 1615, Urbino, Galeria Nazionale delle Marche, fig. 41). Origen was a Christian writer and theologian active at the end of the second and first half of the third centuries. He was known for his meticulous interpretation of Christian sources and his systematic approach to Christian theology. Origen’s academic rigor and prodigious scholarship are acknowledged in an inscription that identifies the figure and that reads: “orogenes doctor indefess[us] (Origen indefatigable doctor).” The inclusion of the inscription is rare as it appears in very few of the philosopher portraits. Gianni Papi has recently re-attributed this work to Ribera, identifying it as one described in the 1638 inventory of the collection of Vincenzo Giustiniani.

While the portrait of Origen is an isolated example, Ribera frequently portrayed the image of Democritus, one of the most important pre-Socratic philosophers. Democritus was born at Abdera, about 460 BCE, although according to some as early as 490. In Ribera’s portraits,
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58 The painting was formerly attributed to Bartolemeo Manfredi or the Dutch Caravaggist Dirck van Baburen and recently reattributed to Ribera. See Papi, 2007, 138-39 and Spinosa, 2008, A10, 308.
60 I have followed the standard modern biography of Democritus that was formulated by W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 386-89. As Christopher Lüthy has noted, there were varied literary traditions for Democritus and at least four very
the Greek sage is often dressed in tattered, worn clothing that signals the poverty that resulted from Democritus having spent his inheritance on travels throughout the ancient world. During his travels, he gained a knowledge said to have surpassed that of any Greek philosopher including Aristotle. Cheerful in nature, he was known as the “laughing philosopher” because he laughed at the follies and foibles of humanity. Democritus also developed an atomistic theory of matter which also extended to the soul of man. According to his philosophical system, humankind could be happy by doing good for its own sake, rather being motivated by fear of punishment or hope of reward. Democritus’ biography and writings were documented in Diogenes Laërtius’s *Lives and Opinions of the Eminent Philosophers.* Written in the 3rd century CE, Laërtius’ compendium contained biographies of celebrated Greek thinkers and philosophers and was a text that was known to Ribera’s learned patrons such as the Duke of Alcalá. A lengthy passage from Laërtius’s systematic biography of Democritus elucidates the thinker’s principal theories, among them that cheerfulness is necessary to leading a balanced life:

> Now his principal doctrines were these. That atoms and the vacuum were the beginning of the universe; and that everything existed only in opinion. That these worlds were infinite, created out of nothing, and that nothing was destroyed so as to become nothing. That the atoms were infinite both in magnitude and number, and were borne about through the universe in endless revolutions. And that thus they produced all the combinations that exist; fire, water, air, and earth; for that all these things are only combinations of certain atoms; which combinations are incapable of being affected by external circumstances, and that are unchangeable by reason of their solidity. Also, that the sun and moon are formed by such revolutions and round bodies; and in like manner the soul is produced; and that the soul and the mind are identical: that we see by the falling visions across our sight; and that everything that happens, happens of necessity. Motion, being the cause of the production of everything which he calls necessity. The chief good he asserts to be cheerfulness: which, however, he does not consider the same as pleasure; as some people, who have misunderstood him, have fancied that he meant; but he understands by cheerfulness, a condition according to which the soul lives calmly, being disturbed by no fear, or superstition, or other passion.
Ribera’s early depictions of Democritus show the figure who is pleasantly smiling, oriented at slight angle to the left and facing the viewer in a half-length portrait (figs. 42 and 43). In one portrait, the painter depicts Democritus as a middle-aged, dark-haired man, who is well dressed in a yellow jacket and brown cape (ca. 1615-18, Lugano, Private collection, fig. 42). Raking light from the upper left corner dramatically illuminates his content face. He is placed between a table and a plain, brown background. His activity as a scholar and thinker is indicated by the book he is holding, the other books, papers, and ink well that are placed on his desk as well the armillary sphere that is displayed to the left behind the figure. A second and contemporaneous depiction of Democritus also shows him as an elderly man with silvery hair and leathery, tanned skinned but still elegant and well dressed, wearing clothing cut from solid red, black, brown, and white fabrics (ca. 1615-18, London, Private collection, fig. 43). The figure is also oriented frontally and holds a sheet of paper in hand. The standard props of an ink well, a quill pen and book also appear on his desk. The brown, coppery tonality of both works is typical of Ribera’s works produced in Rome.63

Ribera’s model for his philosophers as well dressed, scholarly figures took a radical turn in the late 1620s and 1630s. One of Ribera’s most striking philosophers is his Democritus (1630, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, fig. 44).64 As in his other portraits, the philosopher is represented frontally in a half-length pose. Unlike those elegantly garbed Democritus figures, this one wears a tattered, frayed and heavily mended cape as he holds a compass in his right hand and a sheet of geometric drawings in his left. His sagacious smile helps to soften the effects of his slightly sunburned cheeks and deeply wrinkled eyes and forehead.

---

63 Orso, 2010, 89.
64 This figure of Democritus had been identified simply as a philosopher or as the mathematician Archimedes because of the compass. Delphine Fitz Darby and Oreste Ferrari have identified him as Democritus because of his smiling face. This portrait has been thought to be one of philosopher portraits owned by the Duke of Alcalà, referred to in the estate inventory of 1637. The painting can be identified as “philosopher with a compass” that is mentioned in Alcalà’s estate inventory. Brown and Kagan, 243.
which are dramatically illuminated by the light that comes from the upper left corner of the painting. The drab tonality of browns and grays emphasizes his poverty.

The Wilton Democritus (1635, Salisbury [Wiltshire], Wilton House, Earl of Pembroke fig. 45) is unusual in Ribera’s oeuvre because it is a full-length, seated representation of a philosopher. In this portrait, the philosopher figure grins and looks directly at the viewer. He holds a thick book. An empty block of stone, doubling as a writing block for the scholar and as a stone supporting Ribera’s signature, appears to the right foreground. Like the Prado Democritus, Ribera emphasizes the figure’s humility as he wears tattered and torn clothing. Unlike the Prado Democritus, the philosopher is exceptionally young and sports a full head of hair.

A later, signed portrait of Democritus dating to 1635 (Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini, fig. 46) formerly owned by the Marquis of Leganes shows an older figure for the philosopher, which is the type of model that Ribera preferred in most of his later representations such as those he produced for the Prince of Lichtenstein (figs. 73-75). Here the figure is depicted with a full, long beard pointing to a globe with papers on his desk, raking light streaming in from the upper left corner and accords to the formula of naturalism that Ribera replicated in his many portraits. However, unlike his other Democritus portraits, Ribera paired the figure with a corresponding pendant portrait of Heraclitus (Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini fig. 47).

Ribera’s Philosophers demonstrate his striking reformulation of the philosopher portrait. But in another way, they also illustrate the painter’s interest in naturalism through the use of non-idealized figure types based on the study of live models and tenebrist lighting. Ribera produced his philosophers in an age in which art and science, in many instances, were closely aligned or even intertwined. By the early sixteenth century, Spanish humanists had already stated the need for the close and careful observation of nature. In his treatise On Education (De tradendis disciplinis, 1538), the Spanish educator and empiricist Juan Luis Vives wrote that:
He who would advance [intellectually] still further must study outward nature by close observation…All that is wanted is a certain power of observation. So will he observe the nature of things in the heavens, in cloudy and clear weather, in the plains, on the mountains, in the woods. Hence he will seek out, and get to know, many things about those who inhabit those spots. Let him have recourse, for instance, to [humble] gardeners, husbandmen, shepherds, and hunters…For no man can possibly make all observations without help in such a multitude and variety of directions.  

Ribera’s philosopher portraits, like many of the subjects he painted in his early career such as The Five Senses and his Apostles, were based on the study of a live model. Ribera’s careful description of his subject’s flaws and idiosyncrasies such their wrinkles, sunburned faces, and tattered clothing accorded to Vives’ prescription for observing and studying forms and figures in nature. The compelling naturalism of Ribera’s philosopher portraits was praised by the painter and art theorist Francisco Pacheco:

I keep to nature for everything; if everything can be taken from nature, not only the heads, nudes, and feet but [also] the draperies…it would be so much better. This was done by Michelangelo Caravaggio in the Crucifixion of Saint Peter with such pleasing effect…Jusepe de Ribera did this also, since among all the great paintings owned by the Duke of Alcalá, Ribera’s figures and heads alone seem to living, even though they hang next to paintings by Guido Reni. The paintings of my son-in-law, who follows this method, also differ from the rest, because he works from nature first.

Ribera’s Philosophers not only reflect Ribera’s interest in verisimilitude but also his interest, or his patrons’ interest, in current philosophical and scientific theories, namely Neostoicism. This series of paintings coincides and corresponds with the pervasive influence of the theory in Naples. Neostoicism is a late Renaissance philosophy that attempted to revive ancient Stoicism, a philosophy that rejected worldliness and showed an indifference to material
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67 Steve N. Orso has compellingly argued that Ribera’s philosophers were influenced by the revival of Seneca’s ideas. See idem, “On Ribera and the ‘Beggar-Philosophers,’” in Art in Spain and the Hispanic World. Essays in Honor of Jonathan Brown, ed. Sarah Schroth (London: Paul Holberton Publishing, 2010), 86-105. See also Ferrari, 1986, 103-82. Ferrari estimated that Ribera or his workshop painted at least
goods and the external world, in a way acceptable to a Christian audience. This involved the rejection or modification of certain original elements of the Stoic system, especially principles that concerned materialism and determinism. Erasmus’ famed *Sileni Alciadis* (1515-1517) expounded these ideas and was available in a Spanish translation of 1555 produced by Bernardo Pérez published in Antwerp by Martín Nucio. Also among the key early modern text establishing this movement in Spain was Justus Lipsius’ *De Constantia* (*On Constancy*) of 1584. Neostoicism was introduced in Spain in the seventeenth century by the humanist thinker Francisco Sánchez de Brozas and was followed by other philosophers and poets such as Gonzalo Correas and Francisco de Quevedo. The poet Francisco de Quevedo was instrumental in introducing Neostoicism to the Spanish viceregal court in Naples. Quevedo was secretary to the Duke of Osuna and accompanied the duke to Naples in 1616 when he was named viceroy and in all likelihood met with the young Ribera at the Spanish vice-regal court.

The influence of Neostoicism might also explain the change in figure type for Ribera’s philosophers. Ribera’s models for his philosopher series dramatically change from a figure that was well dressed in appearance and bourgeois in class to one that was of lower class and more humbly dressed to the “beggar philosophers” which can be traced in his portraits of Democritus. Art historians have asked what prompted Ribera to make such dramatic changes. Steven Orso has convincingly argued that Ribera was responding to the depiction of philosophers described in the writings of the very philosophers he depicted such as Democritus. Orso has also aptly suggested
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70 Quevedo’s relationship to the Duke of Osuna is assessed in: James O. Crosby, “New Documents for Quevedo’s Biography,” *Boletín de la biblioteca de Melendez Pelayo* 34 (1958): 229-261. The Duke of Osuna’s selection of a poet for his secretary also reflects the high level of literary patronage supported by these viceroys in Spain and Italy, which originated with Duke of Lemos’ establishment of the Accademia degli Oziosi in Naples in 1611. See Girolamo de Miranda, “Il viceré letterato. Mecenatismo artistico e
that Ribera might have been directly responding to the writings of the Roman Stoic philosopher, Lucius Anneaus Seneca, that humans could co-exist in harmony with nature regardless of his wealth and social status. While Ribera, or, more likely, his vice-regal patron might have been directly read Seneca’s texts, the Roman philosopher’s ideas might have been better known to them through the writings of early modern Spanish Neostoic poets and humanists.

Ribera’s formula for his philosophers proved to be successful and appealed to the erudite tastes of his patrons. The Duke of Alcalà, whose was renowned for his “uncommon intellectual distinction,” owned the most extensive series of philosopher portraits that were painted during the course of his tenure as viceroy from 1629 to 1631 by Ribera. The painter’s philosopher portraits had entered the Duke’s collection before 1637. While Oreste Ferrari has astutely suggested that most philosopher portraits were displayed in private libraries and study rooms, as was the case for those owned by the Duke of Montefeltro, Alcalá’s philosophers were displayed in four different rooms in his palace in Seville, the Casa de Pilatos, not in the library of the palace which was famously decorated with mythologies painted by Francisco Pacheco.

The estate inventory of 1637 documents a total of eight philosopher portraits in Alcalá’s collection, all of which are only identified by their attributes, and only four of which can be securely attributed to Ribera. The first set depicted “Two Philosophers with compass and sphere” and are identified with Don Blas, an obscure painter from whom the Duke collected other
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71 Orso, 2010, 89. The standard survey of the reception of Seneca’s ideas in Spain from the Middle Ages to the early modern era is Karl Alfred Blüher, Séneca en España: Investigaciones sobre la recepción de Séneca en España desde el siglo XIII hasta el siglo XVII, trans. Juan Conde (Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1983).

72 In addition to the classical sources Ribera might have known, Ribera or his patrons were also probably familiar with moralized versions of Greek philosophy such as the preacher Pierre de Besse’s famed treatise, Le Democrite Chrétien (The Christian Democritus) (1615). For a recent re-interpretation of Ribera’s philosopher portraits based on early modern, moralized readings of classical sources, see Isabel Mateo Gómez, “Lectura moral desde el conocimiento de lo ‘genuino’ y lo ‘tenebroso’ en Demócrito y su relación con los Sabios y Sentidos de Ribera,” In Sapientia Libertas. Escritos en homenaje al Profesor Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez (Madrid and Seville: Museo Nacional del Prado and Fundación Focus-Abengoa, 2007), 297-302.
works. The location for these works is identified as the “third quarter [or room] that faces the door to the corridor of the garden” (“tercera quadra que sale la puerta al corredor del Jardin.”). The inventory describes one set of Ribera’s philosophers as: “two philosophers by the hand of Jusepe de Ribera, one which has an open book and the other closed book with his eyes looking upwards” (“Dos Philosofos de mano de Josephe de Rivera que el uno tiene aviertu un libro y el otro tiene dos libros cerrados torcidos los ojos del uno ambso sin g° y vinieron en el caxon n°.19.”). The location for these works was “the third quarter [or room] that faces the door to the corridor of the garden” Two more portraits were mentioned in the collection: “Two philosophers one with a sphere, a compass, a book, and spectacles and other with yellow clothing, a cap, and gloves…” (“Dos Philosofos el uno con esphera compass libro y anttojos y el otro con Ropa amarilla i gorrachata guantes en las manos y ambas puestas ençima de un libro binieron en el enrollado seg°. del caxon n°. 7.”) The location for these portraits is identified as one of the Duke’s private quarters or the “fourth room where the black chimney in stone was” (“quadra quarta donde estava el cancel con la chimenea negra de piedra).” Another philosopher held a book and wore a gold cap (“Un retrato de un Philosophe en pie con un libro abierto con g° dorada.”) The work was hung in the “sixth room in the palace where there was a ball candle that assisted the embroiderer” (“quadra sexta donde esta el candil de la bola y asistia el Bordador.”) Another two of Ribera’s philosophers representing the figure writing or holding a compass (“Dos Philosofos el uno escribiendo y el otro con un compaz de joseph de Rivera vinieron en el enrollado prim° del caxon n°.7.”) These portraits were prominently displayed in a small room in which the Duke received visitors (“camerin pequeno donde el Duque mi señor

75 Ibid., 249.
77 Ibid., 249.
78 Ibid., 250, IV, 12.
79 Ibid., 251, VI, 2.
80 Ibid, 251.
Recevia vissitas.”). The display of Ribera’s portraits in his Sevillian palace, albeit in two different rooms, attests to the scholarly interests of the Duke, who was renowned for his large art collection and who also created an informal academy in 1606 which brought together leading artists of the day including the painter and art theorist Francisco Pacheco and the sculptor, painter and architect Alonso Cano.

In sum, Ribera’s Philosophers demonstrate his striking reinterpretation of ancient subjects. On one level, they illustrate the painter’s interest in naturalism through the use of realistic figure types based on the study of live models and tenebrist lighting. On another level, this series represents not only represents Ribera’s intense interest in antiquity but also in art and science in an age when both disciplines were closely interconnected.

Ribera’s Drawing Manual

Ribera was one of the first Spanish artists to create a series of prints intended to teach artists about the art of drawing. He produced a group of prints that would presumably have served as a drawing manual for painters in training in his workshop (figs. 50-52). In his vita of the painter, De Dominici wrote that the young Ribera learned how to draw the human figure by
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81 Ibid., 251, VII, 9.
82 Ibid. Based on the description of the figures in the inventory, Fitz Darby and Spinosa has convincingly proposed that the following figures might have comprised the Duke’s collection of Ribera’s four philosophers: 1) Aesop, Oil on canvas, 125 x 92, ca. 1629-31, New York, Private collection (Spinosa, 2008, A102); 2) Democritus, Oil on canvas, 125 x 81, 1630, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado (Spinosa, 2008, A106, 367, Signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / f. 1630); 3) Philosopher, Oil on canvas, 129 x 91, 1631, Tucson, University of Arizona Art Museum (Spinosa, 2008, A107, 367; 4) Philosopher, Oil on canvas, 125 x 92 cm, ca. 1630-35, Los, Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum (Spinosa, 2008, A108, 368, Signed: Jusepe de Ribera español F.)
making careful studies of different body parts. According to Palomino’s biography of Ribera, the mature artist left a celebrated drawing manual: “He left among other papers by his hand a celebrated manual of the first principles of Painting, so superior a work, that is followed as if they were infallible dogmas of art, not just in Italy, but in all the provinces of Europe.” There is no record of a systematic treatise on anatomy by Ribera, but there are three extant didactic etchings and two grotesque heads made by the artist in 1622 connected with the manual. Similar to drawing manuals of the period, these sheets were used to train apprentices and illustrate different views of eyes and ears, and mouths and noses.

Ribera’s anatomical studies comprise the majority of his etched designs from the 1620s. Produced in about 1622, Ribera’s sheets fall into two groups: three sheets focus on detailed studies of eyes, ears, and noses and mouths, and two represent grotesque heads in profile. Although the prints were not originally bound, they do follow in the tradition of Renaissance and Baroque artists’ manuals. Three prints, one representing the eyes, the ears, and a third noses and mouths, have been deemed as study sheets. The second group consists of two etchings depicting two grotesque male figures shown in profile. Jonathan Brown has rightly suggested that these prints are part of an unfinished drawing manual for young artists. Thus, the role of art theory and art instruction might have been more important for Ribera than previously thought.

Ribera’s Studies of Eyes, Ears, and Mouths and Noses

The Study of Eyes (fig. 50) depicts four rows of eyes in different degrees of finish: some are schematic in profile, some eyes are open, looking downward or looking upward, or are closed. The different directions of the eyes and stages of modeling are sensitively done. Ribera’s Study of Eyes
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85 De Dominici, 1742-5 (1979), 2: “Cosi Giuseppe cominciò ad apprender pittura, perché egli imitando quell suo compagno scolare, copiava molti di quei principj; anzichè passando innanzi gli chiedea teste finite, con alter membra del corpo umano.”
86 Palomino, 1987, 125.
87 Brown, 1973, 16.
88 Ibid.
*Ears* (fig. 51) shows two rows of ears, the top containing four and the lower five. They are positioned frontally and in profile in different angles and positions. Some are schematically drawn in contrast to the ones which are fully formed with curly hair around the tops of the lobes. The number four inscribed in reverse in the lower right corner was probably written by Ribera and suggests that a fourth sheet might have existed at some point. As Brown and others have suggested, the missing fourth sheet might have been etched with the *Large Grotesque Head* (fig. 54). Andrew Robison has noted that the dimensions of the sheet for the grotesque head correspond to the size of the three study sheets and that the format of the print is vertical. It is very likely that four prints were made but that the project for a manual never came to completion.  

Ribera’s *Study of Mouths and Noses* (fig. 52) sustains the juxtaposition between schematic and finished anatomical forms that are employed in his studies of eyes and ears. To the left, a nose is presented in outline form. In the middle of sheet, two views of a man’s nose and mouth are more fully articulated. The noses are highly individualized: they are long and crooked and covered with warts and tumors. The open mouths seem to emit agonizing screams. Between these two elements, the partial representation of a man’s focuses on his tightly shut eyes and pronounced nose. Below these center elements are a profile view of a nose and mouth and another view of an open mouth. To the far right is another profile view of a man using thin, schematic lines. Ribera’s interpretation of the open mouth ultimately derives from Leonardo’s *Five Grotesque Heads* (fig. 19) in which the second figure to left is shown with a large gaping

---


90 While the *Studies of Eyes* has been rightly attributed to Ribera, the signature that appears to the right half of the print does not match with Ribera’s way of writing his name. As Brown first points out, the spelling of the first name with an f at the end is wrong. The participle “de” has been omitted, a significant element of the artist’s name. These omissions suggest that the name was written by someone else, possibly an apprentice. However, no impressions of the print have been found without the signature. In the case of the *Studies of the Mouths and Noses*, this sheet also bears an incomplete form of Ribera’s name as it lacks the participle “de.” Brown, 1973, 73.
mouth and reminds us that Ribera’s meticulous representation of these anatomical parts accords with the detailed preparatory procedure recommended by Leonardo. Thus, Ribera’s designs for eyes, ears, noses, and mouth codified a range of expressions in the most economical fashion on each sheet, in which he catalogues anatomical parts shown in different movements, angles, and degrees of finish.

**Ribera’s Grotesque Heads**

Ribera produced two etchings of grotesque heads (figs. 53 and 54) that have been related to his drawing manual. The *Small Grotesque Head* (fig. 53) shows a male figure in profile to the right, his head wrapped with a cloth. He is afflicted with von Recklinghausen’s disease (multiple neurofibromatosis), the symptoms of which are large, sac-like tumors. Ribera’s emphasis on the figure’s grotesque appearance is evinced in the warts and bulbous tumors on his cheeks and neck. Ribera’s gritty depiction of these physical deformities is indicated in his careful definition of them using a variety of thin lines and thick lines to form the short hairs on the warts and bulbous, sagging tumors.\(^{91}\)

The *Large Grotesque Head* (fig. 54) also depicts a male figure wearing a cap oriented in profile to the right, who was also suffering from von Recklinghausen’s disease. Ribera’s careful modeling of the figure’s protruding nose and the two large tumors on the figure demonstrate his mastery of a variety of etched lines. The weight and volume of the tumors rendered with carefully spaced, curved lines and the texture of the man’s coarse skin are suggested by variety of deftly placed marks that include hatching, cross-hatching, and stippling.

Ribera’s deformed figures and interest in representing physical anomalies were also inspired by Leonardo’s own grotesque heads, which were disseminated in Martino Rota’s *Pagan Gods* (fig. 20). As Andrea Bayer right notes though, “…the dignity and seriousness of Ribera’s
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figure, who is endowed with a recognizable human personality distance it sharply from Rota’s grotesques and even from Leonardo’s exaggerated depictions.” 92

*The Poet: Ribera’s Frontispiece for His Drawing Manual*

Among the other prints associated with Ribera’s “drawing manual” is *The Poet* (fig. 14) discussed earlier in this chapter. Mark McDonald has suggested that this celebrated print was conceived as part of Ribera’s pattern book, and, more specifically, that it was the title-page for that project because of the prominent stone block or pedestal in the foreground. 93 The use of a stone pedestal or block or architectural cornice as a title-page feature became extremely popular in the seventeenth century, and, as we shall see in chapter three, also served as the support for Ribera’s signatures. Agostino Carracci’s title-page to the *Cremona fedelissima città*, which contains an allegorical image in honor of Philip II, provides an important precedent for the use of the stone block as a title-page feature (fig. 68). 94

In his analysis of *The Poet* (fig. 14), Mark McDonald examines the arcane nature of this classical subject in relation to Ribera’s anatomical etchings and to his printmaking practice in general. In 1625, the Duke of Alcalá had written that Ribera was beginning to make etchings. As McDonald notes, Ribera’s etchings are diverse in terms of subject matter, indicating that the artist did not approach etching with the intention of seriality, given the fact that he produced only eighteen known etchings. While Ribera did not pursue etching as a medium in his maturity, the medium of printmaking provided Ribera not only with a means to circulate his work to a wider audience but also with income, by virtue of the multiple impressions of each image, thereby allowing him to establish his reputation and secure a clientele. 95
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92 Bayer, 1992, cat. 81, 184.
94 Ibid., 53.
95 Ibid., 52.
The question, though, remains: why did Ribera choose or at least intend to select *The Poet* as the frontispiece for his drawing manual? Ribera might have connected the image of *The Poet* to a sense of learnedness given the pedagogical nature of the prints. It might have also been a caution to artists of the risks that came with sustaining artistic ability: the lack of practice impeded the development of their artistic skills and prevented the production of their work, parallel in some ways to the message of Dürer’s own *Melencolia I*.

**Drawings Related to Ribera’s Anatomical Studies**

Ribera’s preparatory drawings for his grotesque heads and anatomical sheets indicates the importance that he accorded to drawing as part of his design process, pedagogy, and workshop procedure. A highly finished preparatory drawing in black chalk is known for his *Small Grotesque Head* (E. Schapiro collection, London and Paris) and two known drawings for *The Large Grotesque Head*, one a black chalk study in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge and a remarkable red chalk study in the Tobey collection.  

Two sensitive studies in red chalk can also be associated with his drawing manual that demonstrate his interest in detailed studies of the human form: his *Studies of a Head in Profile* (fig. 55) and *Study of a Bat with Ears* (fig. 56). While Jonathan Brown has noted that the *Studies of a Head in Profile* cannot be specifically related to any of the etchings that comprise Ribera’s “drawing manual,” the careful, studied presentation of eyes and ears in Ribera’s *Studies of a Head in Profile* (fig. 55) parallels those illustrated in his etched sheets. I thus contend that this sheet can be thematically associated with the anatomical prints. The red chalk drawing shows four separate elements which are compositionally and thematically related. The largest section depicts a male head in profile including the ear, nose, and chin. Above the nose is an eye that is

---


placed in an ambiguous, off-center orientation. Above this arrangement there is a lightly modeled eye with a lid and brown that has been blemished by a transparent stain. Ribera carefully draws the back of the man’s head as the uppermost element of the sheet. As with his anatomical prints, Ribera’s forms are carefully modeled using clear and firm outlines. Sensitive passages of cross-hatching are used for the shading of the chin and thin, wispy lines for the chin hairs.

Ribera’s *Studies of Ears with a Bat* (fig. 56) is the other of the two drawings related to his anatomical studies, and, as such, can be dated to circa 1622. The drawing consists of a detailed study of a bat with outspread wings and careful anatomical studies of two ears, the one to the left from a frontal view and to the right in three-quarters view, with short wisps of hair curling around each ear. The composition for the study of the ears and bat is fairly symmetrical and balanced. At the center underneath the creature an inscription in Roman capital letters reads “FULGET SEMPER VIRTUS (Virtue always shines).”

The sheet has been interpreted in various ways. First, as a preparatory drawing, it represents Ribera’s interest in depicting the human body or form. The ears are carefully shaded and blended using red chalk, the soft blurring or blending of the contours demonstrating his mastery of modeling. Secondly, the bat at the center could be a symbol related to Ribera’s regional identity as a Valencian. The bat appeared on the coat of arms of Valencia since 1503. According to legend, a bat landed on the helmet of King Jaime I of Aragon during the retaking of the city from the Moors and was thus perceived as a symbol of Spanish victory. The Latin inscription might connote a heraldic association, but such a slogan does not appear on Valencian insignias and thus has no regional reference.

Few scholars, though, have carefully considered the significance of three elements of the drawing and their interrelatedness. Jonathan Brown has suggested that the design might have

---

99 Mena Marqués, 1992. cat. 90, 204
been a preparatory drawing for a commission from a fellow Valencian. Most recently, Gabriele
Finaldi has proposed that the sheet might illustrate Ribera’s design for his own coat-of-arms. He
has suggested that the odes of Horace might be the source of Ribera’s inscription.  

The central placement of the ears in the drawing might derive from one of Sebastian
Covarubbias’s Moral Emblems (1610) showing two ears encircled by a crown that protects them
from the dangers of lies, false doctrines, and flattery. Moreover, the moralizing element of the
inscription has been related to the trope of the Calumny of Apelles, in which the reputation of the
painter par excellence of antiquity is slandered and a theme that was depicted in the Renaissance
by Sandro Botticelli and Andrea Mantegna. In addition to its correlation with Ribera’s
anatomical studies, the elements of the drawing form a composition that casts light on aspects of
Ribera’s artistic identity and self-fashioning. The drawing might illustrate some form of Ribera’s
impresa, as Finaldi has suggested. Therefore, the inclusion of the bat as a regional symbol
would be entirely sensible.

Publication History, Circulation and Influence of Ribera’s Anatomical Studies

The mass circulation of Ribera’s anatomical studies started in 1650 in Paris by Nicolas
Langlois. Louis Elle, whose pseudonym was Ferdinand, produced plates after Ribera’s designs.
The Spanish edition of Ribera’s anatomical prints would be assembled much later in 1774 in
Madrid when Juan Barcelón published his Libro de principios de dibuxar sacado por las obras
de José de Ribera, llamado bulgarmente (El españoleto) (Book on the Principles of Drawings
Drawn from the Works of José de Ribera, Commonly Called El Españoleto) (figs 57 to 64). The
book illustrated twenty-four prints after Ribera’s designs, including those that comprised the
painter’s drawing manual and reproductions of his most famous works such as The Drunken

100 Finaldi has identified the following lines from Horace’s Odes (11, 17): “Virtus repulsae nescia
sordidae/Intaminatis fulget honoribus,/Nec summit aut point secures/Arbitrio populares aurae” (Virtue
cannot know the disgrace of repudiation/Shining with immaculate honors…..”). Translated by and cited in
Finaldi, 2005, 42, no. 15.
101 Ibid.
These drawing manuals further illustrate the role of Ribera in the education of Spanish and Neapolitan painters and emphasize the role that painters played in developing “unos buenos principios” (or good principles).

In 1650, the publication of the first known bound Spanish early modern drawing manual coincided with the reproduction of Ribera’s designs. It was initially produced in Madrid by Pedro de Villafranca y Malagón in 1637-38, consisting of twenty-one designs. In 1650, Villafranca sold the plates to the bookseller Domingo de Palacio; Villafranca’s prints were thereafter included in the 1702 edition of Vignola’s architectural treatise. Possibly after Ribera’s example, this book and other Spanish drawing manuals do not contain inscriptions or text to guide the reader. One exception is Vicente Salvador Gómez’s Cartilla y fundamentals reglas de pintura, 1674 (Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid). In his introduction, Salvador Gómez explains why artists should draw the human figure when they first begin their training:

The sense of sight and those open doors to the soul, open side by side by the eyes...with them man can broaden his [line of] sight and see; how precious is the light of its two splendid lamps and so much do they admire,and delight in things visible (for which we have more than enough love).  

Seventeenth-century Spanish drawing manuals or sheets such as Ribera’s provided important models and basic guidelines that abided by the same gradual learning process recommended in other theoretical writings. The Spanish artist and theoretician Pablo de Céspedes wrote about a methodical design process and the importance he accorded to the practice of drawing in his Poema de la Pintura that was partially published in Francisco Pacheco’s treatise, El Arte de la pintura (1634, published posthumously 1649):

---

102 Ibid.
103 Manuel Ruiz Ortega, ed., Cartilla para aprender a dibuxar: sacada por las obras de Joseph de Rivera, llamado (burlarmente) el Españoleto (Barcelona: Publicacion de la Universidad de Barcelona, 1990).
104 “El sentido de ver y aquellas puertas al alma, abiertas de par en par por los ojos (...) con ellos pues de el hombre ensancha su vista y verá; cuan preçiosa es la luz de sus dos lamparas lustidas y cuanto le atmiran y deleitan todas las cosas visibles (a que tan sobrado amor tenemos).” Spanish text cited in Ruiz Ortega, 13.
Procure an order which is secure
By its contours proceed
Begin with a pure and simple profile
With the eyes and parts defining
The face. I do not depart from this way
A linear approach for the entire body.  

In his treatise on the nobility of painting, Jusepe Martínez also recommended that artists should be taught to draw forms carefully and in the simplest manner in order to create systematic drafting procedure and ultimately to ensure the consistency and quality of finished works:

To instruct study by the clearest and the simplest [means], because, to the contrary, what happens is that the artist’s professional development will be marred by tediousness or the artist’s understanding of the craft will be shattered to pieces.

Furthermore, to achieve a unified composition, Martínez also advised that painters follow the examples afforded by prints and it is likely that he knew of Ribera’s anatomical designs:

Make use of our studies of prints by the most excellent masters, that these [studies] will give you the sufficient illusion, although some are fantastic and superb, and some foolish, in truth, who have blamed this way of studying, have clearly seen how the ancients have set the model before the moderns.

Ribera’s designs later served as models for later seventeenth-century drawing books such as Jose Hidalgo’s celebrated treatise Los principios para estudiar el nobilisimo y real arte de la pintura (1693) which contains anatomical plates modeled after Ribera’s famous etchings.

**Precedents for Ribera’s Anatomical Drawings**

Italian and Spanish sixteenth-century pattern books and drawing manuals provided fundamental models for Ribera’s own designs. Drawing manuals for young apprentices were an

---

105. “Procura un órden por el cual seguro/Por sus términis vaya caminando/Comienza de un perfil sencillo y puro/Por los ojos y partes figurando/La faz. Ni me desplugo de ese modo/Un tiempo linear el cuerpo todo.” Spanish text cited in Ruiz Ortega, 12.

106. “Instruir al estudio por lo más claro y fácil porque de lo contrario, o sucede quedarse empezada la profesión por el tedio o hallarse hecho pedazos el entendimiento por el trabajo.” Spanish text cited in Ruiz Ortega, 14.

107. “Valerse nuestros estudios de estampas de excelentisimos maestros, que estos tales le darán el suficiente desengaño, aunque algunos fantásticos y soberbios, como ignorantes, de toda verdad, han vituperado este modo de estudio, viendo claramente que los antiguos con sus ejemplares de adelanto de los modernos.” Martínez, 1988, 31.
established part of Renaissance art education or pedagogy. The anatomical drawings made by Spanish sixteenth-century artist Gaspar Becerra might have provided an important precedent for Ribera’s own designs. Becerra made careful anatomical drawings based on the illustrations in Andreas Veselius’s *De humanis corporis fabrica* (Basle, 1543) for Juan de Valdeverde’s anatomical work *Historia de la composición del cuerpo humano*, both for the first Spanish edition printed in Rome in 1556 and the Italian edition in 1559.

Ribera’s anatomical drawings follow the model set out by Odoardo Fialetti’s *Il vero modo et ordine per disegnar* (Venice, 1608). The drawings in Fialetti’s manual provide a detailed rendering of the various parts of the human body. Fialetti’s drawings of eyes (fig. 65) depict careful studies of the human eye. The designer started his study with the most basic elements of the eye such as a curved line for the lash line and the upper part of the eye lids in the first row and then progresses to more fuller and finished representations of the eye, showing it in frontal and profile views. Like Ribera, Fialetti might have also been aware of the precedent set by Agostino Carracci’s anatomical studies.  

Ribera might have also turned to Guercino’s anatomical prints published in 1619. Ribera’s scrupulous studies of ears thus relies on the precedents of Guercino (fig. 66) and Fialetti (fig. 67) who both produced carefully drafted studies of the organ in profile views.  

In designing these didactic prints, Ribera participated in an artistic tradition that dates back to the sixteenth century, when Palma II Giovane and Battista Franco also made similar designs. Similar compilations were made in the Seicento by or after works of Filarete and Guido Reni.

---


109 Seicento sources mention that Agostino considered the ear the hardest part of draw and he made a large plaster cast for this students to study. Gombrich, 161.

110 Brown, 1973, 70
The Reception of Ribera’s Drawing Manual

Ribera’s designs proved to be influential in the seventeenth century. Stefano Della Bella produced two “drawing books” with specific plates modeled after Ribera’s etchings. Northern artists were responsive to Ribera’s forms. The engraver Frederick de Wit produced designs after Ribera also published them in his *Lumen picturae et delineationes* in 1660, an amplification of a previous set of reproductions after Ribera made by Crispin van de Passe in his *Lumen picturae* of 1643. He prefaced the book with a “striking variation” on Ribera’s etching *The Poet* (fig. 69). The Dutch engraver carefully followed Ribera’s design, except “for the insertion on the stone block of anatomical figures.” As Mark McDonald notes, “DeWit, further to realizing the potential of the stone face to contain images has added anatomical details that allude to the contents of the book.”

In addition, DeWit’s book contains several prints after Ribera’s etched designs. DeWit published two sheets that contain a pastiche of anatomical drawings from three of Ribera’s best known reproductive etchings: *The Drunken Silenus*. These sheets show cropped versions of Silenus’ feet and legs. By the time of de Wit’s publication, the French printmaker Poilly had published a series of didactic prints in France, “with the device of showing each detail in contour for easy cropping and shading.”

Another seventeenth-century compilation of prints from the Victoria and Albert Museum illustrates *The Poet* as its title-page. In this engraving, *the Poet* has been reversed and the stone block carries the inscription in capital Roman letters, “IOSEPH RIBERA. ESPAÑOL. INVENT. ABEX.” Furthermore, a collection of seven seventeenth-century engravings after Ribera in
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111 Gombrich, 165.
112 McDonald, 56.
113 Ibid.
114 Gombrich, 165.
115 Ibid.
116 McDonald, 57.
which *The Poet* again appears as an element of the title-page or frontispiece is in the collection of the Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid.\(^\text{117}\)

That Ribera’s *The Poet* “has been copied and adapted so often…testifies to its success as a pertinent title-page formula and as a composition that incorporated theoretical artistic concerns of the Renaissance and the Baroque mind, while simultaneously visualizing the instructive function of the pattern book.”\(^\text{118}\) In sum, Ribera’s didactic, anatomical prints reflect his concerted efforts to “improve the quality of draughtsmanship of Neapolitan painters.”\(^\text{119}\)

**Conclusion**

Ribera’s re-interpretation of Renaissance imagery, his interest in ancient subject matter, and his drawing manual attest to the kind of learned humanism which informed his art. In his quotation or re-contextualization of the art of Dürer, Leonardo, and Titian, Ribera demonstrated his knowledge of art and art theory. Ribera’s novel rendition of ancient philosophers created an enduring figure type that influenced then-contemporary artists such as Diego Velázquez: the two met in Naples in 1630 when Ribera was producing these portraits. Ultimately, his concern with the didactic aspects of art making is expressed in his animated representations of sensory organs that comprise his drawing manual.

\[^{117}\text{Brown, 1973, 111; McDonald, 57.}\]
\[^{118}\text{McDonald, 58.}\]
\[^{119}\text{Finaldi, 1995, 24.}\]
Chapter 3 - Ribera’s Signatures and Likeness

Introduction

Ribera’s signatures on his paintings, prints, and drawings are markers of artistic identity, an effective means by which the artist asserts his presence onto the illusory surface of the canvas or sheet. 1 Ribera is one of the artists of the Spanish Golden Age and viceregal Naples who inscribed his works most frequently and consistently. 2 The artist’s signatures have multiple functions and bear manifold meanings in promoting his art. Traditionally celebrated as a painter

---


of raw naturalism and graphic violence in early modern art biographies, in my study of his inscriptions, Ribera emerges as an artist of great pictorial intelligence and market savvy.\(^3\) By analyzing the complex iconography of his paintings along with the varying orthography, the different formats and placements of Ribera’s name within them, his signatures provide a recognizable “brand” for his distinct style.\(^4\) They should be read in light of his quest for a higher social status and elevated regard. Ribera’s name also helped to commodify an artistic identity in a competitive marketplace such as Naples where the painter heavily relied on vice-regal


patronage and in Spain where royal and aristocratic patrons collected his art.\(^5\) Ribera’s signatures have also been read in light of the painter’s nationality, contested by early modern and modern Italian and Spanish art biographers and art historians.\(^6\) While extant literature on Ribera’s signatures has shed light on questions of artistic identity and nationality, a systematic exposition about the general parameters of his signing practices remains to be done. Therefore, I will focus on analyzing the frequency of his signatures in his oeuvre, the variants he used over the course of his career, significant components of his signatures, types of formats, and the precedents on which Ribera might have relied.

Ribera's signatures, listed in Appendix I, are present on nearly 54% of 364 autograph works.\(^7\) They consist of his name, a Latin verb in the third person, his nationality, and, or, academic affiliation, and a date. Ribera's early signatures, on works dating from 1613 to 1626, have Latin signatures, while the majority of his later works (from 1626 to 1628, and onward), bear them in Spanish.

The signatures are painted normally in a dark, neutral shade, although he will occasionally paint them in lighter colors. The Latin inscriptions are printed entirely in Roman capital or majuscule letters while the Spanish signatures are painted in a small, cursive script that was in prevalent use in Spain.

---


\(^6\) Art historical debates about Ribera’s nationality as a Spanish or Neapolitan painter have proven to be lengthy and irreconcilable. For a succinct presentation of these issues, see Revilla Uceda, 85-101. Jonathan Brown has aptly suggested that Ribera was an artist who could claim a “dual nationality,” Spanish by birth and Italian by repatriation: *Painting in Spain, 1500-1700* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998), 145.

\(^7\) Nicola Spinosa has recently published many new attributions to Ribera, raising the number of the painter’s autograph paintings from 307 in the 2003 and 2006 Italian editions of the *catalogue raisonné* to 364 in the revised and updated Spanish version. Regrettably, Spinosa does not clearly specify why he has introduced fifty-seven additional works into Ribera’s corpus, and many of his attributions merit further consideration; idem, *Ribera: La obra completa* (Madrid: Madrid: Fundación Arte Hispánico, 2008).
The placement of Ribera’s signatures tends to be varied. Although many of them appear in the lower right corner of the painting, several of them appear written across the ground as “earth-bound” signatures, on boulders or stones in the lower left or right corner of the painting, or toward the center of the canvas. Ribera also uses various formats for his signature. In addition to the boulder that he favors in many of his compositions, he occasionally uses cartellini or sheets of paper. While many of the signatures were painted by the artist himself, the repetitive formula of his name, his nationality, and a date in Spanish on paintings dated after 1636 possibly indicates they were painted by his workshop.

The function and role of Ribera’s signature thus raises some questions. First and foremost, what was Ribera’s role in the formidable workshop he ran? How did his name or signature then come to identify the works produced by his assistants? Ribera’s signatures change over the course of his career, and, therefore have implications for his studio practice. In writing about Raphael’s signatures, Lisa Pon astutely observes how signatures can complicate concepts of authorship, branding, and, most importantly, of artistic identity in relation to workshop practices:

Whether acting as a traditional commercial brand or as the personal sign of an artist, the signature works by pairing off the names of the other individuals involved in production, the anonymous “students and collaborators” of the studio, since Raphael alone is named, be it as the workshop head or as the authorial artist.

---

8 For a recent discussion of the origins, format, and function of cartellini as supports for signatures, albeit in Venetian and Venetan Renaissance art, see Kandice A. Rawlings “Liminal Messages: The Cartellino in Italian Renaissance Painting” (Ph.D. dissertation: Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 2009).
9 The function and operation of Ribera’s workshop is beyond the scope of this dissertation and is the subject of a forthcoming dissertation: Yusuke Kawase, “Jusepe de Ribera and His Workshop in Naples, 1616-1652: Its Function and Practice” (New York: Institute of Fine Arts, New York University).
Signatures thus serve as inscriptions that indicate a work is the product of a single artist or can ensure that it is a production made in his studio or workshop.\textsuperscript{11}

However, the absence of a signature is equally important and evocative. For example, many of Ribera’s early works in Rome are unsigned.\textsuperscript{12} As Silvia Danesi Squarzina has noted, Ribera might have already established a workshop as a young and successful artist working in Rome, as claimed by Giulio Mancini’s life of Ribera. The biographer writes that when Ribera left Rome, he rid himself of many assistants or co-tenants, whom he deemed were “sparapani” or “mangia pane a ufo” (parasites and spongers). Mancini’s account is also supported by another entry in the Roman census record of 1615 that indicates that at least four people lived with Ribera in the Via Margutta. In his biography of the painter, Mancini further claims that Ribera had rented “six mattresses.”\textsuperscript{13} One can argue that Ribera had acquired beds for the assistants who were living and working alongside him.\textsuperscript{14}

The omission of a signature can also indicate Ribera’s ambivalence towards his work. In light of Gianni Papi’s recent attributions of early, unsigned works, as briefly discussed in chapter one, Ribera’s paintings in Rome were highly experimental and show a remarkable degree of

\textsuperscript{11} Signatures often times are reliable markers of authorship but this is not always the case. For example, Miguel Falomir has compellingly argued that Titian varied his signatures to indicate authenticity, using the form ‘Titianus fecit’ for pictures of varying quality while reserving ‘Titianus Aeques Caesarius’ for those pictures that are definitely autograph, making it the \textit{form} of the signature rather than its mere presence that verified authorship. Likewise, the forms of Ribera’s signature also reflect the ways in which he differentiated autograph works which often bear Latin inscriptions and ones produced \textit{en masse} by his workshop in the 1630s and 1640s which are signed in Spanish with a simplified form of his signature consisting of his name, nationality and the year of facture.

\textsuperscript{12} Until recently, very little was known about Ribera’s early years in Italy. Current art historical research has more precisely reconstructed Ribera’s career in Rome. For recent studies, see Lange, 2003, and Papi, 2007. An exhibition focusing on Ribera’s youthful artistic activity, “The young Ribera,” was held in April to June 2011 at the Museo Nacional de Prado, Madrid.

\textsuperscript{13}Mancini, 250, cited in Danesi Squarzina, 2006, 248.

\textsuperscript{14} It is difficult to identify specific artists who might have worked with Ribera during his early years in Rome. According to census records, Ribera’s brother, Juan, was living with him on the Via Margutta between 1615 and 1616 and might have assisted him with carrying out these early commissions. For further reference, see Carlos Sarthou Carreres, “Juan José Ribera, El Españoleto: su vida, su obra, su familia en Italia y su siglo XVII,” \textit{Boletín de la Sociedad Española de Excursiones} (1952): 155-80.
heterogeneity and inconsistency. Most of the compositions, such as *The Judgment of Solomon* (c. 1609-10, Galleria Borghese, Rome) and *Christ Among the Doctors* (c. 1612-13, oil on canvas, Church of St. Martin, Langres, fig. 122) are horizontal in format and illustrate multi-figural, religious narratives that are distinct from the half-length, single figures set against a dark, neutral background for which Ribera is best known. Nonetheless, it was during his Roman sojourn that Ribera began to establish his own style and his own method of attaining realism or verisimilitude through the careful analysis and interpretation of the life around him. While Ribera might have begun to cultivate relationships with prominent patrons such as the Borghese, he was also producing pictures for art dealers as a young artist, according to the art biographer Mancini.

While Ribera would have certainly benefited from the contacts he made in Rome and surely would have wanted to assert himself by means of his signature, I maintain that Ribera’s attitudes toward signing could be far more complex. Ronald Cohen has also made an interesting observation, that, given Mancini’s description of Ribera as a dissolute youth who led a bohemian life in Rome, Ribera might have preferred not to have his identity disclosed by a full signature. I also suggest that these unusual pictures showing large, multi-figural compositions could have been produced simply for sale on the art market or made for Italian or Spanish patrons who perhaps asked him not to sign the paintings.

---


16 Mancini, 1957, I, 249: “Et, venutosene a Roma, si messe a lavorar a giornata con questi che fan bottega e mercantile di pitture con le fadighe di simile giovani.” (“When he arrived in Rome, he worked for a daily wage for those who have workshops and sell paintings with the labors of similar young men.”)

17 Cohen, 31.

18 In his treatise on the nobility of painting, Jusepe Martínez recounts an episode in which a young Spanish painter from Zaragoza working in Rome is instructed by his patron not to sign a finished canvas. Nonetheless, in his efforts to assert his authorship of the painting, the artist insists on painting an anagram instead of a full signature: “Let me offer to say, by example and consolation, for another part, two cases that I witnessed by sight and hearing as such. Finding myself in Rome in the year 1625, there was a courtier
Whereas the absence of signatures raises questions regarding the authorship and authenticity of his early commissions, the inscriptions that appear in his later paintings such as the series of twelve Old Testament prophets in the Certosa di San Martino in Naples are remarkably consistent in their placement and treatment of the painter’s name or his initials. Most of the inscriptions are written in Spanish and in large, cursive letters. They are prominently placed beneath the figures’ feet (figs. 70 and 71) because many of the canvases are irregularly shaped due to the elevated position of the architectural frames and spandrels in which the paintings are located. The systematic treatment of the signature and initials in his late works not only indicates that the paintings for this commission were produced, in part, by the large workshop that Ribera employed in Naples but also suggests the public prestige associated with producing a large-scale commission for one of the city’s most prominent charterhouses.

In sum, Ribera included his signatures in his later works to ensure the authenticity of his mature designs, albeit produced in collaboration with his large workshop. The practice of

who was well-versed in the profession of painting as he was in the city for many years and dealt with the best painters to be found there. He had a great friendship with a youth who was a great and learned practitioner of the profession [of painting], originally from Zaragoza. [The courtier] commissioned a painting from the young man, for which he worked with all his diligence and knowledge. When the courtier saw the finished painting and it was to his liking, he told the young man that he would be dissatisfied if he signed his name on said picture. The young man, who refused him much, gathered his courage, and signed the painting with an anagram so that those persons who did not understand art would be unable to read it.” (“Ofréceseme decir para ejemplar y Consuelo, por otra parte, dos casos de que yo soy testigo de vista y de oído, y fue así. Hallándome en Roma en el año de 1625, había un cortesano muy entendido en esta profesión de pintura por hacer muchos años que estaba en aquella ciudad y haber tratado con los mejores pintores que en ella se hallaban. Tenía grande Amistad este tal con un joven muy estudioso y de grande práctica en esta profesión, natural de esta ciudad de Zaragoza. Mandole hacer un cuadro en el cual puso este joven con toda la diligencia posible todo su saber. Viéndolo este cortesano acabado y tan a gusto suyo, le dijo, que no le satisfaría, que no firmara su nombre dicho cuadro. El joven lo rehusó mucho, mas valiéndose de una industria lo puso en anagrama, que este modo de escribir quien no sabe el arte no lo sabrá leer”). Jusepe Martínez, _Discursos practicable de nobilísimo arte de la pintura_, edition, introduction, and notes by María Elena Manrique Ara (Madrid: Catedra, 2006), 297.

consistently signing his works in his mid- and late career thus runs counter to his earlier practice in Rome by which he produced large-scale, unsigned works possibly with the assistance of apprentices or little-known artists.

Ribera’s Name

Joseph or Jusepe or Gioseppe? The Etymology and Orthography of Ribera’s First Name

Despite the questions that the presence or lack of signatures equally raise, Ribera was fairly consistent about the inclusion of his signature in his many paintings, drawings, and prints. Tracing the etymology of Ribera’s name helps to elucidate how he constructed or fashioned his persona in his signatures. Ribera most often employed the Aragonese-Valencian form of his name, Jusepe, except in Latin signatures, when he used the name “Joseph.” He rarely used the Catalan spelling of his name, “Joan Josep,” which was found on his baptismal certificate.

The participle “de” is an essential component of his name, although it is sometimes omitted. In the Latin inscriptions, the participle appears as “a.” The authenticity of Ribera’s handwriting style can be checked against the handwriting of an extant letter dated September 22, 1650 from Ribera to his patron Antonio Ruffo (fig. 77) in which Ribera signed his own name. In this letter, he signed his name as “Jusepe de Ribera,” the “J” in his first name with its characteristic loop. Then, the entire name is followed by a typical, small flourish.

In his early signatures, Ribera tended to be regular with the Latin spelling of his name, which he inscribed either as “Josephus” or “Joseph.” Ribera’s consistency suggests that he was

---

20 Brown, 1973, 49. According to Jeanne Chenault-Porter, the name “Jusepe” could also be a “pastiche of Spanish and Italian.” Idem, 1993, 261.
very much aware of his signature’s notarial value. Various spellings of Ribera’s name appear within his own signatures but also in legal documents related to the painter because early modern orthography tended to be fairly random about spelling. In fact, there is no consistent spelling of Ribera’s name in early seventeenth-century Roman documents. Justus Lange has noted that Ribera’s name appears in different spellings such as “Joseph,” “Josep,” “José,” “Giosseppe,” or “Giuseppe.” In most documents, Ribera’s full legal name in Italy is cited as “Giuseppe Ribera,” “Giuseppe de Rivera” or “Giuseppi Riviera.”

However, in my examination of extant documents, I have been able to trace other variations. The alternative spellings for Ribera’s first name include “Josepho” or “Josepho,” “Joseph,” and “Giossephe.” In official documents, Ribera’s first name was spelled in the Spanish manner “Jusepe” (starting with a “J”) only twelve times compared to the variants of the Italian spelling of his name (“Giuseppe,” “Gioseffe,” or “Gioseffo,” etc.).

In addition to the aforementioned census registrations and his baptismal certificate, the documents that help in tracing variants of Ribera’s name include official correspondence of the Academy of Saint Luke in Rome and his marriage certificate. When the painter received an

---

23 Charles Seymour Jr., “‘Fatto di sua mano.’ Another look at the Fonte Gaia Drawing Fragments in London and New York,” in Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1968), 93-105. This article is important because it helps to establish the concept “that a signature ensures authenticity derives from notarial practice.”

24 Lange, 2005, 17.


26 Finaldi, 1992b, 232-3. The signatures in these documents also mention Ribera’s nationality, a forthcoming topic in this chapter.
invitation to join the Accademia di San Luca (Academy of Saint Luke) on October 27, 1613, the
document recorded his name as “Josefo di Riviera.” Other variations of Ribera’s name appear
in the records of the Academy of Saint Luke. On May 7, 1616, Ribera promised a payment of
two scudi to the institution. His name appears as “Sr. Giospeh Riviera.”

In addition to his full name, Ribera was often called by his nickname “Spagnoletto” or
“little Spaniard.” The appellation was used fairly early in his career and can be traced to his
earliest commissions in the city of Parma in 1611 and Mancini’s biography of the painter (ca.
1617-1621). Although Ribera was also frequently referred to as “Spagnoletto” in early modern
documents and art biographies and even in collectors’ marks and inscriptions, he would never
include the nickname in his signature. The nickname was probably given the artist because he
was quite young when he arrived in Rome or because he was short, as stated in De Dominci’s
description of the painter. In Spanish documents, the orthography of Ribera’s name tended be
more consistent and used the Valencian spelling of his name. For example, Salazár y Castro’s
1638 genealogy of Ribera recorded the painter’s name as “Jusepe de Ribera.”

27 Archive of the Academy of Saint Luke, published in Godefridus Joannes Hoogewerff, Bescheiden in
Italie omtrent Nederlandsche kunstenaars en geleerden, The Hague, 1913, and cited in Finaldi, 2002, 212;
Gallo, 1998. Also see the comprehensive database documenting the early history of the Academy of Saint
28 Finaldi, 1992b, 232.
29 The use of the nickname “Spagnoletto” in association with Ribera began early in his career. It appears in
a record of payment to Ribera for his Saint Martin on a Horse (untraced) for the Church of San Prospero in
Parma (Cordaro, 1980, 324; Finaldi, 1992b, 232; Lange, 2003, 53, 262; Epifani, 242). The nickname
“Spagnoletto” is not exclusive to Ribera. The painter G.M. Crespi is also referred to “Il Spagnoletto.” For
the possible misattribution of works by Crespi to Ribera resulting from the misidentification of this
moniker, and vice versa, see Lange, 2003, 28-31 and Edward J. Olszewski, The Inventory of Paintings of
Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni (1667 - 1740) (New York: Lang, 2004). In addition, another Spanish painter
working in Rome, who was named Girolamo Fracolino, was also called Spagnoletto around 1635
(Cavazzini, 2008, 16).
31 Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, Salazár y Castro, Catalogo de manuscritos genealógicos, 16, no.
27,663, D-34, fol. 123v. Published in San Petrillo, 1953, 9-10. The correct transcription of this document
was published by Finaldi, 1992b, 245 and Lange, 2003, 260.
Furthermore the painter’s name is also spelled in the Italian manner after his death, during the dispute for payment between his heirs and the Certosa di San Martino.\textsuperscript{32} It could be argued that the form of the name on official documents may have often been determined by the scribe, but there is little doubt that such an important painter could and, had he considered it important, undoubtedly would have insisted on maintaining the Spanish spelling for permanent records.\textsuperscript{33}

**Ribera’s Verb Tenses**

In addition to Ribera’s name, the second integral element of Ribera’s signature is the verb. This component of the signature specifically refers to the meaning or execution of the painting. Ribera routinely used the Latin simple past (*fecit*) for the verb. At times, he inserted a simple ‘F’ indicating no specific tense. The letter could possibly suggest the imperfect form of the verb *faciebat*. In fact, Ribera employed the full spelling of the verb *faciebat* in at least seven of his signatures.\textsuperscript{34} Many of the erudite inscriptions in Ribera’s signatures indicate that his paintings were intended for an elite patron or clientele. Since Ribera’s principal patrons were the Spanish viceroys, they might have exercised some influence over the wording of Ribera’s signatures.\textsuperscript{35} Most sixteenth- and seventeenth-century artists were well aware of the story from Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History* related to the way in which famous artists of antiquity signed their works.

\textsuperscript{32} Finaldi, 1992b, 253.
\textsuperscript{33} Cohen, 25.
Pliny wrote that it was for more common for them to use the imperfect, suggesting that the act of painting was not completed but that artists would continue to make changes to improve it, “as though art was always a thing in process and not completed.” He compared it to the less common simple past (fecit), which “presented the work as completely finished, an emphatic statement of great confidence in individual ability, lacking the modesty of the imperfect.”

Some artists did use the simple past in signing their pictures, but it was a bolder statement of their talent. Titian was perhaps the most celebrated Italian Renaissance painter to employ the simple past consistently when he signed his paintings. Like Titian, Ribera made repeated use of the emphatic form of facere or “to be.” With his deliberate choice of the simple past, Ribera, as did Titian, turned his signature on paintings into a compelling statement of artistic invention and indicates that he, as did his Renaissance predecessor, understood the use of such language as an assertion of his own artistic identity.

Ribera first employed the imperfect tense of the verb in his mature, large-scale altarpiece, *Madonna and Child with Saint Bruno* (1624, Schlossmuseum Kunstsammlungen, Weimar) (fig. 72). This signature provides a full statement of Ribera’s artistic credentials: “Joseph a Ribera Hispanus / Valentinus Sethabis Academic / Romanus Faciebat 1624.” Ribera’s use of the verb in this painting also suggests that he would have certainly known the precedent of Michelangelo’s Vatican Pietà. Why might Ribera have used the verb in this context? Renaissance artists employed the term in such a way that it conveys the pervasive rivalry and competition that

---

35 This core of this argument is informed by Joanna Woodall’s discussion of Antonis Mor’s signatures in her doctoral dissertation: *The Portraiture of Antonis Mor*, 2 vols. (Ph.D. dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1990), 376.
existed among them. Rona Goffen has convincingly argued that Titian introduced the imperfect for this reason. Titian rarely used the imperfect (it appears in only five of his roughly eighty signed works). When he did use it, Rona Goffen suggests, it was specifically intended as a reference to his rival Michelangelo.\(^{39}\) It is very likely that Ribera was aware of the precedence for such a signature. While little evidence indicates the painting’s patron and intended location, the signature on the *Madonna and Child with Saint Bruno* suggests that it would have been made for a prominent ecclesiastical patron.\(^{40}\) In this signature, Ribera might have not only been referring to himself as a prominent artist of his, as were Michelangelo and Titian respectively, but also to Apelles, the painter *par excellence* of Greek antiquity. Ribera later explicitly referred to himself as Apelles in the erudite, Latin inscription found in his *Magdalena Ventura* (fig. 9).\(^{41}\) Therefore, his use of the verb *faciebat* illustrates his self-fashioning as both a learned and very ambitious painter who worked in the highly competitive artistic milieus of Rome and Naples respectively.

**Ribera’s Nationality: Regional and National Identity**

In signing, Ribera not only makes specific references to his talent and status but also to his Spanish nationality. Ribera was born in Játiva (also spelled Xátiva, the Roman *Setabis* and at present the town of San Tomás) near Valencia.\(^{42}\) Although he signed his identity very simply as a Spaniard [Jusepe de Ribera español] for most of his career, Ribera at times recorded his regional

---


\(^{40}\) Craig Felton suggested that the altarpiece was intended for the church of Trinità delle Monache (Naples). Nicola Spinosa has recently proposed that it was painted for the Capitular Room of the Certosa di San Martino. Spinosa, 2008, 352-53.

\(^{41}\) Although Ribera refers to himself as Apelles in the long inscription in the *Magdalena Ventura*, he curiously did not use *faciebat* but *depinxit* as the verb in the signature.

identity. He inscribed the terms “Setabis,” “Sethabis,” or “Setaben,” using Latin references to the town of Játiva in at least eleven signatures in works he produced up to 1640.43

Roman census records provide some of the earliest references to Ribera’s regional identity as a Valencian. In 1615, Ribera and his brother were living in an apartment on the Via Margutta in Rome. The record identified a “Giuseppe Riviera da Valenza di anni Pittore.”44 A year later Ribera appeared again as “Giuseppe Riviera Valentiano Pittori.”45 A fuller statement of Ribera’s nationality is manifest in his marriage contract of November 10, 1616. The notary transcribed Ribera’s name or appellation and Spanish nationality: “joseph de ribera hispano valentiano similiter pictore neapoli residente qui dixet habere patrem nomine simonem de ribera residentem jn hyspania a quo dixit esse emancipatum et se ipsum vivere hic neapoli seorsum ab eo….ex parte altera.”46 The inclusion of Ribera’s birthplace in notarial documents and his signatures functions differently. The wording or reference to the painter’s nationality in his marriage certificate carefully identifies Ribera as a resident of Naples and as a Spanish expatriate for legal purposes. In contradistinction, the specific reference to the ancient name of the city of his birthplace in his signatures both boldly proclaims his Spanish nationality and, moreover, that his artistic aspirations and ambitions were informed or shaped by his early education and experiences as a youth in Valencia.47 His association with the region by his repeated inclusion of it in his signature could show too that he wished to identify himself as one of the region’s leading citizens. Valencia was the most important city in the Kingdom of Aragón and was a leading artistic center in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.48 The greater realm of Valencia was, in fact,

43 See Appendix II, nos. 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 32, 36, 64, 135, and 139.
48 Ibid. Leading fifteenth-century Valencian painters such as Jacomart Baçó, Bartolome Bermejo, Paolo de San Leocadio, Rodrigo de Osuna, and Juan de Juanes were known for following and continuing the model
the place from which the renowned Borja (Borgia) family hailed. Two Borja popes, Callistus III (r. 1455-58) and the infamous Alexander VI (r. 1492-1503) were also born in this region. By referring to himself as a Valencian, Ribera also could “co-opt” and associate himself with such a prestigious background.

Ribera’s formulation of his nationality as a patronymic identifying him as a Spaniard, native of Valencia, and citizen of Játiva mainly appears in his Latin signatures of 1620s and 1630s. Three of his philosopher portraits for Karl Eusebius, the Prince of Lichtenstein (1636-7) contain some of the most varied presentations of Ribera’s identity with a given series. For example, in the philosopher *Diogenes* (fig. 73), Ribera records his name and nationality and status as a member of the Roman Academy of Saint Luke in Latin as: “Josephf a Riberaspain/ Valentinus civitas/ Settabis academicus/ Romanus ,F,/ 1636.” The inscription on his *Anaxagoras* (fig. 74) reads: “Josephf a Ribera yspanus valentinus/ ,F, 1636.” The one on the *Crates* (fig. 75) states: “Josephf de Ribera espanol/,F, 1636.”

The elaborate signatures coupled with the fact that these canvases represent the philosophers in a much more solemn fashion and studious demeanor than his other philosopher portraits indicates the importance that Ribera of Flemish realism in Spain. Sixteenth-century artists such as Francisco Ribalta and Juan Sariñena introduced a more naturalistic model of painting. Regrettably, many large-scale altarpieces and independent canvases made by these artists were destroyed in 1936 as a result of the mass-scale bombardment of Valencia during the Spanish Civil War. For a brief survey of early modern Valencian painting, see Brown, 1998, 8-14, and 40-45, and for more thorough studies, consult Miguel Falomir Faus, *La pintura y los pintores en la Valencia del Renacimiento* (1472-1620) (Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 1994); idem, *Arte en Valencia, 1472-1522* (Valencia: Consell Valencia de Cultura, 1996).

Eighteenth-century and nineteenth-century art biographers such as Palomino, De Dominici, and Ceán Bermúdez have all claimed that Ribera hailed from a noble or high-ranking family, a notion that has also been supported by Ronald Cohen in recent art historical literature. However, documentary evidence indicates that Ribera’s origins were quite humble as he was the son of a local shoemaker, Simon Ribera, and his wife, Margarite Cuco. See Finaldi, 1992b, 231.

The varying degree of complexity in the signatures of the Philosophers series have raised questions about the order in which Ribera completed the series. Craig Felton has suggested that the *Diogenes*, the painting with the most complex signature, recording Ribera’s Valencian origins, his birthplace of Játiva, and his membership in the Roman Academy of St Luke, was the first to be painted, with the next two following in the sequence given above: Craig Felton, “Ribera’s ‘Philosophers’ for the Prince of Liechtenstein,” *The Burlington Magazine* 128 (1986):785-789.
conferred on this princely commission. The inscriptions thus reflect Ribera’s awareness of his status as an international artist and as such he inscribed his Spanish nationality in these portraits as an important means of self-promotion in princely courts outside of Naples and Spain.

The broad designation “español” or “hispanus” in his signature contains the most explicit reference to Ribera’s nationality. The earliest painting in which Ribera refers to himself as “hispanus” in the signature is his Penitent Saint Jerome (ca. 1615, Art Gallery of Hamilton, Toronto) (fig. 76), that was eventually purchased by the art biographer Giulio Mancini. The reference to his Spanish nationality in his signature was perceived in early modern art criticism by the biographer De Dominici as a form of self-advertisement or self-promotion and therefore as a means of cultivating patronage among Spanish grandees living in Naples, most notably, the viceroys. De Dominici recorded an anecdote in which the Duke of Osuna, the then-reigning viceroy, was looking from the balcony of his palace and saw a large crowd attracted to a public presentation of one of Ribera’s versions of Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew. The most telling part of the text is where De Dominici recounted that the Duke “wanted to see the picture, and when it was brought to him, he liked it so much that he also had the painter summoned. As he usually did, Ribera had written his name on the picture and added español, perhaps just in order to carry out this trick. It worked, because the viceroy praised him greatly and wanted to have the picture himself, and only days later named him court painter…”

---

52 The prominently placed signatures in the Lichtenstein philosopher portraits also served as markers of the paintings’ authenticity as the contract for the paintings explicitly stated that they should be painted in Ribera’s own hand (“di sua propria mano”). ASBN, Banco dello Spirito Santo, Giornale del 1636, matr. 270, 7 maggio. In Nappi, 1983, 104; Felton, 1986, 786; Finaldi, 1992b, 244.
53 Ibid.
54 The Toronto Saint Jerome is signed in majuscule on the plinth: JOSEPHUS RIBERA, VALENTINUS, CIVITATIS SETABIS HISPNNUS / ME FECIT]. Three letters exchanged between Giulio Mancini and his brother Deifebo from 1615 to 1620 attest to the biographer’s concerted efforts in acquiring Ribera’s Saint Jerome. Mancini’s letters do not state from whom he purchased the painting, but they do indicate the prices he was inclined to pay for the painting. In a letter dated to June 26, 1615, Mancini was willing to pay 40 scudi. As attested by another letter dated to January 17, 1620, Mancini eventually paid 100 scudi for it. See Epifani, 248-9 in Papi, 2007.
55 The English translation of the passage is from Michael Scholz-Hänsel, Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652 (Cologne: Könemann, 2000), 32. The original Italian from De Dominici [1742-5 (1979), III, 4] follows:
One can then construe that Ribera signed his nationality so frequently because he wanted to identify himself as a painter who successfully earned the patronage of the elite European circles, first in Rome, then Naples, and elsewhere in Italy and Europe. Thus, the adjective “español” would be a reminder to his patrons of his life-long identification with his mother country.

**“Accademicus” or Ribera’s Affiliation with the Roman Academy**

Ribera’s signatures not only reflect his national pride as a Spaniard but also publicize his official status as a Spanish painter working in Italy. Ribera often proclaimed his academic affiliation in his signatures as he was active in the Roman Academy by 1614. The use of the

“Il Vicerè D. Pietro Giron, Duca di Ossuna, che dal balcone del Palazzo Regio osservò la molta gente che miravano il quadro curiosamente domandò, che cosa suesse, ed essendogli risposto, che miravano la pittura di un S. Bartolomeo scorticato, che pareva cosa vera, s’invogliò di vederlo; il perché fatto venire il quadro in presenza sua, incontrò in quello tal piacere, che fecesi chiamare anche il Pittore, e tanto più che il Ribera aveva ivi scritto il suo nome in cifra, come far solea, e vi avera aggiunto Español, forse per far q

56 By the time Ribera arrived in Rome in 1611, a community of sixteenth-century Spanish painters such as the Estremaduran Pedro Rubiales, Castilian Alonso Berruguete and Andalusian Gaspar Becerra had paved the way for him. Both Rubiales and Becerra earned prestigious private and public commissions in Rome and Naples during the Counter Reformation. For most of his career, Berruguete assiduously sought to raise the social status of artists working in Spain. See Gonzalo Redín Michaus, *Pedro Rubiales, Gaspar Becerra, y los pintores españoles en Roma 1527-1600* (Madrid: Varona, S.A., 2007). Berruguete’s sojourn in Italy is the topic of a forthcoming study entitled “A Young Spaniard Arrives: Alonso Berruguete in Italy” by Dennis V. Geronimus. Unlike Ribera and his sixteenth-century predecessors, many Spanish painters working in Italy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century had “limited success,” such as the case of Domenico Trizeno, “a Spanish painter from Valladolid,” who worked in Rome in the 1570. For a brief overview of Spanish artistic patronage in Rome, see Thomas James Dan, *Spanish Rome 1500-1700* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 9, 109, 122, 124, 153-4, and 245 no. 32. Sally Gross has carefully considered how the social and economic conditions and concerns of Spanish painters influenced artistic practice and theory in the Golden Age: “A Second Look: Nationalism in Art Treatises from the Golden Age in Spain,” *Rutgers Art Review* 5 (1984): 9-28.

term “academicus” visibly proclaimed the painter’s membership in the academy and his self-fashioning as a learned artist. Furthermore, his adoption of Latin inscriptions in capital Roman lettering in the whole signature can be associated with humanist learning, indicating that as a young painter Ribera was presenting himself as a *pictor doctus* or learned painter – thus conspicuously stating his academic affiliation with the Academy of Saint Luke. The incorporation of “academicus” into his signature might have also have been a shrewd marketing strategy on Ribera’s behalf. As a young artist, Ribera was involved in selling pictures on the art market and worked for dealers and wanted to distance himself from these early ventures. In addition, he would have been keenly aware of the Academy of Saint Luke’s attempts to “corner” the art market and discourage local competition from members of the Compagnia or other painters who were working outside of these institutions. In 1609, the Academy sought to regulate the selling practices of “nonacademicians” by declaring that any painter working on a commission, private or public, appraised above three *scudi*, could only carry it out with the written permission of the head of the Academy.

**Ribera’s Lettering Style**

In addition to signing his status as a member of the Academy of St, Luke, Ribera’s earliest signatures inscribe his name in capital letters in Latin. His later signatures in Spanish are written in small, cursive letters. A comparison of Ribera’s signatures on paintings to autograph

---


documents presents some problems. First, few autograph letters survive: only five are known. Two are letters to Prince Antonio Ruffo of Scaleta, written from Naples respectively on October 7, 1649 and September 22, 1650 (fig. 77), toward the end of the artist’s life. These, like three later letters written from Naples to the Prior of San Martino, in June and September 1651 were signed in the Spanish fashion “Jusepe” or “Josepe” de Ribera. According to Gabriele Finaldi, the last three, though signed by Ribera, were not actually written by him. In this particular context it is also important to recall that, on January 18, 1627, the painter had his son baptized “Ant.o Simone Gioseppe” (spelled in Italian), and on perhaps, the most vital document of all, his petition to Pope Urban VIII on January 29, 1626, for his appointment as a Knight in the Portuguese Order of Christ, his name is once more written in the Italian manner as “Gioseppe.” Jeanne Chenault Porter remarked that this petition was written in Neapolitan Italian, which is another distinctive feature of Ribera’s letters to Antonio Ruffo. Ribera’s name is frequently spelled in Italian on the corpus of extant official and legal documents both in Rome and Naples, in contradistinction to his signature in which he mainly used the Spanish spelling of his name.

Despite the paucity of documents written by Ribera in his own hand, Ruffo’s letter of 1650 (fig. 77) and the cursive script penned in the lengthy inscription on his Saint Francis Receiving the Privileges of the Order (fig. 78; detail, fig. 79) provide two convincing examples of Ribera’s writing style. The 1650 letter to Antonio Ruffo is written in Italian in a somewhat modified form of cancellaresca script, a style first used by humanists in Venice in the fifteenth

---

61 Finaldi, 1992a, 3-8.
century and subsequently adopted by not only administrators in the Habsburg court in the sixteenth century but also by Valencian notaries and officials.\textsuperscript{65} In addition to analyzing Ribera’s handwriting from the extant letter to Antonio Ruffo, one large-scale, religious work dating to the painter’s mid-career contains a long inscription, which I would claim, was written by Ribera himself. In his \textit{Saint Francis Receiving the Privileges of the Order} (fig. 78), an angel appears to Saint Francis and holds a scroll that unfurls to reveal the by-laws of the Order to him. The text mixes the usage of Latin and Italian (not Spanish) and is beautifully and painstakingly written using the \textit{cancellaresca} that was favored by both Italian and Spanish humanists (detail, fig. 79). Although it is difficult to assess any remarkable disparities or changes in Ribera’s handwriting throughout the course of his career, based on my comparison of the handwriting of the extant letter to the signatures and inscriptions in his paintings, it is apparent that Ribera’s handwriting style and signature are consistent.

Ribera changed the language of his signatures from to Latin to Spanish, starting in the late 1620s and early 1630s. The shift from Latin to Spanish is probably owed to changes in patronage and the patterns in collecting his art. In Rome, Ribera relied on the patronage of some Spanish patrons such as Pedro Cussida but mainly on Italian patrons and collectors such as the Giustiniani, and Cardinals del Monte and Borghese among others. Once Ribera settled in Naples, he worked as the de-facto court painter to the Spanish viceroys of the city and produced at least fifty-four works that were exported and installed in the Spanish royal collections in Madrid and its environs. These many canvases were hung in prominent halls and galleries at the Escorial, the Alcazár, and the Buen Retiro. Therefore, the shift to Spanish as the predominant language for his signature and the corresponding change in his letter style underscore Ribera’s life-long efforts to

\textsuperscript{64} Chenault, 1976, 305-7.
identify himself as a Spanish painter who wished to cultivate relations with Spanish royal and aristocratic patrons, both in Naples and in Iberia.

**Ribera’s Placement of His Signature**

The various combinations of Ribera’s signatures and his regular placement of them prominently in the foreground of his paintings indicate the importance he put into his signature and his “conscientious strategizing” of the role his painted name could play in enhancing a work’s meaning or in establishing his identity. Furthermore, when one considers Ribera’s individual signatures more carefully and evaluates how their chosen forms correspond to what one knows about Ribera at specific moments in his career, it seems far more likely that he knowingly took advantage of his signature and its presentation not only to identify himself as the painting’s maker, but to direct his audience toward an understanding of his abilities.

*Devices Used for Placement of Signature: Boulder*

In order to make his authorship of a work readily recognizable to his patrons and collectors or viewers, Ribera frequently placed his signature on a boulder or stone in the lower right corner of the composition in both his paintings and prints. For example, in the Naples *Apollo and Marsyas* (fig. 80), the stone inscribed with the signature is placed in the lower right corner of the foreground. Although the literature on Ribera’s paintings has generally recognized that Ribera used this convention consistently, the sources for and reasons why Ribera placed a boulder or stone remain to be addressed more fully.

---

66 Here I am borrowing a phrase from Mann, 77.
68 For example, Damian Dombrowski has recently written about the interconnected issues of style and artistic identity. While he observes that Ribera uses the element of a boulder in Apollo and Marysas to “bear” his name, Dombrowski does not suggest an argument for why Ribera placed the signature so prominently in the foreground nor does he relate the inscription to a formulation of Ribera’s artistic identity. See idem, “Die Häutung des Malers : Stil und Identität in Jusepe de Riberas *Schindung des Marsyas,*” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 72 (2009): 215-246.
Ribera’s presentation of his signature on a boulder or stone block, I propose, is shaped by the signing practices of Albrecht Dürer. The German master used the device of the stone for his signatures most frequently in the *Small Woodcut Passion* (begun in 1508 or 1509, completed in 1510, and published in 1511) (fig. 81) and in his engraving of *Saint Christopher Facing Right* (1521) (fig. 82). As a young artist training in Valencia, Ribera would have surely known of these prints by Dürer. As we have seen in chapter two, Ribera’s etching of *The Poet* (fig. 14) demonstrated his familiarity with the German master’s famed engraving *Melencolia I* (fig. 16). Dürer’s prints were highly regarded by royal and aristocratic collectors in Spain. Moreover, as Benito Navarrete Prieto has shown, Dürer’s designs exerted extraordinary influence on Spanish sixteenth- and seventeenth-century painters who frequently copied his designs in their large-scale, religious works, including Ribera’s extraordinary depiction of *The Holy Trinity* (fig. 17).

As has been suggested in recent research on Dürer, the inclusion of the boulder in the German artist’s prints might be related to the haptic qualities associated with art that involve both a sensory and intellectual response from the viewer. Like Dürer, Ribera’s placement of his signature on a boulder that is prominently in the lower right corner might reflect the painter’s concern with actively engaging the viewer, and, thereby, relying on another important function of signatures: to elicit a response from the patrons or owners of his paintings.

---

69 For Dürer’s presence in Spain, see Pilar Silva Maroto, “En torno a las relaciones entre Durero y España,” in *El siglo de Durero: problemas historiográficos* / Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, ed. Mar Borobia (Madrid: Thyssen-Bornemisza, 2008), 181-209.


71 Benito Navarrete Prieto has extensively studied the impact Dürer’s engravings had on Spanish Golden Age painters in his study *La pintura andaluza del siglo XVII y sus fuentes grabadas* (Madrid: Fundación de Apoyo a la Historia del Arte Hispánico 1998).

72 Shira Brisman, “A Touching Compassion: Dürer’s Haptic Theology,” College Art Association 95th Annual Conference, New York City, February 14-17, 2007; Philipp P. Fehl, “Dürer’s literal presence in his pictures: reflections on his signatures in the Small Woodcut Passion,” in *Der Künstler über sich in seinem*
Case Studies of Autograph Signatures on Paintings

General

Ribera used his signature most frequently in Naples, his inscriptions serving a “proactive role in shaping [his] reputation and fame.” This section will examine how the signatures in a select group of paintings such as the Drunken Silenus (fig. 83), The Bearded Woman (Magdalena Ventura and Her Husband) (fig. 9), Apollo and Marysas (fig. 80), Philosopher (fig. 48), Astronomer (fig. 89), Vision of Belshazzar (fig. 91), and The Club-Footed Boy (fig. 93) play on different forms of authorship. Thematic issues have guided the order of discussion.

Drunken Silenus

Possibly painted for Giovanni Francesco Salernitano, the Baron of Frosolone, and owned by both the Neapolitan painter, dealer, and restorer Giacomo de Castro and the Flemish merchant Gaspar Roomer, The Drunken Silenus (1626, Naples, Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte, fig. 83) features one of Ribera’s most notable signatures. It is dated and signed on the cartellino in the lower left of the picture: Josephus de Ribera, Hispanus, Valentin / et academicus Romanus faciebat / partenope 1626. A snake is shown in the act of viciously tearing a sheet of paper bearing the artist’s name in half (detail, fig. 84). The serpent can refer to death, to envy, to fame and prudence, or wisdom according to Cesare Ripa’s Iconologia.

Unlike his Spanish contemporaries such as Francisco de Zurbarán who used cartellini consistently, Ribera rarely employed them, only twice in The Drunken Silenus and The Communion of the Apostles. Signatures incorporating animals also infrequently appear in his work. Signatures in which a snake or other reptile is shown biting or tearing a sheet of paper have


73 Phrase borrowed from Mann, 96.

precedents in Venetian Renaissance paintings (for example, in Carpaccio’s *Death of Saint Jerome* [fig. 85]). El Greco too represents the motif of the snake holding a cartellino in its mouth in his *The Martyrdom of Saint Maurice and the Theban Legion* (fig. 86).76

Ribera received the knighthood of the Order of Christ in 1626 but does not mention it in the cartellino. The only painting in which Ribera mentions his knighthood is his portrait of *Magdalena Ventura* (fig. 9). He does not use the Latin term *eques* to refer to his status as a knight as did his Neapolitan contemporary Massimo Stanzione in his signatures. As Gabriele Finaldi has noted, while Ribera conferred great importance to his status as a member of the Roman Academy, he might not have valued his membership into this order as much and perhaps aspired toward a more ambitious goal: to become a knight of the elite Order of Santiago.77

The striking format of the cartellino in *The Drunken Silenus* might not only signpost Ribera’s ambitions as a painter but also could reflect the patron’s taste for such a learned signature. The painting was owned by Giacomo de Castro who was an artist “whose career combined painting, restoration, and art dealing.”78 In the 1650s and 1660s, De Castro commanded very high prices for works sold at market. In 1653, Gaspar Roomer, the best known and most influential Flemish collector of Neapolitan art, paid him 550 ducats “for many paintings sold and consigned to his satisfaction among them a big Bacchus measuring seven and nine palmi (approximately 237 by 184 cm) made by the hand of the late Gioseppe de Ribera the Spaniard.”79

---

75 The cartellino appears in Ribera’s *Drunken Silenus* and *The Communion of the Apostles*, Naples, Choir of the Certosa di San Martino, 400 x 400, [signed: Joseph de Ribera Hispanus Va / lentinus Accademicus romanus español F. 1651] (Spinosa A331, 2006, p. 378)
76 Ribera might have known of El Greco’s painting by means of his encounter with Tristan. For the humanist theme of the serpent in El Greco’s art and what implications, by extension, it has for Ribera’s signature, see José Rogelio Buendía, “Humanismo y simbología en El Greco: el tema de la serpiente.” In *El Greco: Italy and Spain*, eds. Jonathan Brown and José Manuel Pita Andrade (Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art, 1984), 35-46.
79 “Per tanti quadri venduti e consignati a tutta sua soddisfazione et fra essi un bacco grande de nove et sette palmi (approximately 237 by 184 cm) fatto a mano del quondam Gioseppe Rebeira spagnolo.” Marshall,
The “big Bacchus” has been identified as Ribera’s *Drunken Silenus* since its measurements closely correspond to those mentioned in the document. Christopher Marshall has noted that De Castro acquired the painting from Salernitano who might have commissioned the painting.

Marshall has observed that five years before De Castro sold the painting to Roomer, a painting by Ribera with a similar title and high value appeared in an inventory drawn up by De Castro of Salernitano’s collection. It was the second most expensive painting in the collection, worth 150 ducats. Salernitano’s ownership of the painting can thus explain the elaborate treatment of the *cartellino*. Salernitano himself owned a large library of books devoted to history, literature and artistic theory; he also was friends with important Neapolitan poets and writers. He cultivated relationships with some of the leading painters of the day. He was the godfather to Giacomo Recco’s son, Giuseppe Recco, who was subsequently an important still-life painter. Given his erudition and interest in the visual arts, it is very likely that he commissioned the *Drunken Silenus* directly from Ribera and for some unknown reason (perhaps due to the economic instability which followed the revolt of Masaniello) sold it to De Castro.80

The choice of the verb *faciebat* not only appears in this work but also in at least seven other pictures by Ribera.81 Ribera’s declaration of authorship using the imperfect tense, especially in the *Drunken Silenus* echoes Michelangelo’s famed signature in the *Pietà*,82 and by extension, the most famous painter of antiquity, Apelles.83 Therefore, Ribera refers to this classical *topos*, by extension, to fashion himself as the leading painter of Naples. There is one curious omission in

---

81 See no. 33 of this chapter.
83 Pliny the Elder writes: “I should like to be accepted on the lines of those founders of painting and sculpture, who, as you will fill in these volumes, used to inscribe their finished works, even the masterpieces which we cannot tire of admiring with a provisional title such as Apelles *faciebat* or Polyclus [faciebat], as though art was always a thing in process and not completed, so that when faced by the vagaries of criticism the artist might have left him a line of retreat to indulgence, by implying that he intended, if not interrupted, to correct any defect noted.” Preface to the *Natural History*, Loeb Classical Library.
the signature of *The Drunken Silenus*: a reference to Ribera’s knighthood. Ribera was admitted in to the Order of Christ in a ceremony held in St. Peter’s on January 29, 1626 but does not mention it in the cartellino. The only painting in which Ribera mentions his knighthood is his portrait of *Magdalena Ventura* (1631, Palacio Lerma, Fundación Casa Ducal de Medinaceli, Toledo). He never uses the Latin term *eques* to refer to his status as a knight as did his Neapolitan contemporary Massimo Stanzione who often referred himself with that title in his signatures. As Gabriele Finaldi has noted, while Ribera conferred great importance to his status as a member of the Roman Academy, he might not have valued his membership into this Italian order as much and perhaps aspired toward a more ambitious goal: to become a knight of the elite Order of Santiago.84

However, in the reproductive etching of the *Drunken Silenus* (fig. 87), Ribera changed the position and format of the signature. The striking composition of the snake tearing the *cartellino* found in the painting is replaced in the etching with a rectangular, stone block or boulder with the following inscription: Joseph á Ribera Hisp* Valent./Setaben. f. Partenope/1628. Antonio Palomino, the eighteenth-century biographer, identified some of the hallmarks of Ribera’s signatures in his mid-career works:

Ribera was a member of the Roman academy, which is attested to (as well as his birthplace) […] And in the print of Bacchus, an etching done by the hand of the Spagnoletto, there is the following signature on a stone: *Ioseph. a Ribera Hisp. Valent. Setabens. F. Partenope. an 1628.*85

Palomino refers here to the etching of the *Drunken Silenus* made after the painting of 1626 rather than to a print of Bacchus.

---

Ribera modifies the signature in the print because Ribera was concerned with clear recognition of his name, hence the greater ability to market his printed oeuvre. In the print, Ribera revised the composition, altering the center section and the signature for clarity. The change in the format of the signature from the painting to the print reflects two major concerns: firstly with Ribera’s concern with self-promotion and secondly with Ribera’s attitudes toward printmaking as an art. Ribera possibly modified the signature in the print because Ribera was concerned with clear recognition of his name, hence the greater ability to market his printed oeuvre. In fact, the Drunken Silenus was Ribera’s most commercially successful print.

The stone or boulder as a compositional element of Ribera’s signature as discussed above might allude to the convention of the block employed by Dürer in his woodcuts and engravings. Although the signature signals Ribera’s reflection on the practice of printmaking, he also might have been attempting to increase the market value of his prints by means of the inclusion of a signature that is readily recognizable and that also draws upon the precedent of Dürer.

The signature coupled with the horizontal format of the composition in both the painting and the print suggests Ribera’s engagement with the paragone (in this instance, the debate as to the relative merits between painting and sculpture). While Ribera employs a horizontal, frieze-like composition that is comparable to Hellenistic reliefs of the same subject, there is an overall emphasis on tactility and texture evinced in the presentation of Silenus’ smooth, rounded belly and Pan’s bristly fur. These effects still privilege some of the sensual aspects of the original

---

86 As Jonathan Brown notes, “The relationship between paintings and prints lends some weight to the idea that Ribera took up etching because he wanted his art to be known far and wide” (1989, 36).
87 Ibid.
88 Andrea Bayer, “Drunken Silenus,” cat. no. 84, 186, in Pérez Sánchez and Spinosa, 1992. There are three extant states of this print. The first state dates to 1628. The two later editions of the print bear inscriptions by two Roman publishers, Giovanni Orlandi and Giovanni Rossi, the second of which is dated 1649. According to Bayer, the plate was purchased by the Calcografia Nazionale in Rome in 1738, and a modern impression was taken in 1933-34. For further description of the quality of three states, see Brown, 1989, no. 14, 82-83, 105.
painting. While the verb *faciebat* in the painting suggests that the creative process is an ongoing one, the letter *f* in the etching suggests the past tense of the verb, *fecit*. The change in verb tense from the painting to the etching thereby signals the ultimate transformation of the painting’s subject into the medium of print.

I also contend that Ribera’s *Drunken Silenus* both in paint and print gives us a sense of the painter’s theoretical concerns. In writing about Rubens’ celebrated *Drunken Silenus* (1616–17, oil on wood, Alte Pinakothek, Munich) (fig. 88), Pamela Smith notes that the central placement of the rotund Silenus in the composition points to “the body as the source of his creativity.” She further adds that, “Silenus, who had been rendered impotent by drink, instead poured his creative powers into song and poetry.” Like Rubens, Ribera emphasizes Silenus’ expansive belly, which is bloated with the wine which Pan seems to pour endlessly from his wine sack. Ribera’s Silenus’ open mouth does not merely suggest his drunkenness but that he is perhaps about to break into verse or song. It is thus possible to understand Ribera’s painting as an attempt to reconcile erudite concerns such as his understanding of classical texts with practical ones such his understanding of the art market and art production.

In addition to the claims Ribera makes about art making in the inscriptions on the related print and painting of *The Drunken Silenus*, Ribera presents himself not only just as a Spaniard, foremost as a citizen of Valencia, and denizen of Játiva, but also as a resident of Naples. He includes the word *Partenope* in the inscription to refer to himself as a Neapolitan. *Partenope* is the ancient name for Naples. The term refers to the siren who loved Odysseus in Homer’s *Odyssey*. The city was later renamed Neapolis, or, New City, hence the modern name Naples.

---

91 The etched version of *The Drunken Silenus* also omits an important symbol, that is the tortoise that appears in the foreground of the painting. Jonathan Brown has noted that the removal of the element, which symbolizes prudent, moral behavior, was meant to reinforce the explicitly sensual theme of the etching (1989, 36).
93 Ibid.
The inclusion of *Partenope* is significant in Ribera’s formulation of his identity in his signature because the painter is referring to himself as a Neapolitan, or at least, as a resident of the city, for the first time in his oeuvre — a reference which he included in at least five paintings thereafter.\(^9^5\)

Although Ribera was foreign-born, he did meet two qualifications for Neapolitan citizenship for foreigners or residents that were based on a royal decree of 1479: 1) he married a Neapolitan woman, Catalina Azzolino, the daughter of his mentor Gian Bernardino Azzolino, and 2) he had purchased a house, which was located on the Strada di Santo Spirito in 1619.\(^9^6\) As Craig Felton has recently noted, the inclusion of *Partenope* was possibly “a mark of distinction and association with the ruling power.” Ribera was able to use the designation *Partenope* as a marketing device to designate himself as the leading painter of the Spanish viceroys, who were the ruling elite of Naples.\(^9^7\)

Thus, the signatures in the etching and painting of *The Drunken Silenus* serve as bold statements about Ribera’s artistic process, as testaments to his superb technical abilities as a painter and printmaker and, to a large extent, his innovative formulation of mythological and classical subject matter. The signatures in these two works also help us reflect on Ribera’s life-long status as an expatriate Spanish painter who was able to assimilate and navigate the complex, and, oftentimes, competitive artistic milieu of Golden Age Naples.

**The Bearded Woman (Magdalena Ventura and Her Husband)**

Ribera’s striking *The Bearded Woman (Magdalena Ventura and Her Husband)* (fig. 9) contains one of the most complex signatures in Ribera’s oeuvre and, by extension, seventeenth-century painting. The extraordinary inscription in the *Magdalena Ventura* as it relates to Ribera’s

\(^{95}\) See Appendix I, nos. 9, 10, 11, 32, and 36.


art theory has been thoroughly discussed by James Clifton. I will build on Clifton’s interpretation of the painting’s signature by further discussing it as a projection of Ribera’s artistic identity and an indicator of his status as court painter to the Duke of Alcalá, who served as the Spanish viceroy of Naples from 1629 to 1631.

A unicum in Ribera’s career, this full-length portrait represents Magdalena Ventura, a woman from Abruzzo, who became famous at the viceregal court due to her hirsutism, a female hormonal disorder that causes excessive hair growth. According to the inscription, Magdelena developed this illness at the age of thirty seven. Ribera represents her at age fifty-two. She is shown holding a baby who she could not have possibly given birth at such an advanced maternal age. The child she nurses is present “as a paradoxical attribute of both her femininity and her maternity.” Her husband Felice De Amici sheepishly stands behind her to the viewer’s left. Ribera depicts with the woman with a distinctly unidealized, masculine face: she has a lush, black beard and a wrinkled, masculine face that is expertly modeled by Ribera. Aspects of her female sex are indicated by her costume. She wears a long dress, a cap, and a wedding ring. Symbols of her household duties such as knitting are indicated by the wool and skein on a metal spindle atop the stone plinth to the right.

There are two Latin inscriptions in the painting that identify this unusual woman. The first inscription appears at the top of the painting and reads: “DE FOEMINIS ITALIAM QUE GERENS MI[?R]ANDA FIGURA ET PUERUM LACTANS / OCULIS MIRABILE MONSTRUM” (“An Italian woman of wondrous appearance suckling a child / An astounding monster for eyes to see.”). The second inscription is engraved on the tall stele or plinth that is

98 Clifton, 1995.
100 Ibid.
visible to the viewer’s right. The lengthy Latin text introduces the woman as a marvel or “wonder of nature”:

A Great Wonder of Nature Maddalena Ventura from the town of Accúmoli of the Samnites, in the vernacular Abruzzo, in the Kingdom of Naples, aged 52. And what is remarkable is that at 37 she began to become hirsute and grew a beard so thick and long that it is more like that which may be seen on any bearded man than on a woman who has previously borne three children, as she had from her husband, Felice de Amici, whom you see here.

Jusepe de Ribera, Spaniard, decorated with [the order of] the Cross of Christ, another Apelles in his time, painted this from life, for Ferdinando II, third Duke of Alcalá, Viceroy of Naples, on the 16th of February in the year 1631. The painting’s complex inscription makes two important references to the artist himself. First and foremost, Ribera mentions his Italian knighthood in his signature for the first and only time in his career. As discussed in chapter one, the Duke of Alcalá’s intervention was probably instrumental in Ribera’s procurement of this title. Ribera here also refers to himself as Apelles, the court painter par excellence of Greek antiquity. The inclusion of the term Apelles also indicates the close ties he had with his patron, the Duke of Alcalá. The epithet, moreover, implies that the Duke is also the new Alexander the Great of his age. The classical reference and Latin wording of the inscription were certainly owed to the Duke, who was renowned for his erudition.

The prominent placement of such a lengthy inscription not only also shows that Ribera, but also his patron, the Duke of Alcalá, understood the value of the signature as a form of scientific documentation. Alfonso Peréz Sánchez has keenly observed that “the artist’s genius

---


has transformed an abnormal, almost repugnant medical case into a superb work of art.”
The painting’s extraordinary naturalism, coupled with the lengthy inscription, attests to the patron’s scientific interests. The reference to Ribera as Apelles is not coincidental as Apelles was also renowned for his scientific studies. Ribera’s skilled realism serves to provide a compelling record of this unusual woman at the behest of the patron. The Duke of Alcalá was not only an avid art patron but also was a collector of scientific and mathematical instruments as revealed in the published inventory of the Casa de Pilatos, the home he owned in Seville, and the list of another collection that was sold in Genoa in 1637 at the time of his death. Before his collection was sold and dispersed, the Duke had assembled a veritable Kunstkammer or cabinet of curiosity of sorts where he not only “kept” The Bearded Woman but also “several portraits of dwarves and giants, and paintings of other phenomena of nature such a three-horned bull.”

Thus, the functions of this signature are manifold in this extraordinary painting. The lengthy inscription refers to Ribera both as a knight and as the painter par excellence of the viceregal court in its explicit reference to Apelles. Alcalá’s praise of Ribera’s talents also indicates that patrons like him were instrumental in fashioning the identity of their court painters. Ultimately the signature in the painting not only illustrates the Duke’s scientific interests but also inscribes his fame and that of his court painter Ribera respectively as the new Alexander and Apelles of their age.

Apollo and Marsyas

Signatures frequently appear as important foreground elements in Ribera’s paintings, such as The Bearded Woman (fig. 9), and, in particular, works with mythological subjects such as

---

104 I thank Dr. Sarah Blake McHam for bringing this aspect of Ribera’s signature to my attention. See Felton and Jordan, 1982, cat. no. 11, 129.
106 Ibid.
107 I also wish to thank Dr. Tod Marder for bringing this important point to my attention.
108 For the “documentary character” of the signature, see Pérez Sánchez, 1992, cat. 25, 93.
The Drunken Silenus and other canvases such as Apollo and Marsyas. He often depicted the theme of Apollo and Marsyas: two large-scale canvases (Musées Royaux des Beaux-arts, Brussels and Museo e Galleria Nazionali di San Martino, Naples, fig. 80) and six drawings are known. The Brussels version is signed and dated at the lower right “Jusepe de Ribera español F. 1637” and the Naples version “Jusepe de Ribera, espanol valenciano, f. 1637” on a boulder on the ground to lower right. Other painted versions of the same subject are presently untraced. One was praised by Capaccio earlier in 1630 and another was said to have been in Gasper Roomer’s collection in the seventeenth century.

The oft-repeated theme of Marsyas reflects Ribera’s concern with the two notions associated with the artistic process: competition and rivalry. In the Naples Apollo and Marsyas, Ribera’s treatment of the theme focuses on the dramatic moment in the Ovidian narrative when the satyr Marsyas having dared to challenge the god Apollo to a contest of musical skill loses and is punished for his hubris. Apollo has tied Marsyas upside down on the ground, the satyr’s mouth gaping in a soundless scream. The god of music has just begun to skin his hairy leg, and is reaching into the pink, deep wound with a look of calm. The action of the painting is placed close in the foreground and in proximity to the signature. The boulder in the lower right corner helps to draw the viewer’s attention from the agonizing Marsyas’ scream to the satyr-like witnesses in the background who are horrified by Apollo’s cruelty.

---

111 Ovid, Metamorphoses, 6, 382-400.
Philosopher

In various instances, Ribera signed his name on the spines of books and pages, suggesting the conceit or metaphor that just as an author pens a book, Ribera is the author of a painting. In Ribera’s depiction of *A Philosopher* (also identified as *Aristotle*, Indianapolis Museum of Art, 1637 [fig. 48; detail of the signature, 49]), the figure supports a heavy tome in his right hand and holds geometric drawings with his left hand. The deep, meditative expression of the philosopher as he looks at his papers, pens and implements suggests he is fully absorbed in “science, mathematics, and the order of things.” Yet Ribera arranges the papers in such a way that they not only reveal the philosopher’s geometric drawings but also emphasize the prominence of the signature in the foreground. The position of the philosopher’s hand also draws attention to the sheet of paper in the foreground that bears Ribera’s name. The placement of the painter’s signature near these geometric drawings not only boldly proclaims Ribera’s authorship of the picture but also suggests that the act of painting involves the close scrutiny and study of natural phenomenon that similarly inform the principles of science and philosophy.

Astronomer

Like Ribera’s *Philosopher*, *The Astronomer* (fig. 89) shows the interrelated importance of glance and gesture, the fusion of observation and touch, of sight and insight. The astronomer is shown with a compass in hand and looks up to his left – indicating he is about to record one of his astral observations. Ribera situates his name on the stand to the left of the astronomer, directing the viewer’s gaze away from the astronomer’s eyes to the globe, and finally to the signature emerging from the dark ground of the tablet – painted in quick, flickering strokes using a lighter color (detail, fig. 90). The inscription, coupled with the painting’s subject, affords us with a compelling image that privileges the sense of sight. 

112 Felton and Jordan, 1982, 147.
113 The line of interpretation partly follows John Wilmdering’s presentation of Johannes Vermeer’s *The Astronomer* in *Signs of the Artist: Signatures and Self-Expression* (New Haven and London: Yale
Vision of Belshazzar

A signature that illuminates Ribera’s visionary, religious imagery is his unusual representation of the *Vision of Belshazzar* (fig. 91) signed and dated “Jusepe de Ribera español / F 1635.” The subject derives from the story of Belshazzar’s Feast as told in the Book of Daniel, 5:1-31. In this Biblical story, Belshazzar (or Baltasar), the king of the Chaldeans and son of Nebuchadnezzar, holds a banquet in which he used sacred golden and silver vessels that his father had taken out of the Temple of Jerusalem for pouring and drinking wine as part of the celebration. A hand mysteriously appeared and pointed to words written on the wall in Hebraic script:

“MENE, MENE, TEKEL, PARSIN.” This cryptic phrase has been transliterated as: “MENE, God has numbered the days of your kingdom and brought it to an end; TEKEL you have been weighed on the scales and found wanting; PARSIN, your kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and the Persians.”\(^\text{114}\) The prophet Daniel was summoned to interpret the meaning of the words on the wall and predicted that Belshazzar’s reign would soon end by God’s will. During the night, Belshazzar was assassinated by Darius, the Median king, who seized his kingdom.

Although the theme of the painting is unusual in Neapolitan and Spanish Golden Age painting, the subject does appear in Dutch seventeenth-century painting. It was famously represented by Rembrandt in his *Belshazzar’s Feast* (1636-38, oil on canvas, The National Gallery, London, fig. 92). Spanish plays performed at the court in Madrid recounted this tale of a king deposed and assassinated. The same biblical episode was staged in the Palace of the Buen Retiro by Calderón de la Barca in 1634, a year before Ribera produced his painting for the Archbishop’s Palace in Milan.\(^\text{115}\)


In this picture, Ribera avoided the dramatic, narrative approach taken by Rembrandt and instead focuses on a liminal representation of God’s hand that writes the words. The divine hand materializes out of the mist, modeled in sharp, dramatic contrasts of light and shadow to represent the illusion of it suspended in space. Ribera uses pseudo-Hebraic or Aramaic script to illustrate further the prophetic aspects of the story. The signature thus assumes a rhetorical or performative character that underscores Ribera’s ambiguous treatment of the story. Under the word that God’s index finger points to and along a diagonal appears Ribera’s signature, “Jusepe de Ribera español / F 1635.” This insertion of Ribera’s name in close proximity to the religious text reminds the viewer that, while the picture’s message is dramatically presented as a mysterious revelation, the painter is the one who is able to translate it convincingly in visual form. Ultimately it acts as an illusionistic device to generate “a dialectic between engaño (deception) and desengaño (the discovery of the deception).”

The Club-Footed Boy

Ribera’s celebrated canvas of The Club Footed Boy (fig. 93) displays an unusual instance of an earth-bound signature which the painter inscribed directly onto the ground. It is signed and dated at the lower right: “Jusepe de Ribera Español / F. 1642.” Written in the sand, the signature is oriented toward the viewer. Earth-bound signatures have precedent in the art of German and Italian fifteenth- and sixteenth-century artists such as Pisanello (fig. 94), Albrecht Dürer (fig. 95) and Perino del Vaga (fig. 96). The motive or meaning behind the placement of this type of inscription could be understood in different ways for visual and thematic effect. In The Apparition of the Virgin to Saints Anthony Abbot and George, Pisanello inscribed his name on the ground using blades of grass to shape the letters in a novel and unprecedented fashion. In contrast, Dürer engraved the year of facture and his initials on a placard that is placed on the

116 The role of these two concepts is thematized in Spanish seventeenth-century religious literature. As Hansgerd Schulte notes, the word desengaño can have different meanings in the Spanish language depending upon which grammatical form of the word is used: El desengaño: Wort und Thema in der
ground in the lower left and is supported by a dead tree stump topped with a skull as a memento mori. In *The Nativity*, Perino del Vaga signed his name in the lower center on a tablet with an inscription that clearly identifies him as a Florentine artist: .M.D.XXXXIIIII. / .PERINO BONAC / CORSSI.FLORENTIN / OPVS FACEBA[T] (followed by a double monogram combining the letters of PERINO). In comparison, Ribera’s earthbound signature served as an important marker of facture and inventiveness and also as an emblem of Ribera’s “earthbound naturalism,” one that is shaped and informed by his quasi-documentary study of natural phenomenon.

The canvas represents the painter’s interest in restoring a sense of dignity to a deformed boy. The small boy is depicted in a vast, well-illuminated Mediterranean landscape, suggested by the blue sky and low horizon line. The presentation of the boy as a monumental yet unidealized figure who occupies most of the foreground also illustrates Ribera’s interest in science, especially recording people who were afflicted by physical deformities. Denise Marie Pagano has linked Ribera’s careful representation of the boy’s handicap to the influence of Giambattista della Porta’s (1535-1615) scientific writings, which were widespread in Golden Age Naples.\(^\text{117}\)

The allegorical or symbolic meaning of Ribera’s portrayal of this boy derives from the letter that the boy holds along with the crutch in his left hand containing the following Latin inscription: DA MIHI ELIMO SINAM PROPTER AMOREM DEI (Give me alms for the love of God). While the inscription has yielded fruitful interpretations explaining how Ribera’s portrayal of the boy sheds light on the Counter-Reformatory theory that faith coupled with charity aids in the soul’s salvation, instructing the viewer that he or she should give alms to the poor,\(^\text{118}\) the signature in the foreground of the painting has been relatively overlooked by art historians.

Reading the signature as part of the painting’s novel iconography helps to shed further light on

aspects of Ribera’s artistic identity. It is the artist’s hand that aids in transforming the boy’s grave deformity into a superb work of art. Thus, the signature “asserts that pictorial accuracy is based on the skill and knowledge of the individual [artist].”

Furthermore, in closely analyzing the appearance of the signature, one notices that the inscription progressively fades on the earth’s surface, suggesting a sense of transience and temporality that is further enhanced by the landscape setting. While the site Ribera depicts cannot be securely identified, the well-lit background does evoke the Neapolitan countryside. The few surrounding trees are painted using sure but short and economical brushstrokes that gradually blur as they fade into the distance. Thus the temporal and evanescent effects of the landscape are further emphasized by the blurred effect of the signature.

La Porchetta: A Case of a Problematic Signature and Attribution

While signed, autograph works help to inform ideas about Ribera’s artistic identity and social status, controversial attributions to Ribera have been based on signatures. A depiction of a female piglet (La Porchetta [fig. 97]) is a work that art historian Ronald Cohen has attributed to the painter based on its signature that reads: GIOS.R. The painting has been claimed to be Ribera’s copy of a work by Caravaggio — one that was formerly in the collection of the seventh Marqués del Carpio. Art historian Ronald Cohen derives his explanation of how Ribera emulated Caravaggio’s style from De Dominici’s biography of the Spanish master:

After returning from Parma and Modena, Ribera abandoned the Correggesque manner, and returned to his earlier studies, dedicating himself to forceful, naturalistic painting, which one might reasonably say, in some ways surpassed Caravaggio himself. He repeated copies of works by Caravaggio which he possessed, correcting inherent

120 Cohen, 29. As Cohen notes, the painting is described in the 1626 inventory of Don Gaspar de Haro y Guzman as “a dead piglet, opened at the side, of which one sees the innards.” [Una porcetta morta aperta per fianco, che si vede l’interiora].”
weaknesses, with superior draftsmanship and color, thus to demonstrate, to the masters of his craft, his superiority, as a naturalist painter, in the details as in the whole. 121

The signature GIOS. R on the Porchetta had led art historians to believe that either Giuseppe Recco or Giuseppe Ruoppolo, Neapolitan painters specializing in the genre of still-life, was the author of this work. Rejecting an attribution to these artists on stylistic grounds, Cohen instead attributed the painting to Ribera based on the signature, style of the work, and De Dominici’s biographies of Recco, Ruoppolo and Ribera.

La Porchetta is signed GIOS. R, a signature, which, with its Italianate signature of the syllable of the painter’s first name (commencing with ‘Gi” rather than with ‘J’), relates closely to other signatures on such drawings as a Saint Peter inscribed Gio Ra; the Figure Waving a Stick signed Gio Riba; the Saint Sebastian, inscribed Giuseppe de; and the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew signed Giuseppe Ribera l’anno 1649. In his study of Ribera’s drawings, Walter Vitzthum has argued that the Italianate signatures on these drawings are authentic. De Dominici’s aforementioned remarks, confirmed by notarial documents, do support Cohen’s conclusion that such an Italianate spelling of Ribera’s signature might not be entirely unusual. The foreign painters who italianized their names while in Italy are too numerous to list herein but, given that Ribera spent most of his life there, it would be probably strange if he had never done so, as Cohen rightly observes. 122 However, I concur with Jonathan Brown who has aptly reasoned that these signatures (because they were in Italian) may have been added to the drawings by a different though contemporary hand. 123

121 De Dominici, 1742-5 (1979), III, 3-4; translated by Cohen, 29.
122 Cohen, 26.
123 A number of false signatures appear on Ribera’s drawings. For example, Jonathan Brown doubts the signature and date in Ribera’s Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew (Morgan Library) on “orthographic grounds.” He argues that Ribera always spelled his surname as “Jusepe” (except in Latin signatures when it was written as “Joseph”), never as “Giuseppe” as it appears in the Morgan drawing. Brown, 1973, cat. 35, 176. The signature on Ribera’s An Oriental Potentate Accompanied by a Halberd Bearer (ca. 1625-30, Point of the brush with carmine red ink, possibly cochineal, squared in pen and brown ink, 9 1/16 x 5 5/16 in., Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum) has been thought to be autograph. The inscription on this drawing is a false one as the script of the signature does not correspond to Ribera’s actual handwriting as it
Overall, Cohen provides useful insights about Ribera’s signing practices, although he unconvincingly insists that *La Porchetta* is a work by Ribera. He argues that that the abbreviate signatures may be easily confused and discards the attribution to Giuseppe Recco on stylistic grounds. However, I do reject Cohen’s attribution of the painting to Ribera on the grounds that the painter did not paint independent still lifes.

**Signatures on Drawings**

*Introduction*

Ribera signed his paintings consistently but did so occasionally on some of his drawings. I will consider how signatures in drawings are markers of the design and approval process, and how Ribera might have conceived of the function of his signature differently in painting and drawing respectively.

Ribera’s signature appears on eight out of 160 autograph drawings. While the painter’s development as a draftsman is currently much better understood by art historians, very little is still known about his “beginnings as a draftsman.” Ribera’s formidable reputation as a draughtsman was attested to by Filippo Baldinucci who erroneously claimed that, “Because Ribera drew so well he was made head of the Accademia [The Academy of Saint Luke, Rome].” However, very few drawings have been dated to the 1620s, when Ribera was already established in Naples and producing mature works.

Five drawings that I believe contain autograph signatures include: *Archangel Michael* (Cordoba, Museum of Fine Arts, red chalk on beige paper, 225 x 183 mm, fig. 98); *Saint Irene* (Oxford, Christ Church, red and white chalk, 311 x 207 mm, fig. 99); *Saint Albert* (London, The appear on other drawings, paintings, and prints. Ribera probably also did not typically square drawings for transfer himself. The inscription and the squaring were probably added later by another artist: http://www.getty.edu/art/gettyguide/artObjectDetails?artobj=363.
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124 See Appendix I.
British Museum, red chalk on white paper, 232 x 207 mm, fig. 100); *Man Bound to a Stake* (San Francisco, Achenbach Foundation for Graphic Arts, pen and brown wash, 216 x 163 mm, fig. 101); and *The Crucifixion of Saint Peter* (New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, pen and red ink on beige paper, 185 x 213 mm, fig. 102). While the practice of signing drawings in the seventeenth century to ensure authenticity is not entirely unusual, signatures in Ribera’s drawings are idiosyncratic firstly because they appear rather prominently in either large cursive or Roman block lettering in the lower left or right corner of the sheet and secondly while many of the drawings might be for the purpose of presentation, they cannot be linked or securely connected to a specific painting.

Ribera’s signatures on drawings can tell us a good deal about his design process. Drawing played an important role in his artistic life; he created designs in a variety of media including chalk, pen and ink, and wash. Fairly typical of the seventeenth century, the artist’s practice of drawing has been defined in three ways: as preparatory drawings for his paintings and prints; as pensieri that allow him to create variations on themes he already painted or etched; and as independent designs that illustrate a variety of themes that rarely appear if ever in his finished works.

As Manuela Mena Marqués has noted, the signatures on Ribera’s drawings are much larger than those found on those by other Italian artists of the seventeenth century and usually

---

127 Ibid.
129 Among the seventeenth-century European painters who most frequently signed their drawings to establish the authenticity and originality of their designs are the French painter Claude Lorrain, who was working in Rome during the early decades of the Seicento, and Bartolome Esteban Murillo, Seville’s leading painter and draughtsman in the late seventeenth century. In order to guarantee the originality of his compositions, Claude signed many of the sheets that comprise the *Liber Veritatis* (1630s). For a succinct discussion of these drawings, Patrizia Cavazzini, “Claude’s Apprenticeship in Rome: The Market for Copies and the Invention of the Liber Veritatis,” *Konsthistorisk Tidsskrift* 73 (2004): 133-46. Murillo signed at least two thirds of his drawings with either his name or initials. Jonathan Brown has carefully studied the orthography and placement of Murillo’s inscriptions: *Murillo & His Drawings* exh. cat. (Princeton, N.J.: The Art Museum, Princeton University, 1976), 49-54.
include “español” indicating his Spanish nationality.\footnote{Manuela B. Mena Marqués, “Drawing in the Art of Ribera,” in Ribera 1591-1652, eds. Alfonso E. Pérez Sanchez and Nicola Spinosa (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 197.} This practice is rather unusual since the practical nature of preparatory drawings do not necessitate a signature. Marqués acknowledges that: “It is odd that the more finished drawings or the drawings of known compositions are generally not the ones that bear his signature, for it would seem only normal to sign a presentation drawing.”\footnote{Ibid.} In fact, Ribera did produce refined presentation drawings which are signed and dated such as the \textit{Saint Albert} (fig. 100) for which no finished painting can be traced. The inscription “Spagnoletto” on many of Ribera’s drawings is inauthentic. Recent scholarship has noted that most likely these inscriptions were added by contemporary collectors who owned the respective drawings.\footnote{This practice has been recently discussed by Lisa A. Banner in her article: “Francisco de Solis: A Seventeenth-Century Artist-Collector in Madrid,” \textit{Master Drawings} 45 (Autumn 2007): 359-366.} This line of interpretation is also supported by the fact that Ribera never signed his works using the nickname “Spagnoletto.” Signatures on drawings, in some instances, serve only as markers of authorship not necessarily authenticity. The signed drawings appear throughout the artist’s entire production and not during one specific period of the artist’s career. Nonetheless, the prominent presence of the signature on eight of his drawings, four of which will be studied herein, sheds light on the possible functions of these sheets.

**Ribera’s \textit{Saint Irene}**

Ribera's \textit{Saint Irene} (fig. 99) is signed with the Latin version of his name in the lower left corner: “Joseph a Ribera Hisp. s.f.” The subject of \textit{Saint Irene} is connected with one of Ribera's favorite themes, \textit{The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian}, which he illustrated on paper and in paint many times. In the drawing, \textit{Saint Irene} appears as an elderly woman holding the symbolic arrow, the weapon used to inflict Sebastian's many wounds. The drawing is a highly finished chalk study of the saint, in which Ribera uses subtle shading, in particular, the crisscross patterning of the dress to convey texture.
The function of the drawing and its related signature remains uncertain. Manuela Mena Marqués has suggested the drawing might have been conceived of as a preparatory drawing for a painting, but no such image of Saint Irene appears in any of Ribera’s depictions of Saint Sebastian. For the most part, the saint is represented as a youthful woman in Ribera’s canvas rather than the elderly figure shown in the drawing. Byam Shaw has rightly suggested that Ribera might have made the drawing from a model and reworked it to represent the saint. Furthermore, the highly finished quality of the drawing, coupled with the prominent inscription, strongly indicates it was a presentation drawing for a commission that Ribera did not carry out. Thus, the signature on the drawing could correlate to the approval process involved in creating and presenting finished drawings for a commission that, however, was never carried out.

**Ribera’s Saint Albert**

Ribera’s *Saint Albert* (fig.100) is prominently signed and dated in Spanish on a boulder in the lower right corner: “Jusepe de Ribera fe.t. 1626.” It can be related to three other highly finished presentation drawings Ribera made during this period: *Saint Sebastian* (Indiana University Museum); *Samson and Delilah* (Museum of Fine Arts, Cordoba); and the *Man Bound to a Tree* (Louvre, Paris). In the *Saint Albert*, the robust figure of the elderly, bald saint has his arms bound to two trees. His muscular arms and sagging chest muscles are expertly modeled and shaded in chalk. Although he is tied a tree, his legs are more dynamically posed with his left leg raised up on the boulder while his right leg supports his body’s weight.

Like the *Saint Irene*, the function of the drawing is difficult to assess. Manuela Mena Marqués has suggested that it might be a preparatory drawing for an etching, although no print or
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painting by Ribera illustrates such a subject. I would contend that the drawing reflects Ribera's ongoing interest in producing careful anatomical studies.  

Ribera’s Man Bound to a Stake

Like his Saint Albert, Ribera’s Man Bound to a Stake (fig. 101) contains the full spelling of his name on the sheet. The inscription conspicuously appears in the lower left corner: “Jusepe de Ribera español / F.” The drawing depicts a garroting, which is one of Ribera’s most graphic torture scenes. A man is shown bound to a stake at the ankles and the waist, while he slowly asphyxiates to death. Jonathan Brown has suggested that the short strokes at the foot of the post represent the wood pyre that eventually will burn and consume him.

No convincing explanation has been proposed for the function of the drawing. It may be derived from a scene witnessed in reality or may be based on the artist’s imagination. Ribera may have been planning a series on various tortures, perhaps as the basis of prints similar to the two famous series of etchings, the Large Series of War (1633) and the Small Series of War (1636) by Jacques Callot, or he may have been illustrating some work of literature or law. Nonetheless, the large, unmistakable signature in the lower portion of the drawing seems to indicate a public destination for this composition.

Ribera’s Crucifixion of Saint Peter

In some instances, Ribera signed his drawings in various places using a monogram, his initials or his name such as in Crucifixion of Saint Peter (fig. 102). The subject of the drawing is another compositional type favored by Ribera: the martyred saint. Saint Peter is shown crucified
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135 Ribera had a long-standing interest in anatomical studies as demonstrated by the etchings comprising his drawing manual discussed in chapter two.
136 For Ribera’s violent imagery in his drawings, see Gabriele Finaldi, “Jusepe de Ribera: The Iconography of Pain,” in Le dessin napolitain, eds. Francisco Solinas and Sebastian Schütze (Rome: De Luca Editore, 2010), 75-80.
137 Ribera did produce one plate for a book of laws for the Duke of Alcalà discussed in chapter one. It is possible these scenes of tortures could correspond to a planned series that never came to fruition. Ribera’s
upside down, his body depicted in dramatic foreshortening. No known painting by Ribera of this subject exists but there are two other drawings that have the same subject.\textsuperscript{139}

In this exceptional drawing, we can catch a glimpse of Ribera “doodling” as a draftsman. What he focused his attention on was the repeated drawings of his name and initials. Ribera scrawled the paper by marking it with his name and monogram several times. In fact, he scribbled the characteristic looped “J” of his first name at least ten times on the sheet. His monogram JRa appears on the lower right portion of the paper and his name [---]ph de Ribera appears in fragmentary form toward the lower left part of the sheet. The marks on this drawing offer us an intimate glimpse into Ribera’s obsession with his name.

Most recently argued by Jonathan Brown, the varied presentation of Ribera’s name, as seen in this sheet might indicate more broadly that “Ribera devised a distinctive form of signing his pictures to achieve what is now called brand recognition. This tactic created the illusion of authenticity and permitted him to augment his income by selling canvases that were largely, if not entirely, executed by assistants.”\textsuperscript{140}

\textbf{Spanish Precedents for Ribera’s Signatures}

In formulating his signature, Ribera not only considered the signing practices of Northern European and Italian Renaissance artists such as Dürer, Michelangelo, and Titian but also considered those of Spanish early modern painters. Ribera might have been familiar with the art activity as a book illustrator still remains to be studied more fully. See Lubomir Konečný, “An Unexpected Source for Jusepe de Ribera,” \textit{Source} 13 (1994): 24.
\textsuperscript{138} Manuela Mena Marqués, exh. cat. no. 115, 226 in New York, 1992.
\textsuperscript{139} The other two drawings are in the Real Academia de Bellas Artes, Madrid, inv. no. 2206 and the Albertina, Vienna, 13072. See Jonathan Brown, “The Crucifixion of Saint Peter,” cat. 7, no. 1 in \textit{The Spanish Manner: Drawings from Ribera to Goya}, eds. idem, Lisa A. Banner, Andrew Schulz, and Reva Wolf (New York: The Frick Collection, 2010).
\textsuperscript{140} Brown, 2010, cat. 7, 34.
of the fifteenth-century painters Fernando Gallego and Bartolomé Bermejo, the sixteenth-century painter and architect Pedro Machuca, and his Valencian predecessor, Francisco Ribalta.

Fernando Gallego and Bartolomé Bermejo are among the first early modern Spanish artists to sign their names (figs.103 and 104). Gallego’s signature in his Pietà (fig. 103) appears on the ground and oriented toward the viewer so it offers a significant precedent for Ribera’s own earth signature in The Club Footed Boy. Bartolomé Bermejo is one of the first early modern Spanish artists to sign his name using a cartellino. The painting of Saint Michael Triumphant Over the Devil with the Donor Antonio Juan (fig. 104) is most likely the central panel of an altarpiece which was formerly in the Church of San Miguel in Tous, near Valencia. While the painting attests to Bermejo’s mastery of Flemish realism in the donor’s head, the resplendent armor with its stunning reflection of the Heavenly City of Jerusalem on the breastplate, and the archangel’s crystal shield, the signature also provides insight into the artistic identity of an artist who had a fairly peripatetic career. His signature in the panel offers a significant precedent for Ribera’s famed inscription in the Drunken Silenus as it shows a hissing snake protruding from the devil’s stomach crawling toward a cartellino (detail, fig. 105). Unlike the humanist associations of Ribera’s snake, the hissing snake in Bermejo’s altarpiece could be a metaphor for the triumph of evil over good and thereby has religious overtones or connotations.

The signature of the sixteenth-century Spanish painter Pedro Machuca offered a formula that served as an important precedent for Ribera’s own signing practices. One of the key paintings that Machuca completed while he was in Rome is The Virgin of the Souls in Purgatory (fig.106). Machuca signed and dated the verso of this work: PETRUS MACHUCA HISPANUS TOLETANUS FACIEBAT AD MCCCCCXVII. Machuca’s signature proclaims both his regional and national identity as a Spaniard and citizen of Toledo. The fact that he signs in Latin

---

signals his erudition and his aspirations as a Spanish painter who wanted to achieve a more elevated social status. Machuca’s use of the imperfect tense, as signaled by the word *faciebat*, suggests his knowledge of Michelangelo’s famous inscription on the *Vatican Pietà* (1499-1502). Although one can only speculate if Ribera directly knew the painting, the signature does offers an important precedent for Ribera, who, like, Machuca, was a Spanish painter working in Italy.  

The assertion of one’s regional or local identity was especially important in the formulation of an artistic identity for Spanish artists. Francisco Ribalta’s signature in *The Preparation for the Crucifixion* (fig. 1) presents a compelling proclamation of his Catalan nationality and thus also served as an important precedent for Ribera’s insertion of his nationality in his signatures. The painting is signed in the bottom right-hand corner (with digraphs and abbreviations) against a white background in the shape of a label: “FRANCO RIBALTA CATALA LO PINTO EN MADRID ANO DE MDLXXXII.” Infrared examination has revealed two other inscriptions beneath the upper one. The first is barely visible and not in its entirety: “FRANCISCO RIBALTA CATALAN LO PINTO….” Above this inscription, another one was made with digraphs and abbreviations: “FRANCISCO RIBALTA CATALA LO PINTO EN MADRID ANO DE MDCXXII.” The date here – 1625 – differs from the one in the third and final inscription. The signature has attracted the attention of Spanish art historians, as it contains significant information confirming the artist’s Catalan origins and providing evidence that in his youth he worked in Madrid.

In sum, Ribera quite possibly looked to the signing practices of Iberian painters in an effort to align himself with the artistic traditions of early modern Spain. As a Spanish artist

---

142 A recent article by Ana Avila discusses the Neapolitan provenance of Machuca’s panel: “La virgin con el niño y las almas en purgatorio y su vinculación en Italia,” *Archivo español de arte* 85 (2012): 125-46.

143 The issue of Ribalta’s identity as a Catalan was raised by Martínez, 2006, 154: “Años después de su muerte un pintor eminentísimo llamado Francisco Rivalta, de quien yo tenido larga noticia. Unos dicen que catalán, otros que fue valenciano. Sea donde fuere, él fue gran pintor.” See also David Kowal, *Ribalta y los Ribaltescos* (Valencia: Diputación Nacional, 1985), 201-8.

working in Italy, he imitated the signatures of Spanish painters to not only formulate his national identity but also to help raise the visibility of Spanish artists who worked in Spain and abroad in Italy.

**Contemporary Signing Practices**

Ribera’s signing practices raise fundamental questions about attitudes toward authenticity and authorship in early modern European art. How personal or authentic were signatures in seventeenth-century art? What aspects of the artist’s identity did it sign? A brief consideration of the signing practices of other Italian, Dutch and Spanish Renaissance and Baroque artists provides an important context for Ribera’s own attitudes towards his signature. The signing practices of early modern European artists vary a good deal, often due to local guild stipulations and workshop regulations. In her study of Rembrandt’s signatures, Ann Jensen Adams has shown that 90% of the pictures the artist produced between 1632 and 1642 bear his name; only 40% have autograph signatures. In comparison, Ribera signed 54% of his paintings produced between 1613 and 1625. Fourteen of Raphael’s 156 paintings have signatures (translates into roughly less than 9% of his corpus). Rubens is known to have signed few works – only five. Caravaggio signed one, *The Beheading of Saint John the Baptist*, in which the painter figuratively signed his name in blood. If one specifically considers the signing practices of Spanish seventeenth-century painters, one notes that the Sevillian painter Francisco de Zurbarán made frequent use of the format of the *cartellino* in his signatures. Only ten pictures by Alonso
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Cano have autograph signatures.\textsuperscript{148} Velázquez, the painter \textit{par excellence} of the Spanish Golden Age, only signed thirteen out of 120 autograph paintings (roughly 11%). Karin Hellwig has rightly attributed the paucity of signatures in Velázquez’s work to the fact that as a court painter and one who so assiduously sought a knighthood, he wanted to distance himself from the commercial or artisanal aspects of art production that would be borne by a signature.\textsuperscript{149}

To conclude, Ribera effectively fashioned his artistic identity through the vehicle of his signature. With the exception of five autograph letters, there is very little autobiographical material penned by Ribera.\textsuperscript{150} No secure self-portrait or library affords us further insights into the painter’s self-representation or intellectual pursuits. Thus, the artist’s signatures function as fragments of autobiography—as concentrated glimpses of self-representation. In fact, his life-long efforts to fashion his identity ultimately merited him the nickname “Spanish Zeuxis” by the Neapolitan Baroque poet Giuseppe Campanile.\textsuperscript{151} Ribera’s inscriptions not only allowed for the clear identification of his style for the market place but also informed his viewer of his academic and intellectual aspirations. The artist’s varied inscriptions thus not only reflected and promoted his theoretical concerns as an intellectual and nobleman, but also created a recognizable “brand” for his distinct style, which evinces more practical concerns in marketing his art for vice-regal patrons in Italy and royal and aristocratic collectors in Spain. It is through his name that he elevated both the status of his style and artistic identity in Spain and Spanish Naples.

\textsuperscript{148} According to Harold Wethey, Cano’s methods of signing can be identified in two ways: the early signatures are the most complete, while later works simply bear his monogram: idem, \textit{Alonso Cano, Painter, Sculptor, Architect} (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), 143-45.
\textsuperscript{149} Hellwig, 2001, 26.
\textsuperscript{150} Finaldi, 1992a, 3-6; Finaldi, 1992b, 231-55.
Ribera’s Likeness

Introduction

Ribera’s concerted efforts to fashion his artistic identity are evinced by the varied signatures inscribed on his paintings, a strategy frequently employed by early modern European artists. Aside from their signing practices, seventeenth-century painters often fashioned their persona by means of their self-portraits. Such images oftentimes signal the painter’s ambitions. A relevant example would be Velázquez’s Las Meninas (Maids of Honor) (fig. 28), which projects the image of a confident, self-assured artist who, in boldly placing himself in the company of the royal family, asserts his position not only as first court painter but also as a prominent courtier in his own right. Other Spanish painters chose the format of an allegorical self-portrait in presenting themselves as pious and devout men such as Francisco Ribalta’s in his Self-Portrait as Saint Luke (fig. 107) and Francisco de Zurbarán’s scene of The Crucifixion with a Painter (fig. 108). Among early modern European painters, Rembrandt is unsurpassed in terms of the prodigious number and variety of self-portraits in either print or paint that he created, ones that show him at every stage of his life and career.

For an artist who was so concerned with fashioning his identity by means of his signature, ironically, such remarkable or secure self-presentations of Ribera are not extant. Nonetheless, this absence of self-representation still raises two important questions: what did Ribera look like? Are there any accurate, or at least, reliable portraits or representations of the painter? The matter of Ribera’s likeness thus merits further critical attention. Early twentieth-century art historians such as August Mayer and Delphine Fitz Darby were among the first to propose possible independent self-portraits of the painter and to suggest that Ribera used himself

as a model in some religious paintings such as *Saint James the Greater* (fig. 113) or that he incorporated his self-portrait in his extraordinary late work, *The Communion of the Apostles* (fig. 30; detail, fig. 31). More recently, Lubomir Konečný seriously re-engaged with the question of Ribera’s likeness and self-presentation and the thorny issues of identification and attribution raised by this topic. The fact that we have no secure self-portrait of the painter or a portrait of him fashioned by another seventeenth-century artist is a fundamental problem in getting an accurate sense of Ribera’s semblance. In my critical assessment of the issues and problems related to ascertaining Ribera’s likeness, I shall examine literary descriptions of the painter’s likeness culled from early modern art biographies. Then, I will consider known, seventeenth-century self-portraits, some of which are untraced, examine eighteenth and nineteenth-century engravings depicting the artist, and a portrait medal and full-length portrait both produced by the nineteenth-century Spanish sculptor Mariano Benlliure (figs. 116 and 117).

**Literary Accounts of Ribera’s Appearance**

Literary descriptions of Ribera’s likeness are scarce. To my knowledge, none of Ribera’s seventeenth-century biographers reported what he looked like. A description of Ribera’s likeness is curiously absent from Mancini’s biography of the painter and from Martínez’s famed interview with the painter in Naples. The only description of Ribera’s features is found in De Dominici’s posthumous biography of the artist. In a passage describing Ribera’s personality, the eighteenth-century art biographer very briefly described what the painter might have looked like:

Ribera was, by nature, arrogant, as I have said, and for this reason his actions were reserved beyond measure, and although he was small in stature and had short limbs, he demonstrated seriousness in his movements, and in his dealings with people of high rank,


and authority, as were the Viceroy of his time, dealing with them with considerable familiarity, [but also] with decorum and skill. He dressed nobly…”

De Dominici’s words need to be heeded with caution. Unfortunately they reiterate the “black legend” associated with Ribera – that he was haughty and opportunistic.

**Known Seventeenth-Century Self-Portraits**

Despite the paucity of recorded seventeenth-century descriptions of the painter, I have located a seventeenth-century portrait of Ribera in the collection of the Louvre that has been generally overlooked in the literature (fig. 109). Made by an unidentified artist, it is a pen and black ink drawing on white paper with an inscription along the lower border: *Joseph de Ribera dicho el Espanoletto*. The sheet shows the artist in a half-length pose with his face turned in a three-quarters view. He has long hair and sports a moustache and carefully trimmed beard.

While the source of said portrait remains to be traced, I suggest that it is a persuasive likeness of the painter. The reason why I contend its veracity is based on a second drawing by the same artist that illustrates a convincing portrait of Diego de Velázquez (fig. 110): the painter’s features are comparable to those found in his self-portraits such as *Las Meninas* (fig. 28). Both sheets also portray the artist using the same formula: a half-portrait of the painter with an inscription identifying his name in the lower border. I further propose that the artist who made them was Spanish and was probably familiar with extant portraits of both painters.

---


159 Ibid. Both the Ribera and Velázquez portraits were in the vast drawing collection of the celebrated collector Pierre-Jean Mariette (1694-1774).
The related type of the inscriptions found on both drawings further suggests that they were drawn in Spain where they might have been served as preparatory drawings for a series of printed portraits of famous men, in particular, artists. The dark shading of the prints simulates the tone used in engravings. While Lizzie Boubli has argued that similarities or correspondences cannot be established for this type of portrait in Golden Age Spain, extant late sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spanish collections of drawn portraits, mostly notably Francisco Pacheco’s *Descripción de verdaderos retratos de ilustres y memorables varones* (c. 1599-1644, Madrid, Museo Lazaro Galdiano) contained images of famous painters such as the Sevilleans Pablo de Cespedés and Diego Valentín Díaz. Pacheco originally planned to illustrate 160 portraits of famous poets, artists, and ecclesiastics: only sixty are extant. Compiled between the last two decades of the sixteenth and the first four of the seventeenth century, the format of Pacheco’s drawings is by far more elaborate than the Louvre portraits of Ribera and Velázquez in that he uses color, puts the figure in a highly ornamented frame and then places the person’s name in the lower border of the design along with a long eulogy or poem. The importance of Pacheco’s portraits lies in their concept of the drawn portrait as a “true likeness” and thus giving precedence to drawing as an important medium for recording a portrait.160

A portrait or possible self-portrait of Ribera has also been identified in the Medici collection. The picture was purchased by Cardinal Leopold de Medici in 1668 for his gallery of artists’ self-portraits. The 1675 inventory describes the portrait as: “Un Quadro simile in tavola dipinto di sua mano il ritratto dello Spagnoletto da Giovane con poche basette, capelli lunghi neri, collare con poca trina, e si vede dal Braccio destro la Camicia della mancia con ornamento simile […]”.161

Two seventeenth-century self-portraits attributed to the artist are named in English eighteenth- and nineteenth-century collections but remain untraced. The first one was a drawn self-portrait formerly in the collection of the English eighteenth-century collector Charles Rogers, who purchased it along with others en bloc from the landscape designer and art dealer William Kent, who, in turn, had acquired them from the Florentine nobleman, diplomat, painter and collector Francesco Maria Niccolò Gabburri. According to a citation from the catalogue of the collection’s sale, the work was put up for purchase on the sixth day (April 20, 1799) as: “46. [‘Ribera (Gioseppe, detto Spagnoletto’) ] ‘His portrait, caricatured, by himself, in an ornament…’ (1 of 3), lot 538.” Unfortunately there is no mention or record of a buyer or collector who purchased the self-portrait.

The second work in question is a self-portrait by Ribera of around 1626 that was identified in a nineteenth-century English collection. According to Gustav Friedrich Waagen’s description of English private collections, it was owned by the Earl of Shrewsbury. The painting was kept in his collection at Alton Tower until 1856 when it was sold and the Earl’s collection was quickly disbursed thereafter. Unfortunately, the whereabouts of that Ribera’s self-portrait remain unknown.

Ribera’s Self Portrait as Saint Luke (?)

Ribera might have represented himself as Saint Luke Painting the Virgin (fig. 111). The work in question is a copy of a lost original, probably dating to 1646-48. Saint Luke is
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163 Ibid., 210.
164 When Waagen visited the collection at Alton Tower, which is the seat of the Earl of Shrewsbury, he recorded seeing one of Ribera’s philosopher-portraits and a self-portrait: “Of the Neapolitan school I observed – Ribera, called Il Spagnoletto – Archimedes, of powerful effect and great excellence; and his own portrait of equal merit.” In *Works of Art and Artists in England*, vol. 3 (London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1838 [reprint 1970]), 254.
165 Konečný, 2005, 49, no. 2.
shown to the lower left while he paints the Virgin and Child who appear to the right with a host of angels beneath them. The saint is represented with short, dark hair and a mustache. The composition is loosely based on a work that Ribera indubitably knew: Raphael’s Saint Luke Painting the Madonna and Child in the Presence of Raphael (second decade of the 16th century?, oil on canvas, Accademia Nazionale di San Luca, Rome, fig. 112). 

It was believed in the eighteenth century that the portrait was a self-portrait of the painter himself. In 1745 Dézailler d’Argenville and later in 1769 Cochin mentioned seeing the painting in the Certosa di San Martino in Naples. At least two eighteenth century copies of the composition can be traced: one in the Royal Academy of Naples and another by an anonymous painter kept in a private collection in Madrid which appeared for auction in 1978. Luca Giordano copied the composition in two works that are dated to 1650-54 (Museo de Arte Ferré de Ponce, Puerto Rico; Musée des Beaux-arts, Lyon).

Possible Self-Presentation and Self-Portrait in Religious Paintings

The painter’s self-presentation in religious paintings has been suggested by both Mayer and Fitz Darby. Both art historians have both hypothesized that Ribera might have painted himself as a saint. The model for Saint James the Greater (fig. 113) might have been the young artist himself. The painting has been securely attributed to Ribera and dates to circa 1616, made before Ribera departed Rome for Naples or executed soon after his arrival. While there is a Roman and Spanish tradition for images of Saint James the Greater, there is no literature that connects such a representation of the saint to artists’ self-portraits or self-imaging.
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167 Ibid.
Fitz Darby has also suggested that the figure of Saint Joseph in the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s *Holy Family with the Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine* (fig. 114) might bear Ribera’s features or could contain a self-portrait of the painter. She has seen a similarity between the figure of Saint Joseph and the middle-aged man in the Certosa *Communion of the Apostles*. The identification of Ribera with one of the apostles in the Naples Communion had been already stated in the late eighteenth century (around 1770) (fig. 31).

However, it has proven to be difficult to distinguish which one Ribera might represent. The figure which most scholars identify as Ribera is placed third from the left and stands beneath the arcade. He has long black hair and a trimmed beard and stares directly at the viewer. It has been suggested that Ribera might have placed himself next to a bald figure who represents Judas Iscariot, the apostle who betrayed Christ. Ribera’s placement next to Judas raises two questions. Why would Ribera stand next to Judas? Why would Ribera present himself in this way? As Konečný has argued, there could be an element of “negative self-fashioning” involved in said self-portrait of Ribera in the *Communion of the Apostles* in which the painter chose to represent himself next to Judas, the reason why remaining unbeknownst to us.

**Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Printed Portraits of Ribera**

A secure self-portrait of Ribera still remains to be identified. Despite the absence of a firmly-attributed seventeenth-century portrait or self-portrait, at least nine known portraits of Ribera were engraved in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These modern portraits
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170 As Konečný notes the first author to propose that said apostle depicted Ribera was Onofrio Giannone in a manuscript note to De Dominici’s *Lives*, written c. 1768-73. See idem, 2005, 51, no. 22.

171 Ibid, 48. Konečný has drawn parallels to works by Rembrandt in which similar evidence of “negative self-fashioning” is seen. The most remarkable example is Rembrandt’s self-presentation as one of the executioners in *The Raising of the Cross* (1636, oil on canvas, Bayerische Staatsgemaldesammlungen, Munich).

represent Ribera as a younger man in his early 30s with long black hair parted down the middle and a moustache. He wears clothes typical of seventeenth-century men’s dress: a black jacket with cut sleeves and a white shirt with a broad collar.

Of the nine, the portrait of Ribera drawn by José Maea and engraved by Manuel Alegre (fig. 115) presents the most compelling portrait of the artist and resembles the Louvre drawing (fig. 115). The sheet was part of a large-scale publication, the Colección de Retratos de los Españoles Ilustres (Collected Portraits of Illustrious Spaniards), made between 1791 and 1814. The ambitious project was first started under the auspices of the Count of Floridablanca and was to include 114 engraved portraits of Spain’s most important writers, theologians, scientists, military leaders, and artists.174

In this compilation, six artists were chosen to represent the artistic achievements of the Spanish Golden Age.175 Fictive frames surround each portrait and each artist is shown with a distinct attribute. Ribera’s portrait shows him standing a three-quarters length pose holding his etching of A Large Grotesque Head, one of his best known designs. Based on this portrait, one


can propose that Ribera was best known in the eighteenth century for his talents as a printmaker and as an artist whose shocking naturalism was manifested in many deformed and grotesque figures he created.

**The Benlliure Portrait Medal and Statue of Ribera**

Among the most unusual portraits of Ribera is a bronze medal cast by sculptor Mariano Benlliure in 1888 (fig. 116). The medal was struck as a commemorative one that celebrated Ribera’s reputation as one of the great masters of the Spanish Golden Age. The presentation of Ribera’s physical features in Benlliure’s medal is quite different from the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century engravings in the following ways. First, the medal shows Ribera in profile in a bust-length format, which is distinct from the third-quarters length of the engravings. Secondly, his hair is parted and chin-length; in the engravings, his hair is shoulder-length. Third, his facial features are more angular in Benlliure’s portrait. In the medal, the artist has high cheekbones and an aquiline nose which are distinct from the softer, more rounded features seen in the Louvre drawing and the extant engravings. Based on my comparison of the medal with the extant engravings, I contend that Benlliure’s representation of the painter is entirely fanciful.

A year before he cast the medal, Benlliure also sculpted a full-length statue of the painter in 1887 (fig. 117). It was the second, large-scale statue dedicated to a painter in Spain during the late nineteenth century. The bronze statue was cast in Rome in the workshop of Achille Crescenzi. The Carrara marble base was carved by Antonio Martorell. The plaster cast from which the statue was taken had won first prize in the National Exhibition of Fine Arts of 1887. The statue was installed and inaugurated on January 12, 1888, coinciding with the celebration of

---

175 The artists include: Juan de Herrera, Pablo de Céspedes, Ribera, Alonso Cano, Diego Velázquez, and Bartolomé Esteban Murillo.
177 The first monumental public statue of an artist was dedicated Murillo in Seville. See Maria de los Santos García Felguera, *La fortuna de Murillo (1682-1900)* (Seville: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1989).
the third centenary of Ribera’s birth. The statue of Ribera moved several times. In 1888, it was displayed in the Plaza del Temple in Valencia, then in Plaza del Castelar in 1903. In 1931, it was relocated to its original spot in the Plaza del Poeta Llorente where it currently stands. Benlliure’s full-length portrait is marked by a realistic style. Ribera is shown standing proudly, holding his palette in his left hand and brush in his right hand. His stance suggests that he is taking a step back from a canvas which he is working on. Feelings of national and local pride inspired this image of Ribera as an “artist-hero” in Spain. Benlliure, who was himself from Valencia, sought to honor one of the great painters of the seventeenth century who was also one of city’s native sons.

Ribera’s image in nineteenth-century Spain was thereby conditioned by an agenda of nationalist ideologies that appropriated the context of the Spanish Golden Age to serve new political purposes. In specific, Benlliure’s depictions of Ribera illustrates this renewed interest in the subject of the artist by which nineteenth-century artists and writers re-contextualized the history of early modern Spain that will be addressed in chapters four and five.

Conclusion

Ribera’s principal means of self-fashioning was his signature which appeared in the majority of his paintings and in a modest number of his drawings and prints. Ribera effectively fashioned his artistic identity through his varied signatures. The artist’s diverse inscriptions not only reflect and promote his theoretical concerns as an academician, but also create a recognizable “brand” for his distinct style, which evinced more practical concerns in marketing his art for Spanish vice-regal patrons in Italy, royal and aristocratic collectors in Spain, and

---

179 Until the discovery of Ribera’s baptismal certificate by Viñes in 1923 which established Ribera’s birthdate as February 17, 1591, the artist was said to have been born on January 12, 1588.
princely patrons in other European courts. Oddly enough, except for his striking portrait of *Magdalena Ventura*, the painter omitted any reference to his knighthood, which would have been a major marker of his elevated status. For an artist who was very much concerned his identity and status as a painter, the absence of Ribera’s self-portrait further presents a paradoxical view of his self-fashioning. The question of Ribera’s likeness will remain unresolved until a secure self-portrait or secure portrait of the painter surfaces.

---

Chapter 4 - Ribera’s Fortuna Critica in Pre-Modern and Modern Art Biographies

Introduction

Ribera was one of the few Spanish painters whose critical fortunes and reputation never waned in the early modern and modern eras. He occupies a special position in Spanish Golden Age art history because he resided outside Spain in Naples yet was able to maintain ties with his homeland by means of his position as a court painter to the Spanish viceroys who governed Southern Italy and exported his works to Spain. Along with Murillo and Velázquez, Ribera is also one of the few Spanish painters whose biography was documented in Italian, German and Spanish pre-modern and modern art biographies. In addition, Ribera’s prints, although limited in the number of their designs, widely circulated his compositions throughout Europe.  

Ribera’s art and career have inspired early modern responses of all sorts in which the painter and his art were simultaneously met with a critic’s admiration or displeasure. This chapter seeks to analyze the critical fortunes of Ribera from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries by focusing on select themes drawn from biographies of the artist written by early modern European painters and art theorists. The corpus of Ribera’s early modern biographies has been rightly employed by scholars such as Alfonso Pérez Sánchez, Ronald Cohen and Gabriele Finaldi to produce modern art biographies that focus on fundamental aspects of his life and career in a chronological fashion: his birthplace and lineage, his training, his nationality, his technique, his workshop and legacy, public distinctions, aspects of his personality and behavior, and death. This chapter thus builds on previous scholarship by focusing specifically on the different images of Ribera fashioned by early modern art biographers and thereby treating the biographies thematically. Rather than focusing on analyzing Ribera’s entire career in sequential order, I concentrate on select topics that shaped or constructed the image or myth of Ribera in these texts.

---

such as his youth, the public recognition of his talent and fame, his training and early career in Valencia and Rome, his painting style, his nationality and nationalism, his rivalry with his then-contemporaries Domenichino, Batistello Caracciolo, and Massimo Stanzione, his “dishonor,” his ideas about art and the artistic profession, and the “black legend” of the painter. My focus on these specific themes has been guided by three important studies by Julius von Schlosser, Ernst Kris and Otto Kurz jointly, and Catherine Sousloff on the construct of artistic identity in early modern art that privilege the special position of the artist in Renaissance biographies.³

In considering these themes, I present how Ribera’s image was “constructed” by his art biographers, in particular as it relates to his social status and artistic identity. I shall examine how, as James Clifton has rightly noted, “the production of biographical and artistic meanings is simultaneous and interdependent; a fortuna critica of an artist’s work and what we might call a fortuna biographica of an artist’s life are simply parallel but mutually informing and even merging phenomena, so that life, persona and work become a unified whole derived from, but not the same, either a historical person or his artistic oeuvre.”⁴

My approach to studying Ribera’s biographies has also been shaped by important studies of Golden Age literature that re-consider the construct of the individual and identity in Spain. The writings of George Mariscal have focused on the complex nature of subjectivity in early modern Spanish society, whereby the construct of identity consists of the “intersection of contradictory discursive positions.”⁵ In this chapter, I have been guided by Mariscal’s methodology in examining Ribera’s complex, and, often times, paradoxical image in early modern Italian and Spanish artistic literature.

---
Before I turn to these issues and themes presented in Ribera’s art biographies, it is necessary to note the extant documentary and archival evidence that is also instrumental in shaping the artist’s reputation. With the exception of his baptismal certificate, there is little documentary evidence tracing the painter’s youth and early education in Játiva and his subsequent move from Spain to Italy. To my knowledge, Ribera left behind very little autobiographical material. Only five letters are said to have been written in his own hand and a possible sixth scribbled on the verso of a drawing, Christ Recognized by His Disciples (pen and ink, Florence, Uffizi, 10098 S). As argued in chapter three, Ribera’s signatures are the primary sources from which we can glean first hand any attempt at self-fashioning. Visual evidence that offers us a more direct glimpse into Ribera’s fashioning is also lacking. As already discussed in chapter three, unfortunately we have no extant self portrait of the painter that gives us a better sense of Ribera’s appearance and personality.

Although some aspects of Ribera’s biography remain elusive, a significant corpus of documents published over the past twenty years have cast light on crucial aspects of his biography and career. In 1992, Gabriele Finaldi assembled an important appendix of 160 documents that incorporated previously published documentation by Ulisse Prota-Giurleo and Eduardo Nappi among others with his own archival findings. In recent years, more records have been found by Justus Lange and Silvia Danesi Squarzina that have shed light on Ribera’s pivotal
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6 Ribera’s baptismal certificate was published in Gonzalo J. Viñes,”La verdadera partida de bautismo del Españoleto y otros datos de familia,” *Archivo valenciano de arte* 9 (1923):18-24.
7 According to Gabriele Finaldi, the text that appears on the verso of the Uffizi drawing is autograph and might be a draft of a letter to Antonio Ruffo. Unfortunately Ribera’s Italian was weak and there are some misspellings and grammatical errors that Finaldi’s careful transcription of the letter includes: ticularmente en quelo / li que credo vedano ani / quello p che volveva tua / Sero con Vra ave con tan / la suplico me facha / espero fara per un Cuore / dir al padre prior de s / leda quello q…espero / quello que yo le resto dbi / altro le mande li dinari s / repillo el quadro o vera / mande lo complimen / 70 ducati un tornese. The following inscription appears along the margin of the sheet: sempre servitor de V. Sa acqui quan / nor decara (?) / Servitor de Vra aff / jusepe de ribera. Finaldi, 1995, cat. no. 17, 285.
8 Finaldi, 1992b, 231-55.
early years in Rome. A recent exhibition and symposium held at the Prado Museum in 2011 have also thoroughly re-examined the trajectory of the artist’s early career.

Aside from a substantial number of documents related to the painter’s life and career, most scholars have principally relied on Ribera’s biographies as recounted in early modern Italian and Spanish art treatises and biographies: Giulio Mancini’s *Considerazione sulla pittura* (c. 1617-21), Jusepe Martínez’s *Discursos practicables del nobilísimo arte de la pintura* (c. 1673), Joachim von Sandrart’s *Academie der Bau-, Bild-, and Malerey-Künste* (1675), Antonio Palomino’s *El Parnaso español pintoresco laureado* (1715-24), and Bernardo De Dominici’s *Vita de’ pittori, scultori ed architetti* (1742). Ribera is briefly mentioned in other early Italian and Spanish art treatises that include Lazaro Diaz del Valle’s *Varones Ilustres* (1656 and 1659), Francisco Pacheco’s *El arte de la pintura* (1634, published posthumously 1649), and Giovanni Pietro Bellori’s *Le vite de’ pittori, scultori, et architetti moderni* (1672). These three latter texts offer scant but useful information about the painter. Before I turn to the specific themes that are the core of this chapter, I shall introduce the general character and context of the aforementioned biographies.

Despite the relative paucity of autobiographical materials, major aspects of Ribera’s art and career are known from a number of early modern art biographies, which are of varying length and complexity. The earliest biography written about the painter can be found in Giulio Mancini’s *Considerazione sulla pittura* (c. 1617-21), which was first published in the twentieth century. It is among the few that was written and circulated during the artist’s lifetime. Given the early date of his biography, it can be said that Mancini probably knew Ribera personally. Mancini’s chronicle focuses on Ribera’s early years in Rome and praises him as a gifted painter,

---

9 Lange, 2003; Danesi Squarzina, 2006.
Despite his financial and legal troubles. Regardless of its occasional omissions, I find that the text provides a fairly reliable account of Ribera’s early career in Parma and Rome.

Like Mancini, Ribera’s Spanish art biographies focus on the painter’s talent and social status. However, the Spanish biographies single out Ribera’s mature years in Naples so they tend to emphasize the nobility, status and rank of the painter. The Aragonese painter Jusepe Martínez’s 1625 interview presents a striking image of Ribera. Jusepe Martínez was the son of Daniel Martínez, a Flemish painter who married a woman from Saragossa. In 1623 Martínez went to Italy and in 1625 he is documented in Rome where he met Guido Reni and Domenchino and thereafter traveled to Naples where he met Ribera. He returned to Spain in 1627. In 1644, Martínez began teaching painting to Juan de Austria, Philip IV’s illegitimate son.13 His book, *Discursos practicables del nobilísimo arte de la pintura* (*Practicable discourses on the nobility of painting*), was written around 1675 but remained unpublished until 1866. Divided into twenty-one sections or “treatises,” as he calls them, the text intersperses artists’ biographies with passages devoted to artistic education. While Martínez never identifies the painter by name, art historians have safely assumed that the artist who Martínez interviewed in Naples was Ribera. Martínez’s dialogue with Ribera casts the painter as noble and well-informed, painfully aware of the low status or regard with which painters were held in Spain.

The court historian Lazaro Diaz del Valle’s brief comments about Ribera focus on the painter’s fame, nobility, knighthood, and his long-standing rivalry with Massimo Stanzione. Lazaro Díaz del Valle was a court servant, singer in the Capilla Real and chaplain to Charles II. His writings on art are collected in his *Varones illustres* (*Illustrious Men*) assembled between 1656 and 1659. Extant in manuscript form and largely unpublished with the exception of some passages, the compilation consists of an assortment of notes that Díaz del Valle took from a

---


variety of Italian and Spanish art treatises. The nobility of painting as an artistic practice and painters as its esteemed practitioners is the main concern of Díaz del Valle’s text.

Francisco Pacheco’s writings about Ribera are also sparse but emphasize Ribera’s social status as well as his talents as a master colorist. There are some fundamental differences among Díaz del Valle, Martínez, and Pacheco’s writings. Diaz Del Valle and Martínez do not make specific references to Ribera’s works in Spanish collections and are more concerned with introducing biographical information and commenting on Ribera’s social status and artistic style. Unlike the former two writers, Pacheco mentions paintings in collections in Seville, namely the works by Ribera owned by the Duke of Alcalá.

The one painter and theorist in Spain who is relatively silent about the art and life of Ribera is Vicente Carducho. In the eighth chapter of his Dialogos de la pintura (Dialogues on Painting), he briefly mentions that Ribera’s paintings hung in the royal residence of the Alcazár. Carducho’s few words about Ribera might have to do with his vehemence toward Caravaggio, and, by extension, Spanish painters who worked in a realist style.

However, one of the most pervasive images of Ribera as a painter of violent and turbulent images derives from Joachim von Sandrart’s vita of the painter in his Academie de Bau-, Bild-, und Mahler-Künste (1675), published posthumously after Ribera’s death. Published in 1675,
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14 Díaz del Valle’s writings about artists are collected in following manuscript: Varones ilustres, 2 vols. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Diego Velázquez, 1656, 1659).
15 The excerpts of Ribera’s biography from Díaz del Valle’s text are from F.J. Sánchez Cantón’s Fuentes literarias para la historia del arte español, vol. 2 (Madrid: C. Bermejo, 1933).
16 Pacheco, cited and translated in Véliz, 41: “Jusepe Ribera did this also, since among all the great paintings [owned by] the Duke of Alcalá [d. 1637], his figures alone appear to be living, and the rest only painted, even though they hang next to works by Guido Boloñés [Guido Bologna].”
17 Vicente Carducho, Dialogos de la pintura. Su defensa, origen, esencia, definicion, modos, y diferencias, ed. Francisco Calvo Serraller (Madrid: Ediciones Turner, 1973), 435: “Estas dos adornan el salon grande, que se hizo de Nuevo, que tiene balcones a la plaza (estas son todas las Pinturas de Ticiano) y a este peso en el mismo salon estan otros quadros de la misma grandeza, de mano de Pedro Pablo Rubens, de Eugenio Caxes, de Diego Velazquez, de Iusepe de Ribera (que llaman el Españoleto) del Domenquino, y por debaxo dellos otros de menor grandeza. Encima de todos estos estan las quatro furias, que diximos, de Ticiano. Estas son las que la memoria me ha restituido del deposito que en ella hize, quando las vi; si bien sé que ai otras muchas, que pudo ser, que por poco singulars se ayan olvidado.”
Joachim von Sandrart’s treatise contains a short biography of the painter. Sandrart spent six years in Italy from 1629 to 1635, first traveling to Venice and Bologna, then to Rome, and eventually to Naples and Messina. It is likely that Sandrart met Ribera in Naples as well as other leading artists of the city such as Artemisia Gentileschi and Massimo Stanzione. He thereafter returned to Rome, where he become curator of the Giustianini collection and later organized the “Galleria Giustiniani,” a series of engravings copying the Giustianini collection of antiquities. According to Sandrart, he met with Ribera who accompanied him on a visit to Massimo Stanzione’s studio in Naples.19

Spanish and Italian eighteenth-century biographies of Ribera drew from these Baroque biographies of the artists but also from existing oral traditions and histories. While his vita builds on and augments seventeenth-century treatises, Antonio Palomino’s six-page biography of the painter in El parnaso laurado (1724) is the most extensive of these Spanish sources in its methodical presentation of Ribera’s biography, providing his birthplace and date and detailing his family history, describing Ribera’s education and earliest artistic training, and recounting his youthful years in Rome and his life-long residency in Naples. Palomino is among the few of Ribera’s Spanish biographers to mention individual works by the painter in Spanish collections and describe the artist’s signing practices.

The Neapolitan painter and art historian Bernando De Dominici wrote the lengthiest and fullest biography of Ribera in his Vite de’ pittori, scultori ed architetti napoletani (1742-5). At twenty-four pages, De Dominici’s biography presents a detailed, chronological survey of Ribera’s life and career. However, De Dominici often paints an unfavorable image of Ribera as arrogant, haughty, and opportunistic. In the case of De Dominici’s vita of the painter, the reliability and
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18 For an English translation of Carducho’s diatribe against Caravaggio, see Enggass and Brown, 173-74; see also Margrit Franziska Brehm, Der Fall Caravaggio. Ein Rezeptiongeschichte (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992), 58-9.
19 Sandrart 1675 (1925), 278; Silvia Danesi Squarzina, “La vita di ‘Josephus Riverius alias Hispanus Valentianus’ scritta da Sandrart.” In Joachim Von Sandrart: ein europäischer Künstler und Theoretiker
veracity of this source have been called into question. In fact, De Dominici was nicknamed “il Falsario” (or “the falsifier”) because it was said that he invented or fabricated the manuscript sources he claimed he relied on. But the claim that De Dominici made up the information he provided in his lives has been challenged in recent scholarship and the usefulness of his biographies has been revalidated.  

In constructing Ribera’s “portrait” from these varied and oftentimes contradictory sources, one must nevertheless proceed with caution. In writing about Caravaggio’s biographies, Catherine Puglisi rightly notes that “time-honored conventions governed early modern artists’ Lives, and the individual author’s biases – theoretical, geographical, or stylistic – inform even seemingly objective reporting.” In many instances, myth and fact are deeply intertwined in early modern art biographies, as has been in the case of Ribera.

New approaches to studying Seicento biographies have proven to be useful in assessing the varied presentation of Ribera’s art and life in his biographies. In his study of Caravaggio’s life, Philip Sohm has rightly pointed out that “biography can be read as art criticism.” My own examination of Ribera’s seventeenth- and eighteenth-century biographies of the painter will take into account how these biographies ask one to consider how “historical truth can coexist with mythologized biography.” These sources not only allow one to consider how Ribera’s biographers emphasized his status as a painter but also allow one to question some of the myths about the painter propagated by many of them.


23 Ibid.
“Myths” About Ribera

The Artist’s Education and Training

Despite recent research that has yielded insightful discoveries about Ribera’s early career, little is known about Ribera’s upbringing and education in his native Játiva. The eighteenth-century art biographer Palomino claimed that the young Ribera trained with the painter Francisco Ribalta.24 Writing in 1800, Ceán Bermúdez also wrote that Ribera’s parents wanted him to study Latin so that he could pursue a “life of letters” but Ribera’s affinity for painting led him to study with Ribalta, following Palomino.25

To my knowledge, there is no documentary evidence that Ribera was ever apprenticed to Ribalta. Writing years after Palomino, Marcos Antonio Orellana (1731-1831), the eighteenth-century historian of Valencian art, also noted that Ribera trained with Ribalta, but he was unsure whether it was Francisco or his son Juan, who trained the young Ribera.26 Art historians Diego Angulo Iñíguez, Alfonso Peréz Sánchez and Jose Milicuá all have cast doubt on the validity of Palomino’s statement.27 Following these scholars, Finaldi also rejected Palomino’s claim because Ribalta’s mid-career and Ribera’s styles are distinct.28 Ribera’s early works are quite different from Ribalta’s (i.e. the latter’s Algemesí retable, 1603-1610).29 Finaldi has further argued Ribalta’s and Ribera’s respective drawing styles also are different.30 However, Ribalta’s work begins to take on a Caravaggist quality in about 1613. Yet stylistic differences are not necessarily sufficient grounds to dismiss Palomino’s statement entirely. Some masters and pupils had distinct styles of paintings that do not necessarily discredit that they worked with one another.

24 Palomino, 1987, 122: “He was a pupil of Francisco Ribalta, an outstanding painter.”
25 Ceán Bermúdez, 1800: “Sus padres Luis Ribera, y Margarita Gil le enviaron a estudiar la latinidad con el fin de inclinarle a la carrera de las letras; pero su aficción a las bellas artes le obligó a preferir la escuela de Francisco Ribalta a la universidad.”
26 Marcos Antonio de Orellana, Vida de los pintores, arquitectos, escultores y grabadores valencianos (Madrid: Gráficas Marinas, 1930), 169.
29 Ibid., 40.
An example that attests to the divergent styles among master and pupils are Simone Peterzano and Caravaggio. Despite their different styles, we do not discredit claims that Caravaggio ever apprenticed with Peterzano in Milan. In further support of Palomino’s statement, Ribalta was also the leading artist working in Valencia in the early seventeenth century. It is reasonable that the young Ribera might have sought him as a teacher. Therefore, I believe that Palomino’s statement that Ribera trained with Ribalta remains plausible.

Both Mancini and De Dominici have also maintained that Ribera, as a young painter working in Rome, was a member of the “school” of Caravaggio and possibly studied with the master himself. Many scholars have long rejected this theory because Caravaggio was dead by the time Ribera reached Italy in about 1611. However, in a recent essay, Gianni Papi suggests that Ribera might have arrived in Italy earlier than we think, proposing a date of 1604 to 1605. Caravaggio was still in Rome at the time. Ribera would have been quite young: he was thirteen or fourteen years old when he arrived in Italy. Papi supports his theory based on Mancini’s earlier claim that Ribera was an artist who was part of the “school” of Caravaggio that included artists Giovanni Antonio el Spadarino, Cecco del Caravaggio, and Bartolomeo Manfredi. Based on my study of Ribera’s biographies, both Mancini and Palomino mention that Ribera was quite young when he arrived in Italy. According to Mancini, his extreme youth earned him the nickname “Il Spagnoletto” or the little Spaniard. While Papi’s theory is tantalizing and it would significantly revise the chronology of Ribera’s career, unless firmer evidence in the form of a document or painting emerges, it remains largely speculative.

30 Ibid.
31 I thank Dr. Catherine Puglisi for bringing this important example to my attention.
33 Papi, 2011, 37.
Ribera’s Early Career in Parma and Rome

Giulio Mancini’s account of Ribera’s early career in his treatise Considerazione sulla pittura is the earliest and most detailed source discussing Ribera’s time in both Parma and Rome.\(^{34}\) Mancini’s short yet informative biography appeared about roughly five years after Ribera departed Rome for Naples. Mancini not only wrote about Ribera’s art as he mentions five paintings by the artist in his text but he also collected Ribera’s art. According to two letters exchanged by Mancini and his brother Deifebo in 1617, Mancini had acquired Ribera’s *Saint Jerome*, the artist’s first signed work, (fig. 76) and sent the painting to his brother in Siena.\(^{35}\)

Mancini begins by celebrating Ribera as an extraordinarily gifted painter, very high praise given the number of talented painters working in Rome during the early decades of the seventeenth century. He then writes that Ribera spent his earliest years in Italy in Lombardy, probably spending his *Wanderjahre* in cities such as Milan, Genoa, and Parma:

> It cannot and ought not to be denied that Giuseppe de Ribera of Valencia, commonly called Lo Spagnoletto, is the most naturally gifted artist to have appeared for many years. For while still quite young, having journeyed through Lombardy to see the work of those able men, and finding himself in Parma, he aroused the jealous fear of those who served his Highness [Ranuccio Maria Farnese], that, coming to the notice of that Prince, he might be taken into the latter’s service, causing them to lose their positions; for that reason they forced him to leave.\(^{36}\)

While in Parma, Ribera was protected by Mario Farnese, the duke of Latera. According to Mancini, the young artist had to leave the city because of the jealousy and envy that developed between him and the established artists of the city. According to Mancini’s text, the young
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\(^{34}\) José Milicua, “En el centenario de Ribera. Ribera en Roma (El manuscrito de Mancini).” *Archivo español de arte* 25 (October-December 1952): 309-322.


\(^{36}\) Translation in Finaldi,1992, 237; Felton, 1991, 81; original text in Mancini, 1956-7, I, 249: “Non si può nè deve negare che Giuseppe Ribera, valentiano, comunemente detto il Spagnoletto, non habbia havuto una dispositione tale da natura che da molt’anni in qua, fra i suoggetti comparsi, non si sia vista la maggiore; perchè, ancor giovanetto, essendosene andato per la Lombardia per veder le cose di quei valent’huomini, capitando in Parma, messe gelosia in quelli che servivano quell’Altezza che, venendo questo sugetto a notizia di quell’Principe, lo pigliasse al suo servitio et così fussero levati da quella servitù, onde lo necessitorno a partirsene.”
Ribera was introduced to an artistic culture that was defined by rivalry and competition. As we shall see later in this chapter, Ribera himself was a fierce opponent to any artist who sought to compete against him for public commissions in Naples.

When Ribera arrived in Rome, as discussed in chapter one, he was hired to paint pictures for direct sale on the art market. According to Mancini, he “worked for a daily wage for those who have workshops and sell paintings through the labors of similar young men. With this opportunity, comporting himself well, he made his talents known, and came into a great reputation with a very great profit.” Apparently, soon after, the young painter’s early success, career ambitions, and financial insecurity led him to search for greater opportunities:

But as time went by, disliking the work, and leading a life in which he spent much more than he earned, he was forced and compelled through debt to leave Rome and go to Naples where he was taken by Giovanni the Sicilian [Giovanni Azzolino], a painter and most singular man who works with wax and terracotta on a small scale and is now no ordinary painter.” He married one of his daughters and, doing various works with his usual felicitous manner he was introduced to the Viceroy. As a result, he stays in the city, still spending his usual amount and that extra that a wife and honorable appearance at court necessitate; nonetheless, having left the wastrels [sparapani], and given his speed of working together with his handling of paint [colorito] and good judgment, his earnings are enough to maintain the splendor of his life.


Translation in *Finaldi, 1992*, 237; Felton, 1991, 81; original text in Mancini, 1956-7, I, 249. “Ma in progresso di tempo, riscrescendoli il lavorare e tenendo vita che spendeva molto più che non guadagnava, fu forzato e necessitate dal debito a partisì di Roma et andarsene a Napoli dove, raccettato da Giovan [siculiano] (1091), pititore et huomo singularissimo in far in piccolo di cera et di terra et adesso nella pittura non ordinario, pigliò una sua figlia per moglia et, operand varie opera con quella felicità che suole, hebbe introduttion appresso il Vicerè, onde adesso con guadagno e splendore vive in quella città dove, / anchorchè spenda second il suo solito et quel più che comporta e necessita la moglie et il comparer alla corte honoratamente, nondimeno, havendo lasciato i sparapani, con la prestezza del lavorar accompagnato dal colorito e buon intendimento, guadagna tanto che supplisce all splendor delle sue spese.” Assuming that Mancini’s estimate about Ribera’s earnings is accurate (or even correct), one can tentatively speculate that the painter earned a reasonable monthly salary of at least 150 to 180 *scudi*. However, this income does
In his appraisal of Ribera’s early career, Mancini adds to the positive reception of Ribera’s art in Rome, when he mentions that apparently the painter was also “…much admired by Signor Guido [Reni] who thought a good deal of his determination and handling of paint [colorito], which for the most part follows the path of Caravaggio, but is more experimental and bolder,”40 making specific stylistic comparisons between Caravaggio and Ribera. As for the young painter living and working in Rome, according to this source, he was:

[M]ore than lax in his behavior, and although he was very shrewd, nonetheless he sometime ran into trouble, more through neglect than through bad intentions or any other for him a non gravetur, nor did the court of the governor handle such cases. Notwithstanding this naiveté of his, he had acquired a rhetoric which served him in times of need, as was seen many times by the most illustrious governor Giulio Bunterentij [Monter…..], before whom he was often brought for pro suspicione fuga pro dare [for suspicion of fleeing his debts]; so well did he plead that the governor lent him money in exchange for a promise that he would paint him some pictures.

Notwithstanding all this and his extravagant ways he had a very great reputation. And what is a greater marvel, he turned aside with sweet words men that had a taste for painting, that were creditors of loans and of money, with his chattering words, and tricks, giving them hope of doing that for which they desired. But the landlords, bakers, butchers, green grocers, and Jews beat on his door and sent bill collectors with documents called citations at all hours of the night, so that finally, doubtful of the outcome, he departed….41

Despite his financial and legal troubles, Mancini notes some of Ribera’s earliest commissions in Rome: “He made many things here in Rome, and in particular for the …., the Spaniard, who has five very beautiful half figures representing the five senses, a Christ Deposed and others, which
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41 Translation in Finaldi, 1992, 237; Felton, 1991, 81; original text in Mancini, 1956-7, I, 250. “che per mala volontà o altro impedimento, dubitando che non l’intervenisse qualche cosa, pregò un suo amico che gli facesse haver un non gravetur, non sapendo che simil cause non hanno il non gravetur nè le tratta il foro del Governatore. / Nondimeno con questa sua semplicità haveva congiunta, nei bisogni, una gran rethorica, come si vede più volte in persona dell’illustrissimo governatore Giulio Bunterentij che dactus ad presentiam pro suspicione fuga pro dare, si sapeva tanto ben raccomandare che da esso in quelle necessità li venivan prestati denari con promessa di farle tante pitture. In ultimo si parti per Napoli, et invero si potrebbe ascrivere a un po’ di mala volontà poichè, ogni volt ache voleva lavorare, si guadagnava cinque o sei scudi il giorno che, con la spesa ordinaria, presto e facilmente havrebbe pagato ognuno”
in truth are things of most exquisite beauty.” The paintings that Mancini identifies include Ribera’s celebrated *Five Senses* (ca.1615-16) for the Spanish merchant Pedro Cussida.

*The Public Recognition of Ribera’s Talent in Rome*

Episodes recounting Ribera’s talent are among the important “myths” of the painter that early modern biographers created. This kind of account also takes up one of the major themes that is not only important in Ribera’s biographies but also generally early modern art biographies: the influence of chance or good fortune that enabled a young artist to follow his career and “thence to rise in social standing” after the public recognition of his talent.43

The story of the public recognition of Ribera’s talent in Rome is told by Palomino in his biography of the painter. Ribera is portrayed as a young, poor artist who is dressed in rags and who supports himself with the menial commissions that he is receiving. According to Palomino, the artist was “discovered” as a young artist by a cardinal in Rome, and the lengthy but colorful anecdote is quoted here in full:

He lived in great poverty, maintaining himself by virtue of his industry and the crumbs from the draftsmen at the Academy, with no other support or protection. One day while he was drawing after one of those paintings that embellish the streets of Rome, a Cardinal passed by chance in his carriage saw him and looked at him with great attention. With pious and noble thoughts, he considered the boy (so attentive to the study of his drawings and so forgotten by Fortune that he barely had some rags with which to cover his body, called him, and sent him to his house. There he clothed him and favored him so much that all that pampering did what necessity had not been able to, and Ribera started to become spoiled and to deviate from the goal that made him leave his home and country. But since doing what others would have had to against their will came naturally to him, he came to his senses and abandoned the house and comforts that he had (without saying goodbye) and returned to his first manner of living and studying. When the Cardinal found him again, he reproached him for this deed and his bad behavior, calling him an ingrate and a thankless Spagnoletto. But once satisfied of the purity of his motives, he praised him as virtuous and admired him as rare – for he had preferred the interests of his studies – to comfort of his house and offered him his protection again. But Ribera always thanked in words but never accepted in deed.44

---

43 Kris and Kurz, 28.
Palomino’s lengthy anecdote about Ribera’s encounter with this cardinal, who remains unidentified, also introduces some of the less favorable personality traits that were and are still associated with Ribera: his arrogance, haughtiness, and overall “bad behavior” as a young painter.

**Ribera’s Rivalry with Massimo Stanzione, Domenichino, and Caracciolo**

While Mancini and Palomino both mention that Ribera was in financial straits while he was living in Rome, and Mancini, in specific, mentions that Ribera left Rome for Naples to escape his debts, the young painter had begun to build a reputation. As discussed in chapter one of this dissertation, when Ribera arrived in Naples in 1616, he was mentored by Giovanni Bernardo Azzolino. Ribera married Azzolino’s daughter in that same year. As a rising artist in Naples, Ribera was also employed by the Spanish viceroy, the Duke of Osuna, who, according to De Dominici, “discovered” the artist in Naples.\(^{45}\)

Ribera’s biographers mention his antagonistic relationships with other leading painters residing and working in Naples that illustrate the culture of rivalry and competition that pervaded early modern artistic life and that is prevalent in early modern artistic literature. In biographies by Bellori, De Dominici, and Palomino, Ribera is pitted as the arch-rival of the painters Domenichino, Massimo Stanzione, and Battistello Caracciolo. Ribera’s awareness of his status as a foreign-born artist, who nonetheless was the official painter to the Spanish minority who ruled Naples and the city’s leading artist, might have intensified his rivalry with other artists.\(^{46}\)

Ribera’s rivalry with the Bolognese painter Domenichino (Domenico Zampieri) not only had to do with these two artists competing for prominent public commissions at the Certosa di San Martino but also with their antithetical styles of painting. James Clifton has rightly noted that there was a theoretical element to this rivalry, i.e. the contention among painters who favored

---

\(^{45}\) Chapter one, 11.  
an idealized style of painting versus those who preferred a naturalistic idiom.\textsuperscript{47} Ribera’s raw naturalism thus was an effective contrast to Domenichino’s calm classicism. However, the more luminous style and classicizing composition of Ribera’s celebrated \textit{San Gennaro Emerging Unharmed from the Furnace} (1647, Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro, Naples) and his later works respond to the Bolognese master’s sense of line and light.

Ribera’s bitter rivalry and hostility towards Domenichino is noted by at least five art biographers that include Giovanni Battista Passeri, Bellori, Carlo Cesare Malvasia, Palomino and De Dominici. Domenichino’s acceptance of the commission to paint the pictures for the Cappella del Tesoro fueled the ire of local Neapolitan painters including Ribera. Domenichino’s growing reputation among collectors in Naples is also attested by his receipt of an important commission from the Duke of Monterrey, who was the viceroy and an important collector and patron of the arts in his own right, to paint a work, \textit{The Funeral of a Roman Emperor} (1635, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid). The work was part of the \textit{History of Rome} series that was intended for the decoration of the Buen Retiro in Madrid.\textsuperscript{48} Passeri wrote that the Viceroy had to protect Domenichino from the threats of local artists who “resented the competition of outsiders.”\textsuperscript{49} Passeri also mentions that the viceroy had to intervene with the authorities of the Capella del Tesoro, for whom Domenichino was exclusively working, to allow him to combine his work there with his commission for the Buen Retiro. The threats against Domenichino mounted to the extent that the artist had to leave Naples for Rome in the autumn of 1634. He worked on the painting for the Buen Retiro while he was in Rome, and finished it upon his return to Naples in the spring of 1635.\textsuperscript{50} Bellori repeats the same story in his biography of Domenichino.\textsuperscript{51}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{47} Clifton, 1995.
\textsuperscript{49} Úbeda de los Cobos, 2005, cat. no. 38, 200.
\textsuperscript{51} Bellori 1672 (1976), 209; Úbeda de los Cobos, 2005, cat. no. 38, 200.
\end{flushright}
Ribera is counted among the artists who threatened Domenichino while he was working in Naples. In his biography of the painter, Bellori mentions that Ribera insulted Domenichino by his unwillingness to acknowledge him as a painter and claiming that he did not know how to paint:

This man was never willing to recognize Domenichino as a painter, and through the viceroy he caused him serious trouble by saying that he did not know how to paint. After Domenichino died, he finally obtained the commission for the large altarpiece in the Chapel of the Treasure, of the miracle of Saint Januarius emerging from the furnace.52

Like Bellori, the Spanish art biographer Palomino wrote about Ribera’s reputed arrogance and condescending attitude toward Domenichino but he was protected by the viceroy:

With this and the Viceroy’s protection, he would not acknowledge anyone as superior in art, and he especially gave a lot of grief to Domenichino, even to the point of saying that he did not know how to paint, and when the latter died, Ribera painted the *Miracle of San Gennaro Issuing from the Oven* for the Cappella del Tesoro, a superior work.53

De Dominici retells a similar episode in which Ribera tormented poor Domenichino while he was in Naples.54 Based on these accounts, both Ribera and Domenichino sought the protection of the viceroy. According to both Bellori and Palomino’s comments about Ribera, Ribera probably felt threatened by Domenichino’s presence and growing reputation in Naples and sought the aid of the viceroy. If the Viceroy did attempt to protect Domenichino, as Passeri and Bellori both claim, his efforts failed because Domenichino fled Naples for Rome in 1634. Domenichino returned to Naples in 1635 and died there in 1641. While Domenichino’s untimely death was

---


53 Palomino, 1987, 123.

54 De Dominici, 1742-5 (1979), III, 7.
blamed on his working under very stressful conditions, the artist might have died of a natural cause or illness.

In a set of notes focusing on the lives of prominent men, Díaz del Valle also commented on the long-standing rivalry between Massimo Stanzione and Ribera in a marginal comment in his biography of the Marquis of Aula and the Duke of Alcalá: “The knight Massimo was a great painter and competitor with Jusepe de Ribera nicknamed the little Spaniard. In the Buen Retiro is [Stanzione’s] story of Saint John by his hand, a famous thing.”

De Dominici’s telling of the competiveness between Ribera and Stanzione, however, raises the issues of national pride and reputation. Although Naples was a renowned city of art, it could boast of few artists who were internationally famous (and vexingly, Ribera, one of the most distinguished, was Spanish). The polemical anti-Spanish prejudices that typify Neapolitan historiography in the eighteenth century are evident in De Dominici’s account of the rivalry between Massimo Stanzione and Ribera. According to the biographer, both painters asked to paint a large Pietà for the Certosa di San Martino. De Dominici’s account of the competition is somewhat inconsistent. He “tests” the artists’ reputations respectively and their moral character. In the context of De Dominici’s biographies, Ribera emerges as the “typical Spaniard”: he is arrogant, jealous and spiteful. As a foil to Ribera’s deficient character, Stanzione is dignified and direct, even-tempered and fair. In fashioning the image of both painters, De Dominici describes Stanzione as modest in his dress, while Ribera dresses ostentatiously and puts on the airs of a noble man. While Stanzione provides his students with an example of moral uprightness and civic virtue, Ribera corrupts his followers by involving them in his degenerate schemes.

---

Ribera’s rivalry with Stanzione might have been exaggerated by De Dominici. In his biography of Ribera, Sandrart reports that he went with Ribera to Stanzione’s studio. As discussed in chapter one of this dissertation, Ribera and Stanzione jointly appraised works by Paolo Finoglia. While Sandrart’s comments and extant documentation attesting to the professional collaboration of these two painters does not discount that possibility that their relationship was contentious, their association might not have been as acerbic as De Dominici portrayed it.

A letter from the Tuscan agent Cosimo del Sera attests to Ribera’s hostility toward the Neapolitan painter Batistello Caracciolo. In a letter dated January 23, 1618, Del Sera wrote to the grand duke’s secretary that if the secretary wanted an opinion of Ribera’s talent, he should not ask “a certain hunchbacked painter from these parts called Giovambattistello,” who happened to be in Florence at the time, “since there is no love lost between them and this Spaniard is envied by everyone.” Ribera and Caracciolo’s relationship might have been one of two rivals, not necessarily enemies. Both men stood together as witnesses to the marriage of Ribera’s collaborator, the Spanish painter Juan Dó.

The “Black Legend” of Ribera

De Domenici’s portrayal of Ribera as arrogant and cruel also fed the Romantic legend of Ribera as a painter of cruel and violent imagery perpetuated by nineteenth-century British and French poets such as Lord Byron and Théophile Gautier. In his celebrated poem, Don Juan
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58 Chapter one, 56-57.
59 Finaldi, 1992a, 4-5.
60 Ibid.
(1824), Lord Byron proclaimed that Ribera was a painter “who tainted his brush with all the blood of the sainted.” 62 Gautier exclaimed, “You, cruel Ribera, harsher than Jupiter, from his hollow sides, you make flow in streams of blood, by way of horrible cuts, cascades of entrails!” 63 These stereotypes of the artist have colored our perceptions of Ribera as an artist whose tormented personality and psyche were reflected in the gruesome images of martyrdom he painted. 64 As Gabriele Finaldi has rightly observed, this myth has its origins in Joachim von Sandrart’s biography of the painter in the Academie de Bau-, Bild, und Mahlerey-Künste. 65

Before I turn to Sandrart’s treatment of Ribera, the term “leyenda negra” (or “black legend”) as it pertains to Ribera, though, merits further explication. The term “Black Legend” was invented namely as war propaganda against Spain in the sixteenth century. It was coined mainly in the Low Countries, Italy, and France not only to refer to Spain’s brutal and violent conquest of the Americas but also its brutal occupation of the Northern countries and its religious intolerance. It later became associated with national stereotypes that associated Spain with religious fanaticism, violence, racism, and ignorance and presented the nation as “a bastion of intolerance, ignorance, and bigotry.” 66 As a result of the “Black Legend,” many Spaniards who traveled and lived abroad were often viewed with suspicion. Spanish artists did not escape this
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62 Canto XIII.
bias. For example, when Velázquez took his first trip to Italy in 1629, the Italian courtiers and grandees he encountered thought he was a spy working on the Spanish crown’s behalf. In his biography of the painter, Sandrart wrote about Ribera’s celebrated *Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew* and a set of Ribera’s *Four Damned* owned by the wealthy Flemish merchant and ship-owner Lucas van Uffel. He continued to say that the patron’s wife, Jacoba, gave birth to a deformed child, as result of having looked at the series, especially the *Ixion* whose gnarled hand so affected her that her child was born with a similar deformity. Palomino repeats this story in 1724, adding that the paintings were returned by van Uffel and were “transferred to Madrid to the Buen Retiro Palace.”

Ribera’s *Ixion* and *Tityus*, both in the Prado and discussed in chapter two of this dissertation, were once thought to be part of the van Uffel series. The paintings that Sandrart describes were

---

probably copies of the originals owned by Mary of Hungary. The van Uffel pictures are said to be the copies that are in the collection of the Prado. In addition, Sandrart also describes a *Cato of Utica* as one of the tortured subjects for which Ribera gained notoriety. Recently reattributed to Luca Giordano (ca. 1660, Art Gallery of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada), the painting depicts the Roman statesman, who was known for his honesty and integrity, after he has stabbed himself and is tearing out his intestines.71

Ribera’s fame for painting these kinds of horrifying themes and tortured subjects was celebrated in later centuries. The art writer Palomino might have inadvertently contributed to the “black legend” of the painter by claiming that:

Ribera did not enjoy painting sweet and devout subjects as much as he liked expressing horrifying and harsh things, such as the bodies of old men: dry, wrinkled, and lean, with gaunt and withered faces, everything done accurately after the model with extraordinary skill, vigor, and elegant technique.72

Palomino’s description of Ribera’s graphic yet skillful realism also infiltrated French nineteenth-century views of Spanish art and culture. However, the opinions of French critics were deeply entrenched in the negative labels of the Black Legend. Negative stereotypes about the Spanish as violent and oppressive managed to permeate French opinions and views about Spanish painting and painters virulently, tarnishing the reputation of Spain abroad and enforcing notions of France’s cultural superiority.73 In the case of Ribera, the dark and violent nature of his imagery was correlated to his personality by nineteenth-century writers and critics. The French nineteenth-century artist and writer Charles Blanc famously began his article on Ribera noting that: “It is amazing that all painters with a strong style had a tormented, melodramatic life, filled
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70 Palomino, 1987, 123.
71 Sandrart, 1675 (1925), 277-78: “Er malhte auch einen Cato Uticensis, der in seinem selbsteigenen Blut nach verrichtetem Selbstmord liget und die Därmin mit beyden Händen in Stucjen zerreist; mit andern dergleichen zwar widerwärtigen, jedoch Kunstreich und natürlichen Dingen.”
72 Palomino, 1987, 123.
with tempests, tragedy, and misfortune...Ribera’s life in particular was a long series of contrasts between splendor and misery, dark shadow and dazzling light, like his paintings.”

**Ribera’s Dishonor**

The dramatic aspects of Ribera’s myth reach their apogee with the story of Don Juan de Austria’s purported abduction and seduction of Ribera’s daughter or niece. This story is one of the best known stories from De Dominici’s *vita* of the painter. Don Juan de Austria was the illegitimate son of Philip IV who has been appointed admiral of the Spanish fleet and was sent to Naples to subdue the revolts led by Masarniello in 1647. As discussed in chapter one, Ribera painted an equestrian portrait of the young Juan de Austria and made a reproductive etching after it.

While De Dominici’s telling of the story is the best known, accounts of the abduction of Ribera’s daughter or niece had already been in circulation as early as the mid-1650s. The earliest version of the story was related in Capecelatro’s diary of 1647-50 who identifies the young woman as Ribera’s niece who bore Don Juan’s child. Other contemporary sources, including an anonymous diary, claim that Don Juan was in love with Ribera’s daughter but do not give her name or mention that she had a child. The story was in such wide circulation that it was the subject of a popular song. The documentary finds of Prota-Giurleo and other scholars have shown the young woman could not have been one of Ribera’s three daughters, Margarita, Anna Luisa, or Maria Francesca. Ribera’s three daughters all married prominent men. Margarita had already married the judge Giovanni Leonardo Sersale in 1644. Anna Luisa was sixteen or seventeen years old at the time of the episode but she eventually married Giovanni Morgano, the

---

75 Elvira González Asenjo, *Don Juan José de Austria y las Artes (1629-1679)* (Madrid: Fundación de Apoyo a la Historia del Arte Hispanico, 2005), 80.
president of the Cappa Corta of the Real Camera della Sommaria in 1667. Maria Francesco, who was eleven or twelve at the time of the abduction, married Tomasso Manzano in 1667. Manzano was named Captain of Barletta (Apulia) in 1686. In all likelihood his niece, the woman who was sequestered by Juan de Austria was either the daughter of his brother Juan or Rosa Azzolino, a niece on the side of his wife’s family.\(^79\)

De Dominici wrote about how Don Juan de Austria dishonored Ribera by abducting his daughter Maria Rosa. According to De Dominici, Ribera invited Don Juan to his home. He puts on airs for young Juan and entertains him with food and music. De Dominici spitefully notes that the abduction of Ribera’s niece was an apt punishment for Ribera’s arrogance and pride.\(^80\)

According to De Dominici’s narrative, after Juan de Austria seduced his daughter, Ribera sent her off to a convent because he could not arrange a marriage for her. Based on De Dominici’s version of the story, Ribera’s public standing was compromised because of this affair and he “loses face.” What happens then to Ribera’s grand-daughter or grand-niece? A daughter of Juan de Austria who was said to have been Ribera’s grand-daughter (or grand-niece) entered the Convent of Las Descalzas Reales in Madrid as a child in 1656 and professed as Sor Margarita de
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\(^77\) Finaldi, 1995, 84.
\(^78\) Ibid.
\(^79\) The identification of the young woman as Rosa Azzolino has been supported in recent literature. See Carlos José Hernando Sanchez, “Teatro del honor y ceremonial de la ausencia, La corte virreinal de Napolés en siglo XVII,” In vol. I, Calderón de la Barca y la España del Barroco, eds. José Alcalà-Zamora and Ernest Belenguer (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales /Sociedad Estatal España Nuevo Milenio), 617.
\(^80\) De Dominici, 1745-52 (1979), III, 20: “Tra costoro si fece Avanti Giuseppe Ribera, che ambiziosamente (como era il suo naturale) volle farsi conoscere valente nella Pittura, e vedendosi gradito da D. Giovanni, e sapendo, ch’egli si era compiaciuto di andare anche in qualche casa private a divertirli con la Musica, prese l’ardire a d’invitarlo una sera a casa sua. Andovvi D. Giovanni, e fu ricevuto dalla Moglie, e da’figli del Ribera, che ebbero l’onore di baciargli le mani. Indi datosi principio alla veglia, mirò quel Principe attentamente le figliuole di Giuseppe, e ne lodò la bellezza specialmente di Maria Rosa, che veramente era bellissima, e discorse volentieri con lei, e con l’occasione del ballo, volle ononarla danzando seco, in somma acceso di lei vi ritornò il giorno seguente, sotto colore di ammirare le pitture del Padre, ed fine famigliarmente le spiegò il suo desiderio. Ella vedendosi favorita da un tal Personaggio, non si disese; ma più tosto se ne vantò, come è solito delle Donne, quando si veggono amate da Persone di conto, non pensando quanto biasimo apportion al proprio honore. In fine ella fu deflorata da D. Giovanni, che l’arricchi di preziose gioje, togliendole quella dell’onore, cui niun altra puó paragonarsi; E si dic:, che per non esporla a’ rigori del Padre, la condusse nel Regal Palagio, e poi la condusse feco a Palermo, ove decorosamente la pose in un Monistero. Saputosi dal Ribera il vergognoso caso, che non fece, e che non
la Cruz y Austria in 1666. Portraits of the young Margarita survive, including one in the portrait collection of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid.

The rumors and stories that circulated in Naples aggravated Ribera’s dishonor. The culture of honor in both Spain, and, by extension, Spanish Naples profoundly shaped individuals’ identities and behaviors. The abduction and seduction of Ribera’s niece was perceived by the public as tarnishing his honor and implied a loss of social standing, as defined by honor codes that privileged the integrity and right behavior of both the male and female members of the family.81 One can imagine that the rumors about Juan de Austria’s and his niece’s illicit affair and the child it produced probably fueled gossip at court in Naples and Madrid. In addition, Ribera’s loss of honor compounded the many problems affecting the artist in his late career as he was beset by poor health and mounting debts.

However, as Gabriele Finaldi has incisively asked, would Ribera really have been so ashamed of being the grandfather to the granddaughter of the King or least her great-uncle?82 Despite the public shame brought on by this scandal and decline in his personal fortunes that this story might signal, Ribera did petition special favors from King Philip IV. Between August 31, 1651 and September 3, 1652, Ribera petitioned the king to give his recently widowed daughter Margarita some benefice.83
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Ribera’s Ideas about Art and Attitude toward the Artistic Profession

While Ribera’s biographers circulated a number of stories that helped to perpetuate colorful myths and legends of the artist, we still know little about Ribera’s ideas or opinions about art. To my knowledge, no diary or estate inventory has been uncovered. According to Finaldi, Ribera’s will is also lost. The scant, extant correspondence written in Ribera’s own hand does not reveal or yield any insights into his thoughts about art. It has been assumed or held by some art historians that Ribera lacked an erudite understanding of art. However, early modern sources have indicated the contrary – that Ribera’s views about painting were known and apparently were well respected.

The young Ribera’s talent as a painter and his opinions about art were celebrated by the Bolognese master Ludovico Carracci. Carracci corresponded extensively with the Parmenese writer, patron, collector, and amateur dealer Ferrante Carlo. In a letter dated December 11, 1618, Ludovico Carracci wrote that he had been impressed by Ribera’s comments on Carlo’s collection:

It has been an immense pleasure to read your letter, so full of news on the paintings of his lordship, who works continuously, and to learn of the opinions of those painters who have excellent taste, especially that Spanish painter who is a follower of the school of Caravaggio. If it is he who painted the Saint Martin in Parma, who was with Sir Mario Farnese, you should be mindful not to do less for poor Ludovico Carracci. It is necessary to stay informed. I know well that they are not dealing with a naïve person.

Apparently, Ribera’s talent and perspicacity were such that they caused some concern to Ludovico. In the same letter, Ludovico wrote that one of his own clients, Bartolommeo Dolcini, mentioned to him that he wished to show his art collection to Ribera to get the young Spanish painter’s opinion: “Sir Bartolommeo Dolcini greets your lordship and seems to be interested in
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85 Clifton, 1995, 111.
86 Cited in Bottari, 1745-55; Bottari y Ticozzi, 1822-25; Finaldi, 199b2, 236; idem, 2011a, 27 no. 18: Mi è stato di grandissimo gusto sentire dalla sua lettera, copiosa d’avvisi intorno alli quadri di V.S., che vi è la furia di giorno e di note, e sentire li pareri di quelli pittori che hanno un gusto eccellentissimo, particolarmente quel pittore, Spagnuolo, che tiene dietro alla scuola di Caravaggio. Se è quello che dipinse un S. Martino in Parma che stava col signor Mario Farnese, bisogna star lesto che non diano la colonia al povero Ludovico Carracci: bisogna tenerisi in piedi con le stringhe. Io sono bene che non trattano con persona addormentata.”
the opinion of the Spaniard. He said: I wish to show him my paintings to see what he [the Spaniard] says. One must excuse Sir Bartolommeo, as he is in love with his own things.”

According to Finaldi, Carlo’s return letter to Ludovico, that was said to have reported Ribera’s opinions, has been lost.

Although art historians have no direct statements about art from Ribera, some of his views have been passed down by early modern art biographers and critics, most notably the Aragonese Jusepe Martínez’s 1625 interview with the painter culled from *Discursos practicables del nobilísimo arte de la pintura* as previously discussed in chapter two and further in this chapter. Martínez’s passage indicates that Ribera highly valued the art of the High Renaissance, in particular, Raphael’s Vatican frescoes. In fact, Ribera claimed that an understanding of such art was fundamental in educating artists. It is curious that Ribera makes no mention of Caravaggio, an artist whose own radical model of realism had a profound impact on his early style.

Written later in the eighteenth century, De Dominici’s biography of Ribera also related a curious anecdote that might shed light on Ribera’s attitude toward the artistic profession. According to the Neapolitan chronicler, Ribera orchestrated a joke on two Spanish officials who visited him frequently in his studio to discuss alchemy, the philosopher’s stone, and the secret of making gold. Annoyed by their ridiculous ideas and opinions, Ribera said to them that he knew the secret of making gold and if they came back the following morning he would share it with them. The next day the two men found Ribera at work on a half-length painting of *Saint John the Baptist*. When he had finished it, he sent off an apprentice to deliver the work to a certain but unspecified knight. The apprentice returned with a small paper packet. Ribera invited the two officers back to his studio, enticing them with the promise that he would reveal to them the secret of making gold. He opened up the packet and cast the ten gold doubloons sent by his client on a

---

88 Finaldi, 1992a, 4.
table and exclaimed, “Here’s how well I know how to make gold! What alchemy, what gold, what stone? Learn from me how to make perfect gold: I with painting and you by serving his Majesty!”

De Dominici’s telling anecdote underscores that Ribera understood the art market and the profitability of painting. As Christopher Marshall’s recent study of the Neapolitan art market has shown, Ribera was one of Naples’ best paid painters. At the start of his career there, Ribera earned fairly small amounts. For example, he was paid fifteen ducats for a single half-length figure in 1616 and ten ducats for a head in 1620. As he rose to prominence, the prices he commanded for his works rapidly increased. Marshall has rightly noted that the painter’s prices increased “…in part to the more immediate interest in his work among the leading collectors of the day.”  

Ribera earned 100 ducats for a Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew commissioned for a Florentine collector in 1618. His 1623 Pietà for Marcantonio Doria commanded 150 ducats. Ribera’s earnings in the 1620s were among the highest of the period for works painted in oil on canvas. For example, he was paid 500 ducats for the Lichtenstein philosophers, 400 ducats for the 1637 Pietà he painted for the Certosa di San Martino, and 1,400 ducats for the large altarpiece

---

89 Finaldi, 1992a, 6.
90 Finaldi, 1992a, 6; De Dominici, 1745-42 (1979), III, 18-19: “Frequentavano essi la casa del Ribera, da cui anche aveano avuto alcuni Santi dipinti; e discorrendo un giorno del Lapis Philosophorum vantavansi di far divenire oro ogni metallo, ed altercando mille ridocoli argomenti, lo storidivano più tosto, che divertivano: ond’egli per torglisi d’intorno, pensò di far loro una burla, quindi voltatosi verso de’medesimi, disse con aria molto seria; aver egli il segreto di far l’oro, ed anche il Lapis Philosophorum, e che se aveano caro vederlo operare, venissero la matina seguente, che averebbero il tutto osservato, perchè egli dalla sera avrebbe appareciato ogni cosa. Contenti l’Officiali vennero la mattina di buon ora, e ritrovano che il Ribera avea cominciato una mezza figura di S. Gio: Battista, e vedendo che egli non lasciava di dipingere, a volta a volta gli domandavano quando il sarebbe fatta l’operazione promessa, rispondeva il Ribera adenso, nè mai si levò dal trepidio infino a tanto che quella mezza figura non ebbe finita alla prima, e quindi consegnatela ad un Suo Discipolo, gli disse, che la portasse a quel Cavaliere, ch’egli sapea, e si facesse dare qualche già gli avea detto. Partito il Discipolo con la mezza figura, seguitó lo Spagnoletto a dire agli Officiali, che fra breve averian veduta l’operazione, e che al ritorno di quell Discipolo sarea stato da quel Cavaliere provveduto della cosa più importante, e necessaria al segreto; così dunque gli Officiali, benche fusse venuta l’ora del desinare, con gran pazienza aspettavano, sperando veder far l’oro. Tornato finalmente il Discipolo con un involto di carta, il Ribera invitò gli Officiali che più soffrir non potevano ad osservar l’operazione, e condotti in un altra stanza, sviluppato il cartoccio, buttò su di un tavolino diece doble d’oro, che quel Cavaliere gli avea mandate, dicendo loro, ecco come ben so far l’oro: che alchimia, che oro, che lapis, son tutti farsalloni che v’imbrogliano il cervello, e di sarvi venir matti: Apprendete da me come si faccia l’oro perfetto: Io con le pitture, e voi col servire S.M […]”
of Saint Januarius Escaping From the Furnace (1647) for the Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro in Naples Cathedral. However, Ribera’s prices leveled out and slightly decreased toward his late career. His last work for the Certosa di San Martino, The Last Communion of the Apostles, earned him 900 to 1,000 ducats.\(^92\)

**Ribera’s Colorito**

Ribera’s financial but also critical success in Naples is after all due to his innovative style. In their comments on the painter’s style, Ribera’s biographers stress the importance of his coloring (It. colore or colorito and Sp. colorido) and saw it as a fundamental aspect of Ribera’s style. While most modern scholars have rightly tended to think of Ribera as a tenebrist painter who was “born under the sign of Caravaggio,” they have accorded less importance to the painter’s sense of color. Scholars of Caravaggio’s art have dealt with this issue as he too was a painter whose sense of rich, bold color was noted in early modern art biographies but bypassed by modern scholars who have tended to focus either on Caravaggio’s innovative compositions and dramatic tenebrism or on the negative criticisms of his work culled from early modern art biographies.\(^93\)

As an artist deeply influenced by Caravaggio’s system of lighting and deep rich colors, Ribera incorporated these elements into his early Roman works. According to Giulio Mancini’s biography of the painter, Ribera, as a follower of Caravaggio, was even more radical in adopting Caravaggio’s coloring, making it “more tinted and more fierce (più tento e più fiero).”\(^94\)

Among Ribera’s early collectors, Vincenzo Giustiniani commented on Ribera’s command of color and lighting. In a famous letter written to Teodoro Amayden (circa 1617-18), Giustiniani devised a hierarchy of art in which there were twelve kinds of painting, which were ranked on a

\(^{92}\) Ibid.


\(^{94}\) Mancini, I, 249.
scale of easiest to most difficult. In his discussion of the eleventh category of painting, Giustiniani described the challenges an artist faced in imitating the colors of nature. The artists he includes in this category are Rubens, Ribera and Gerrit von Honthorst among others:

The eleventh method is to paint directly from natural objects before one’s eyes. Be warned however that it is not enough to make a mere reproduction. Rather it is necessary that the work be well designed, with fine well-proportioned contours. It must have pleasing and appropriate coloring, which comes from the experience of knowing how to handle colors and almost from instinct, and is a gift granted to few. Above all, one has to know how to give the right light to each part so that the eye is satisfied by the blending of the lights and the darks with alternation of true color and without harming the spirit of the painting. Leaving the ancients aside, those who painted this way in our time are Rubens, Giuseppe the Spaniard [Jusepe de Ribera], Gherardo [Gerrit von Honthorst], Enrico [Henrick Berckmans], Teodoro [Theodore Heemskerck], and others like them. Most of them were Flemish but were active in Rome and had a good sense of color.95

Ribera’s sense of richly, textured color was also praised by the artist and art theorist Francisco de Pacheco: “Antonio Correggio used color very beautifully, and I admire him very much, but the great Titian was superior to all others in color. In our times in Andalusia, Pablo Cespédes used color with the greatest mastery. And now, in the use of color, Jusepe de Ribera, called Españolete in Italy, is the finest to be found.”96 Pacheco also explicitly states that among the three necessary components of successful coloring in painting, relief is the most important element because it shapes and creates forms. While Ribera’s forms might lack beauty or softness, Pacheco praises Ribera’s ability to model forms and paint using colors that are bold and fiercely tinted.97

95 Enggass and Brown, 19.
96 Translated by Véliz, 1986, 75.
97 Pacheco, 404: "Lo más importante de las tres partes en que dividimos el colorido es esta postrera, que es el relieve, de que se tratará en este capítulo: digo que es la más importante, porque tal vez se hallará alguna buena pintura que carezca de hermosura y de suavidad, que por tener esta parte de la fuerza y relieve, y parecer redonda como el bulto y como el natural, y engañar a la vista saliéndose del cuadro, se le perdonen las otras dos partes; las cuales no son tanta de obligación como está, Porque muchos valientes pintores pasaron sin la hermosura y suavidad, pero no sin el relieve, como el Basan, Micael Angelo Caravacho y nuestro español Jusepe de Ribera; y aún también podemos poner en este número a Dominico Greco, porque aunque escribimos en algunas partes contra algunas opiniones y paradoxas suyas, no lo podemos excluir del número de los grandes pintores, viendo algunas cosas de su mano tan reveladas y tan vivas (en aquella su manera), que igualan a las de los mayores hombres (como se dice en otro lugar); y no solo se ve la verdad de lo que vamos diciendo en estos pocos que hemos puesto por ejemplo, pero en otros muchos, que los
Ribera’s coloring was also admired by French Golden Age artists and critics such as Abraham Bosse, André Félibien and Florent Le Comte. However, these writers valued the prevailing style of classicizing art in France and nevertheless reproached the painter for his fundamental Caravaggism.  

While Ribera’s sense of color was praised by many early modern art biographies, De Dominici’s *vita* of the painter notes that Ribera might have altered his later style, with its brighter palette and increased luminosity, partly in response to criticism from artists such as Massimo Stanzione. While De Dominici’s observation is valid, Ribera might have changed his style in response to the demands of his viceregal patrons, who preferred Stanzione.

**Ribera’s Social Status**

Ribera’s biographies not only inform us of the painter’s critical and financial success but also provide insights into Ribera’s social standing and status. Ribera’s statements about the social status of artists living and working in Spain are culled from Jusepe Martínez’s treatise. Martínez recorded his interview in 1625 with Ribera, during which Ribera expressed his ideas about art and his homeland. As the title of the book signals, Martínez’s project focused on elevating the status of painters and painting in Spain, an issue that remained unresolved until the establishment of the Real Academia de San Fernando in 1752. It should be stated that Martínez’s text is also marked by overt, national interests, as illustrated in the final chapter of the book in siguen: que no solo no pintan cosas hermosas, mas antes ponen su principal cuidado en efectar la fiedad y la friereza.”

90 De Dominici, 10-11, 365. As Philip Sohm has noted, “The articulation of motives assigned to artists for willfully manipulating their styles also become more specific in the seventeenth century, as did the range of perceived motives... Examples of artists abound changing styles to suit the tastes or pocketbooks of patrons or to secure an artist’s reputation or his market share. Ribera and Mattia Preti were thought to have brightened their colors and made their style more charming (*vago*) in response to criticism by Massimo Stanzione and “various Neapolitan gentlemen.” In doing so they turned against their “natural tendency” to paint in a Caravagggesque style “con maniera gagliarda” and “alla maniera, forte, anzi terrible.” Sohm, 2001, 133.
which the author expresses his utter frustration with the international status (or lack thereof) of Spanish painting.\footnote{Gross, 17-18.}

Ribera’s opinions about the status of the artist in Spain are largely derived from Martinez’s interview with the artist. Cited in the ninth treatise of his book entitled “how to paint with propriety,” Martinez’s interview with the artist contains insights into 1) the painter’s ideas about history painting, in particular, the importance of Renaissance models that were discussed in chapter 2, and 2) the artist’s view of the low status of painters in Spain. It is worth reexamining an excerpt often quoted in discussions of Ribera’s attitude toward the status of painters and painting in Spain as it directly relates to the issue of the low social status of Spanish artists:

Among various conversational topics, I came to ask him how, seeing himself so acclaimed by all nations, he did not consider returning to Spain, for he could be assured his works there were viewed with great veneration. And his response to me was: [‘] My very dear friend, I desire it very much, by through the experience of many well-informed and sincere persons I find an impediment [to that intent], which is, to, be received the first year as a great painter, but upon the second year to be ignored because, once the person is present, respect is lost; and this has been confirmed to me by having seen several works by excellent masters of [those kingdoms of] Spain held in little esteem, and this I judge that Spain is a merciful mothers to foreigners but most cruel stepmother to her own children.

I find myself well admired and esteemed in this city and kingdom, and my works compensated to my complete satisfaction and so I take the well-known adage to be true: He who is happy, let him remain where he is. \footnote{Martinez, 1950, 100; translated by Finaldi, 239-40; “Entre varios discursos pasé a preguntarle, de cómo viéndose tan aplaudido de todas las naciones, no trataba de venires a España, pues tenía por cierto eran vistas sus obras con toda veneración. Respondióme: amigo carísimo, de mi voluntad es la instancia grande, pero de parte de la esperencia de muchas personas bien entendidas y verdaderas hallo el impedimento, que es, ser el primer año recibido por gran pintor; al segundo año no hacerse caso de mí, porque viendo presente la persona se le pierde el respeto; y lo confirma esto, el constarme haber visto algunas obras de escelentes maestros en estos reinos de España ser muy poco estimadas; y así juzgo que España es madre piadosa de forasteros y cruelísma madrastra de los proprios naturales.” For further analysis of Martinez’s theoretical ideas, see Maria Virginia Sanz Sanz, “La teoria del arte del pintor Jusepe Martinez,” Cuadernos hispanoamericanos 427 (1986): 83-98.}

Some art historians have interpreted this passage as evidence of Ribera’s aloof and disdainful personality. In her monograph on the artist, Elizabeth Trapier Du Gué saw it as an example of
Ribera’s haughtiness and arrogance. Mateo Revilla Uceda and Miguel Morán Turina have interpreted Ribera’s comments quoted in Martínez’s text as the painter’s outspoken criticism of the low regard for local painters in Spain and the preference for foreign art.

The low status of painters was a concern for Spanish artists who sought greater recognition for their art. Unlike their Italian contemporaries, who by the sixteenth century, were successful in elevating the status of artists from mere craftsmen and technicians to intellectuals, courtiers and knights, Spanish painters struggled to achieve a more noble status without much success. Along with unfair market practices established by appraisal methods such as the _tasacion_ and the implementation of the _alcabala_, a sales tax collected on paintings as commodities, the preference for Italian and Flemish painting among royal patrons such as Isabella of Aragon, Charles V and Philip II fueled further resentment and rivalry on the part of Spanish artists. The taste for foreign art still prevailed in the court of Philip IV in the seventeenth century; royal and private art collections brimmed with paintings by famous Italian and Flemish painters such as Titian, Raphael and Rubens.

Writing in the sixteenth century, Francisco de Holanda wrote about the lowly status of painting in Iberia. In his second book on _Da pintura antigua (On ancient painting)_ (1548), de Holanda included some of the disparaging criticisms of the attitude of the Spanish toward painting, culled from the statements of both Giulio Clovio and Michelangelo. However, de Holanda noted that Spanish clients did not pay native artists well and implied that artists were ill-treated, coincidentally echoing Ribera’s own attitude:

> I know that in Spain they do not pay for painting as well as in Italy, and therefore you will be surprised by the large payments, because you are a man who is accustomed to small ones; and I am well informed of this by a Spanish-Portuguese servant I once had. For this reason, painters live here [in Italy] and there are painters here and not in Spain.

---

102 Trapier Du Gué, 3.
And yet, they have in Spain the most genteel nobles of the entire world, and you will find some who enjoy Paintings and who overflow with praise, but if you press them, they will not order a small work or pay the price asked for it; and, what I find worse, they are shocked when you tell them that in Italy there are people who pay so much for paintings.  

Similar to de Holanda’s observations, Ribera’s comments in Martínez’s text imply a level of disdain toward Spanish collectors who favored foreign artists over Spanish ones and are also indicative of the frustration that Ribera and other artists felt with the status of painting and painters in Spain. This is further reiterated in the text of a letter dated May 15, 1610 quoted by Jusepe Martínez in his treatise. According to Martínez, the letter had been sent by an Italian painter named “Pedro Antonio” to his friend Bartolommeo Cavarozzi in Rome where Martínez had seen it and copied it a few years later. The letter quotes a conversation between Pedro Antonio and the court painter Eugenio Cajés when both artists met in Madrid:

[W]here I attempted to meet with our fellow artists, who greeted me with great hospitality and courtesy. And what surprised me was to see how little Spaniards esteemed their own native painters. I was also disappointed to see how two very ordinary Flemish painters, whose works were all bright colors and nothing more, had acquired a great reputation, although in our country they would not cast a shadow. Sympathizing with this miserable state, I spoke with an excellent painter called Eugenio Cajés who responded as follows: ‘Dear Sir, There are many reasons for it, and the first is the little confidence we have in ourselves, and in particular in this profession of drawing. To those who know little of the profession, it seems as if we were not apt in it. And because there are so few intelligent people among the masses, [our talent] never comes to be known. The second cause is all that the gentlemen who go abroad from Spain attempt to bring back great quantities of pictures from foreign provinces, but they take nothing with them when they leave, which, if it were done, would make the value of our talents known.

Cajés’s comments recall Ribera’s opinions, as also quoted by Martínez. Both are indicative of the frustration that he and other artists (including Martínez) felt with the status of Spanish painting and painters. While other professionals’ endeavors, such as those of poets and architects, were well-received and praised, the contemptuous regard with which painters were held in Spain was

104 Francisco de Holanda, *De la pintura antigua* (1548), Madrid (1924) cited in and translated by Falomir Faus, 2002, 231.
maintained by the nobility at court in Madrid and also Naples. These negative attitudes toward painters and painting as a lowly craft can be gleaned from the 1653 ordinances of the elite Order of Santiago (which were reworked from the statutes of 1560):

And by vile and mechanical occupations we mean silversmiths or painters who earn their living at those occupations, embroiderers, stone masons, inn keepers, tavern keepers, notaries who are not employed by royalty, public solicitors, or occupations similar to these, or inferior to these, such as tailors or similar types who live by working with their hands.¹⁰⁶

Furthermore, Ribera’s complaint that noble Spanish patrons preferred foreigners to native artists might cast light on his efforts in attempting to keep foreign artists out of Naples, especially in the case of Domenichino, as he fiercely sought to protect his interests.¹⁰⁷

Based on Martínez’s comments, it has been usually assumed, although wrongly, that Ribera never returned to Spain. However, a recently discovered document indicates that Ribera was called to the court in Madrid and was about to depart for Spain in 1643. An “avviso” dated to January 20, 1643 from the Archivio di Stato in Florence (Mediceo del Principato, filza 4112) states that: “Jusepe de Ribera famous painter has been called by His Majesty to Spain and will on the first occasion.”¹⁰⁸ It remains unconfirmed though if Ribera actually returned to Spain. However, according to Martínez’s interview, Ribera preferred to remain Naples where his reputation had already been well established.¹⁰⁹ In returning to Spain, the artist might have had to experience the vicissitudes of the art market there, conditions that Ribera might have possibly not wanted to have endured.

¹⁰⁷ Clifton, 128, no. 32.
Ribera’s Knighthood

Despite Ribera’s awareness of the low status of Spanish artists, he was clearly aware of his social status and strove to elevate it. Made a knight of the Italian Order of Christ in 1626, he mentions his knighthood in just one signature in his *Magdalena Ventura* (fig. 9) and never refers to himself by the Latin term “eques” as did his contemporary Massimo Stanzio. According to Gabriele Finaldi, Ribera did not think very highly of this title and sought a Spanish knighthood which he deemed more prestigious.\(^{110}\)

Ribera’s knighthood is indeed significant for the raising of the status of Spanish painters. Knighthoods were rare honors for Spanish artists. Only one other Spanish painter – namely Velázquez – was knighted in the seventeenth century.\(^{111}\) Ribera might have possibly attempted to petition for a Spanish knighthood in the Order of Santiago without much success. The Council Order of Madrid required solid evidence of one’s nobility and Ribera petitioned it from a most unlikely source. According to his *Abecedario*, Pierre-Jean Mariette had seen a letter that the painter supposedly gave to a Monsieur Langlois “in which [Ribera] requested that [Langlois] should find out if the diocese of Ausch [sic] there were people of the name de la Rivière so that Lo Spagnoletto could associate them with his own family to magnify his glory.”\(^{112}\)

According to a document that shows that Ribera was admitted into the order of Christ in 1626, he was of noble birth (*de nobili genere procreatus*).\(^{113}\) Some biographers such as Palomino maintain that Ribera hailed from a noble family with its origins in Murcia.\(^{114}\) However, extant documents have indicated the contrary. Ribera came from humble origins as he was the son of a shoemaker. This factor certainly would have barred him from qualifying for a more prestigious

---

\(^{109}\) According to Ribera, as quoted by Martínez, his reputation would have suffered if he returned to Spain. Ribera said that upon his arrival in Spain he would be praised as a great painter his first year there and in his second year there all respect for him would have been lost: Martínez, 1988, 98-100.

\(^{110}\) Finaldi, 1992a, 6.


\(^{112}\) Finaldi, 1992a, 6.

\(^{113}\) Finaldi, 1992b, 240.

\(^{114}\) Palomino, 1987, 121.
title such as the Knighthood of the Order of Santiago.\textsuperscript{115} Later in the late nineteenth century, Lorenzo Salazar had also published documentation that claimed that Ribera hailed from a noble family.\textsuperscript{116}

**Ribera’s Nationality and Nationalism**

Ribera’s own attitude toward his nationality or Spanishness seems paradoxical or ambivalent. On the one hand, he understood that his success as a painter working in Spain might have been limited, given the court’s preference for foreign-born artists. However, Ribera worked his “Spanishness” to his advantage in his signatures. The painter’s insistence on identifying himself as a Spaniard or “español” made his works more marketable in Spain and Spanish Naples. He was able to capitalize on the idea or the allure of a successful Spanish artist who worked abroad.

Yet the perpetuation of myths and fictions about Ribera’s nationality are evinced in Ribera’s biographies and the issue of nationalism is raised in these texts. For example, Pacheco considers Ribera a painter who was a knight of the Order of Christ and a stellar representative of the Spanish nation or “nacion española,” based on Velázquez’s comments.\textsuperscript{117} To my knowledge, Pacheco is one of the earliest writers to make such explicit nationalist claims and to integrate Ribera into the Spanish school or tradition of painting. Palomino maintained that Ribera was “a Spaniard,…a native of Játiva in the Kingdom of Valencia, even though his origins were in Murcia, as is attested to by the last name Ribera, which is Castilian and of a very well-known illustrious family in that Kingdom.”\textsuperscript{118} However, De Dominici claimed that Ribera was the son of a Spanish army officer who was born in Gallipoli in the province of Lecce in Italy, and not Spain.

\textsuperscript{115} Finaldi, 1992b, 231.
\textsuperscript{116} Lorenzo Salazar, “La patria e la famiglia dello Spagnoletto: Nuovi documenti,” *Napoli nobilissima* 3 (1894): 97-100.
\textsuperscript{117} Pacheco, 2001, 191: Añado a esto (por relación de mi yerno, deste año de 1632) que estando el caballero Josefino descontento de su hábito por ser como los demás, lo mejoró con otro que, con una cadena de oro y una espada, le envió el rey de Francia; yo pienso que es de San Miguel. Y Josefe de Ribera (que en Napolés acredita con famosas obras la nación española) lo trae de Cristo, por merced de Pontíficé
\textsuperscript{118} Palomino, 1987, 121-22.
As Finaldi rightly notes, “De Dominici used Ribera’s supposed Italian birth to bolster his characterization of Ribera as vicious, vindictive, and arrogant, for yet another failing in the artist’s character was that he was an inveterate liar because he passed himself off as a Spaniard when he was really regnicolo, that is from the Neapolitan provinces.”119

In Spain and France, though, Ribera’s art and biography were fundamental to national discourses about art. Palomino’s essential biographies of Spanish artists in the eighteenth century and important studies by French art critics such as Frédéric Quilliet helped to establish a distinct Spanish school of painting.120 By the nineteenth century, artists and academicians as well as politicians sought to define the authentic Spanish national character. The great painters of the Spanish Golden Age that include Ribera himself, Velázquez, Zurbarán, and Murillo were deemed exponents of the greatness of the Spanish character. The concept of Hispanidad (“Spanishness”), as described by art historian Oscar Vázquez, is a fundamental element in the way in which artistic identity was constructed in the nineteenth century.121 The historicizing tendency to look to the past in Spanish academic circles meant that greater authority was conferred on the past.

Even though Ribera was relatively well known outside Spain in the early modern era, greater interest in his art was rekindled in the nineteenth century with the exhibition of his paintings in the “Galerie Espagnole” (Spanish gallery) that was established in the Louvre by King Louis Philippe in 1838. The king’s collection represented the art of the realist masters of the Spanish Golden Age that included Murillo, Velázquez, and Zurbarán.122 In France, writings about Ribera’s gritty realism and tormented personality had already been in circulation since the

120 Frédéric Quilliet, Dictionnaire des peintres espagnols (Paris: Chez l’auteur, 1816).
121 Vázquez, 100.
122 For the identification of the Spanish school of painting in nineteenth-century France, see Luxenberg, 2008, 24-30.
seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with the writings of André Félibien and Antoine-Joseph Désallier d’Argenville.123

Ribera’s style and personality exerted a good deal of influence in nineteenth-century France. Ribera’s “legend” inspired various French nineteenth-century history paintings. In the Salón of 1824, Charles Fourier des Ormes exhibited a Landscape Representing a Theme in the Life of El Españoleto (no. 669, lost). Jules Laure showed his Episode from “The Life of Ribera,” which was based on a story by Flora Tristan (no. 1242).124 Robert Fleury exhibited his Scene from the Life of Ribera in the Salón of 1840 (private collection, Lille). A year later Henry Baron included his Infancy of Ribera in the annual exhibition (no. 90, lost). Felix Cottrau displayed his Abduction of Ribera’s Daughter by the Viceroy of Naples in the Salón of 1843 (no. 282, lost). In 1859, Adolphe Aze showed his Ribera Teaching Spanish Chemists How to Make Gold (no. 95). Extant fanciful paintings related to Ribera’s biography include Claudius Jacquand’s A Cardinal Seeks Ribera in His Workshop in Naples (1839, Musée des Beaux-arts, Nantes), Antoine Gibert’s José Ribera Called the Españoleto Exhibits One of His Works in a Public Square in Naples (1863, Musée des Beaux-arts, Bordeaux [exhibited Salón of 1865, no. 896], and Leon Bonnat’s Ribera Making a Drawing on the Steps of the Ara Coeli in Rome (Salón of 1867, lost, known through a reproductive engraving).125

In France, Ribera’s biography inspired Romantic myths and legends. Yet in Spain, Ribera’s vida was fodder for nationalist discourses about art. Ribera was counted among the “Great Men of the Spanish Arts.” This theme was first introduced to the Academy of San Fernando, Spain’s official art institution, in 1871 after the dethronement and exile of Queen Isabella II in 1868 and on the eve of the short-lived Spanish Republic (1873–74). The six-year

124 Rosenberg, 153.
125 These paintings are listed by Rosenberg, 153.
time period of the “Sexenio liberal” (1873-74) saw the emergence of new educational reforms and the foundation of local libraries. It was witness to the new regulations in the Academy. The reform period also saw, too, a re-evaluation or reappraisal of the “genealogy of civic and artistic traditions.”

The formerly defunct project of the “Pantheon of Illustrious Men,” a shrine dedicated to Spain’s national heroes, was rekindled. Art projects such as these fueled Spanish nationalism.

In Spain, Ribera was part of the triumvirate of great Spanish painters that included Velázquez and Murillo, as illustrated by a number of compositions that included Juan José Martinez de Espinosa’s preparatory drawing of The Apothesis of Spanish Art, 1873 (fig. 118). The drawing illustrates a grouping of Spain’s most prominent painters and playwrights in front of a Roman temple front above which reads the inscription “Renacimiento” (or “Renaissance”). The figures who prominently occupy the center of the composition are Velázquez, Murillo, and Ribera, flanked by the painter, sculptor, architect Alonso Cano, Miguel de Cervantes, and the poet Francisco de Quevedo.

The year 1888 marked the third centenary of Ribera’s birth and a pivotal year in the critical reception of the painter in Spain. The occasion was commemorated in Spain by the publication of the first major surveys of the painter’s art. In addition, public monuments were made in honor of Ribera. As discussed in chapter three, the leading Spanish sculptor Mariano Benlliure cast a commemorative medal (fig. 116) which is a fanciful portrait of Ribera. In 1887, Benlliure also made a full-length monument of the painter (fig. 117). These images of Ribera

---

126 Vázquez, 105.
127 Ibid., 105-6.
128 Until the discovery of Ribera’s baptismal certificate by Viñes in 1923 which established Ribera’s birthdate as February 17, 1591, the artist was said to have been born on January 12, 1588.
129 These surveys include A. Dánvila, “Reseña critica de la obras de José de Ribera el Espagnoleta,” Revista de España, Madrid, 1886; Pedro de Madrazo, Homenaje artistico-literario de a la memoria de Josepe de Ribera (el Espagnoleta) en el tercer centenario de su nacimiento (Madrid: Imprenta de Tomás Rey, 1888); and A. Querol, Discurso leido sobre el día 12 de enero de 1888 en la sesión apologetica del insigne pintor José de Ribera (Valencia: Imprenta Domenech, 1888). For the centenaries of Golden Age Spanish at the fin-de-siècle, see María de los Santos García Felguera, “Centenarios de artistas en el fin de siglo,” Fragmentos 15-16 (1989): 71-83.
not only embodied the “Spanishness” that drove the nationalist rhetoric of the artist-hero in Spain but also positioned in him with the broader discourse of “ejemplaridad,” that claimed artists as models of upright moral behavior.\textsuperscript{130}

**Conclusion**

Ribera’s critical reputation was deeply shaped by the biographers who portrayed complex and contradictory “portraits” of the painter. It has not been my intent here to dispel the falsities of these myths but to consider them as they have wrought the critical reception of the painter, especially as they relate to his social status.

Ribera’s talent was recognized early in his career by such commentators as the biographer Mancini and the painter Ludovico Carracci. Ribera’s rank and nobility were praised by Spanish art theorists and artists such as Martínez, Pacheco and Palomino who sought to raise the profile of Spanish painters. However, Ribera’s reputation suffered at the hands of his Neapolitan biographer, De Dominici. De Dominici, who was a classicist and nationalist, sought to elevate the rank of Naples’ native-born artists such as Massimo Stanzione. Owing to nationalist biases, he portrayed Ribera, as Stanzione’s nemesis, and in doing so, generated a negative image of the painter that persisted for almost two centuries. In addition, Sandrart’s “black legend” of the painter circulated an image of Ribera as a painter of dark, violent, and cruel subjects that was further perpetuated by French Romantic artists and painters.

Starting in the eighteenth century and reaching its apogee in the nineteenth century in France and Spain, Ribera’s image would not only be conditioned by Romantic ideals in France but also by nationalist agendas of the period in Spain. Ultimately, cultural politics of the day paradoxically transformed Ribera’s image into that of a tormented artist in France and that of a national hero in Spain.

\textsuperscript{130} Reyero Hermosilla, 1996, 32.
Chapter 5 – Ribera’s Image in Early Modern and Modern Poetry and Plays

Introduction

Ribera’s reputation and critical fortunes were created by the various biographers who wrote about his art and life from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries. In order to create a more nuanced “image” of Ribera, this chapter will consider poems dedicated to the painter by the Neapolitan poets Girolamo Fontanella and Giuseppe Campanile and the Spanish poet Pedro Soto de Rojas. 1 While these poems have been published in modern editions and are known to art historians, they remain to be read in the context of Ribera’s critical fortunes. 2 In this chapter, I specifically consider how these texts contribute to the reception of Ribera’s art and add to his reputation. These writings indicate that Ribera’s art was widely admired by early modern poets and writers and give insight into how Ribera and his paintings were judged. The poems presented here serve as supplementary literary evidence of Ribera’s fame and his talents as a colorist.

Furthermore, this chapter will consider how Ribera’s image might have shaped the perceptions of the artistic profession of the celebrated Golden Age playwright Calderón de la Barca, who was himself a staunch defender of painting and painters. In turn, I shall also consider Ribera’s own familiarity with literature as he drew inspiration from some of Calderón’s plays. Ribera’s critical fortunes fared well into the nineteenth-century. In Spain, he was the subject of Romantic plays that reflect the nationalist ideology and historical imagination of the era and thereby he was transformed into an “artist-hero” of sorts. These literary works enhance our understanding of Ribera’s reputation in Naples and Spain and also provide another means of evaluating the critical reception of Ribera’s art.

---

1 A recent article on the contribution of poetry to the critical reception of Artemisia Gentileschi’s art and career has proven to be a useful model for this chapter on Ribera. See Jesse Locker, “ ‘Con pennello di luce: Neapolitan Verses in Praise of Artemisia Gentileschi,’” Studi secenteschi 48 (2007): 243-62.
2 Silos’ verses were recently reprinted in Epifani, 2007, 254 and Campanile’s poem Schütze, 2003, 52-53.
Ribera and the Poets of the Accademia degli Oziosi

Ribera’s works came to the attention of Girolamo Fontanella and Giuseppe Campanile, poets who were both members of the Accademia degli Oziosi, Naples’ foremost literary academy. The Accademia degli Oziosi was established on May 3, 1611 by Pedro Fernandez de Castro, the Count of Lemos and viceroy of Naples. While an official art academy would not be established in Naples until 1752, this institution was the place for the exchange and dissemination of information, ideas, and opinions and also the locus for literary and artistic matters and debates.

Sebastian Schütze has shown that prominent artists in Naples such as Massimo Stanzione, Battistello Caracciolo, Aniello Falcone, and even Ribera’s father in-law, Giovan Bernardino Azzolino “moved in the academy’s circles.”5 While Ribera’s direct involvement with the academy or association with its poets has yet to be established firmly, it is plausible that Azzolino or one of his viceregal patrons introduced him to prominent members of the Academy.6 Given Ribera’s membership in the Roman art academy, it makes sense that he might have sought the company of fellow academicians in Naples.7 Schütze has also rightly suggested that Ribera’s mythological subjects, most famously the Drunken Silenus, appealed to the taste of members of this literary elite.8 The painting’s possible ownership by the erudite Salernitano and its subsequent popularity as a reproductive etching was perhaps owed to its appeal to a literate or literary
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7 Schütze, 1992, 209-226.
9 For Ribera’s participation in the Accademia di San Luca, see Gallo, 1998. The extent of Ribera’s involvement in the Roman academy when he resided in Naples remains to be assessed. Ribera’s association with the academy did remain important to him based on the fact that he continued to sign himself as “academicus.”
10 Schütze, 2001, 416.
audience. In addition, some of Ribera’s independent half-length, haggard philosophers, “whose [sense of] serene detachment from the pain and fears of life” and whose ability to laugh at human vanity in the midst of adversity, might also have appealed to the tastes of the “idle” poets and thinkers of the Neapolitan academy.

Despite the cultural influence exerted by the Neapolitan academy, little biographical information is known about either Girolamo Fontanella (1612-1643/44) or Giuseppe Campanile (d. 1674). Girolamo Fontanella’s first work, L’incendio rinovato di Vesuvio, was published in Naples in 1632. He wrote three books of verse that include his Ode (Bologna, 1633, and Naples, 1638), Nove ciele (Naples, 1640), and Elegie (posthumously printed in 1645).

Giuseppe Campanile was an established poet and academician who was a member of the Accademia degli Oziosi and author of the Notizie de nobilità (Naples: Luc’Antonio Fusco, 1672). In his Notizie, Campanile compiled a history and genealogy of Naples’ nobility and prominent citizens. The publication supposedly contained references to Neapolitan academies; however, that section is sometimes missing from it. In his Dialoghi morali (1666), Campanile refers to himself as an “academico Umorista e ozioso.” The epithet “umorista” suggests that Campanile might have also been affiliated with Accademia degli Umoristi, the most prominent literary institution in Rome. The academy was established in 1607 and was active until 1670. Its members included the poets Giambattista Marino; Antonio Bruni; Ottavio Tonsarelli; the papal secretary Cassiano del Pozzo; Pope Urban VIII, his nephews, their entire intellectual retinue; and
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10 De Miranda, 230. See also Alain Tapié and Regis Cotentin, Portraits de la pensée (Paris: Chaudun, 2011).
13 Giuseppe Campanile, Dialoghi morali, dove si detestano le usanze non buone di questo corrotto secolo (Naples, 1666).
most of the leading Italian poets of the day. The panegyric poem about Ribera’s works appeared in print fourteen years after the painter’s death as Campanile’s Ode was published in 1666.

Much of the poetry written in Naples in the seventeenth century was influenced by the poet Giambattista Marino. Marino’s celebrated Galleria (Venice, 1619) provided an important model for the poets of the Accademia degli Oziosi. The Galleria contains poems that are all based on real and, or, fictive works of art. In the Galleria, Marino also drew on the established topoi of famed ancient artists such as Apelles, Zeuxis, and Parrhasios who were exceptionally skilled at painting trompe l’oeil or highly illusionistic paintings. Marinisti (or followers of Marino) such as Fontanella and Campanile also followed similar themes. For example, Fontanella wrote verses on the works of other artists including Massimo Stanzione, Guido Reni, and Artemisia Gentileschi in his Nove Cieli.

Fontanella’s Ode to Ribera’s Saint Jerome

Fontanella’s ode to Ribera’s Saint Jerome was published in 1646 in his Nove Cieli. Ribera and his workshop specialized in the subject of Saint Jerome with at least twenty-two autograph paintings, three etchings, and four drawings. One of the four fathers of the Church,
Saint Jerome was renowned for the Vulgate, his Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible. The image of Saint Jerome as a cardinal and scholar was popular during the Renaissance. During the Counter Reformation, greater emphasis was placed on the saint as an ascetic, whose retreat into the wilderness and ritual self-mortification with a stone was a model of saintly atonement and penitence. The renewed popularity of the saint in the seventeenth century was further fueled by the publication of a new edition of the Vulgate in 1592 by Clement VIII.

Fontanella’s sonnet does not describe a specific image of Saint Jerome but instead focuses on Ribera’s ability to paint a vivid and naturalistic portrayal of the saint:

>Pretence it is not, but truthful here if you look  
At the marvel of a sweet work of art  
Deprived of feeling, from man steals feeling  
And mute speaks and senseless breathes  
All eyes turn to such a beautiful work of art  
And Nature does not know how to find itself  
Art doubts itself, and, in one gentle figure,  
Enviously admires your beautiful art.  
Perhaps an angelic hand amongst us  
Of every well-made part has expressed,  
That heaven knows to paint only celestial heroes.  
But Fame turns pale in every way  
That Riviera made it so that he could afterwards  
With his miracles make Art even more beautiful.

Fontanella’s ode refers to Ribera’s painting as “a marvel of art.” The notion of the marvelous – a term that not only refers to nature’s wonders but also the artist’s representation of it – was an element essential to producing compelling works of art. It was an idea that was well accepted by Ribera’s time as it had been long advanced by Giorgio Vasari in connection with Leonardo da Vinci’s art. The concept of the marvelous also was integral to Marino’s poetics. The references to the marvels of Ribera’s art in Fontanella’s poem follow Marino’s concept of meraviglia, or marvel, wonder, surprise, or the extraordinary, and the Marinisti (or Marino’s followers) such as
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21 Ibid.  
22 See Appendix IV for the original Italian text.
Fontanella followed suit. Furthermore, Marino’s notion of the marvelous is often described in terms of a reader’s or viewer’s experience of and response to a work of art which is stimulated by artistic virtuosity and technical ability. Fontanella’s poem, though, not only incorporates the Marinist conceit of the marvelous but also sets up a paragone (or rivalry) between the artist and Art itself. Ribera’s “truthful” forms in depicting Saint Jerome are such that Art itself begins to doubt its own capacity and is envious of the expressive power of the painter’s style. According to the poet, the “miraculous” or transformative power of Ribera’s brush has the ability to revive Art so that it is ultimately more beautiful.

While Fontanella does not identify the version of Saint Jerome that he viewed, he might have known Saint Jerome and the Angel of Judgment (1626, Museo e Galleria Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples, fig. 119). According to De Dominici, the painting hung in the Church of SS. Trinità delle Monache, for which Ribera also painted a large-scale altarpiece of the Trinitas Terrestris.

Ribera’s humble Saint Jerome is a model of saintly learning and erudition. In this example, Saint Jerome is depicted with a skull, a stone (for the penitential ritual of self-mortification), and a parchment scroll with Hebrew letters (a reference to the Vulgate). His wrinkled, tanned, bare-chested body has been exposed to the elements and his lower body is covered with voluminous red robe. The saint, who was probably in the midst of study or prayer, is interrupted and startled by the Angel of Judgment, who blows his horn as a proclamation of the end of days.

Fontanella admires the skill that Ribera employed and refers to the work as a “marvel of art.” Fontanella’s fascination with Ribera’s Saint Jerome reminds one (following James Clifton’s perceptive interpretation of the painter’s naturalism) that Ribera’s works “are never
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24 Pagano, 1992, cat. 17, 78.
limited to a transcription of experiential reality, although the artist consistently employed that expectation on the part of the viewer to concretize the transcendent meaning of his works.”

Clifton further observes, “In any case, it would be presumptuous to assume that Ribera was unconscious of the conflict between strict imitation of the model and historical verisimilitude, between an experiential naturalism and a historical naturalism; rather it seems that in the Saint Jerome … he is visually playing on the ambiguity and on the viewer’s expectations, thereby provoking a contemplation on the very concept of naturalism.”

Fontanella was not alone in making the association between Ribera’s artful naturalism and the element of the marvelous. Ribera’s unusual portrait of Magdalena Ventura (fig. 9), which he painted for the third Duke of Alcalá as Viceroy of Naples, had also been perceived as a wondrous object. On February 11, 1631, the Venetian Resident of Naples wrote a letter describing a visit in the vice-regal palace during which the Viceroy showed him the painting as it was nearing completion:

In the apartments of the Viceroy there was a most famous painter making a portrait of an Abruzzese woman, married and mother of many children, who had a completely masculine face, with more than a palmo of the most beautiful black beard and a completely hairy chest; His Excellency took pleasure in showing her to me as a marvelous thing, and truly she is such.

Ribera’s incredible skill at depicting forms and figures convincingly was compared to that of the Greek painter Zeuxis whose art was known for its striking illusionism. Ribera’s skillfulness was such that it earned him the nickname “Spanish Zeuxis” that was conferred to him by the poet Giuseppe Campanile.

---

26 Ibid, 114.
Paintings in Campanile’s Poem

Giuseppe Campanile’s poem gives us a further sense of how Ribera and his works were viewed by his near-contemporaries in Naples.\(^{28}\) Campanile’s poem is dedicated to Antonio Matina, a canon of the former church of Santa Restituta in Naples.\(^{29}\) Matina is one of the lesser known figures of seventeenth-century Neapolitan cultural history. Few primary sources mention him and many aspects of his biography remain unclear. It is known that Matina was close friends with Carlo Celano, the author of the famous guidebook, *Notizie del bello, dell’antico e del curioso della città di Napoli* (1692). According to Celano, Matina’s erudition was exceptional and he had special interests in history, literature, poetry and theater. Matina also possessed a library and an art collection.\(^{30}\) Antonio Bolifon’s obituary of Matina published in his *Giornale di cose memorabili* (1701-2) reveals that the canon was compiling *vite* of noted Neapolitan painters.\(^{31}\) While Matina’s manuscript has been assumed to be lost, the artists’ biographies contained in it might have been consulted by De Dominici.\(^{32}\)

\(^{28}\) The full text of the poem appears in Appendix IV.
\(^{29}\) The church was incorporated in the fabric of the Cathedral of Naples.
What the relation was among Campanile, Matina, and Ribera is difficult to assess given the scarcity of information on both Campanile and Matina. Nevertheless, Campanile cites at least six works by Ribera whose subjects consist of literary and mythological themes, derived from both classical and early modern texts. With the exception of the *The Death of Adonis*, the paintings cited in the poem are untraced, unrecognized, or entirely fanciful and could be deemed as *favole dipinte*. However, Campanile’s choice of subjects suggests that he thought of Ribera as a painter of erudite, literary topics. The paintings described by the poet purportedly belonged to his friends (who are all unnamed) as stated in the dedication of the poem: “Si celebra il Pennello di Giuseppe di Rivera, e si discorre sopra alcune pitture di quello, che si vedono nelle Case di carii Amici dell’Autore.” The myths represented in the paintings praised by Campanile include those of Dirce, Lycus, and Antiope, which is based on the ancient Greek playwright Euripides’ *Antiope*, the story of Olympia and Bireno from the Italian poet Ludovico Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*, and references to the stories of Venus and Adonis and Apollo on Parnassus from the *Metamorphoses* by the Roman poet Ovid that were later the basis of the early modern poet Marino’s *Adone* and *Galleria*.

In the first stanza of Campanile’s poem, Ribera is presented as a Spanish Zeuxis who animated form who “merits the praise of European painters.” Campanile’s praise of Ribera as the “Spanish Zeuxis” allows one to draw important parallels between these two painters. Zeuxis, like Ribera, was known for his intense modeling of form and color. In fact, the Roman writer Quintillian praised Zeuxis for his invention of chiaroscuro modeling. In his *Natural History*, Pliny the Elder recorded a famous competition between Zeuxis and his rival Parrhasios in the creation of optical illusions. Both artists held a contest to determine which one of the two was the greater painter. Zeuxis painted a still-life of grapes that was so appealing that birds flew down from the sky to peck at the lusciously painted fruit. When Zeuxis asked Parrhasios to pull the
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33Campanile, 1666, “Ispano Zeusi in animar Figure, / A ‘Pittori di Europa i pregi involi; / Che se t’ingegni à linear I Poli, / Fan l’Arte insuperbir le tue Pitture.”
curtain aside to reveal his work, Zeuxis realized that the curtain itself was a painted illusion. When Zeuxis conceded victory to Parrhasios, he remarked, “I have deceived the birds, but Parrhasios has deceived Zeuxis.”

The rivalry between these painters also points to Zeuxis’ and Parrhasios’ different styles of painting, the former emphasizing form and depth and the latter line and shade. These contending models of painting not only divided the ancient models but also early modern ones. The long-standing rivalry between Ribera and Domenchino discussed in chapter four is just one example. Furthermore, the reference to Ribera as Zeuxis also supports the idea of the nobility of painting in Spanish Naples, and, by extension, Ribera as a noble practitioner of the art.

Campanile praises Ribera’s extraordinary skill as a coloriasta. Ribera’s brush is able to animate even the morbidness of death as Campanile “claims” in the second stanza of the poem: “Dai col vivo color morte a la Morte.” The following three stanzas all describe unknown or imaginary paintings by the artist. The third stanza of the poem relates an episode from Euripides’ Antiope in which king Lycus traverses the river Thebes. The poet then describes the Nereid Galatea driving her chariot with her sea nymphs in the fourth stanza. The painting in the fifth stanza derives its subject from Bireno’s desertion of Olympia in Ludovico Ariosto’s Orlando Furioso.

The sixth stanza of Campanile’s poem sensitively describes Ribera’s Venus Discovering the Death of Adonis, the only painting mentioned in the poem of which there is a known signed and autograph version (fig. 120, 1637, Rome, Galleria Nazione d’Arte Antica di Palazzo Corsini). Although whether Campanile knew this canvas or another version is not known, he relates the
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35 Ibid., XXXV.xxvi.65
36 Javier Portús Peréz has discussed how these literary references made by poets in the Golden Age aided painters in gaining public support for their profession: “Una introducción a la imagen literaria del pintor en la España del Siglo de Oro,” Espacio, tiempo y forma 12 (1997): 173-97.
tragedy of Adonis’ death. Campanile vividly depicts Venus’ reaction to Ribera’s representation of the scene. Ribera’s masterful ability to portray the power of tragedy is evinced by Venus’ dramatic reaction to the canvas: “O cruel Heavens, who has ever so vividly expressed my pain?”

Ribera’s Venus Discovering the Death of Adonis depicts one of the better known tragedies from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (10:708-739). Venus warns her lover Adonis of the perils of the hunts, beseeches him not go, and goes as far as to restrain him. Adonis, ensnared by the thrill of adventure, resists her and ignores her warnings. During the hunt, Adonis is fatally wounded by a wild boar that was goaded out of its lair by the hunter’s hounds.

In the Corsini version of the subject, Ribera chooses the moment in which Venus discovers Adonis’ dead body. Suffering pervades the mood of Ribera’s Venus Discovering the Death of Adonis. Ribera powerfully conveys the goddess’s pain through color. The golden sunset is contrasted to Venus’ red hair and scarf and the bright red mantle on which Adonis lies. The intense drama of the moment is made palpable in Venus’s pained expression and gesture as she dashes through the air to reach her beloved and realizes that he is dead. The lifeless Adonis lies on the ground. His hunting spear is partially obscured by a shadow and one of his dogs cautiously sniffs his back.

In addition to Ovid, Ribera might have also known the narrative from Marino’s principal work, *L’Adone* (1623). At 41,000 lines long, it stands as one of the greatest epic poems of the seventeenth century. Marino’s epic not only contains an expanded version of the myth of Venus and Adonis but also relates other chivalric and mythological tales. As Jeanne Chenault has observed, one important detail in Ribera’s canvas accords with the Neapolitan poet’s description nella “pinacoteca” poetica di Marino e la “galleria regia” dell’Orlando Furioso nella letteratura artistica,” *Studi rinascimentali* 7 (2009/2010): 119-33.

38 Campanile, 1666. “Se di Adon miro il tragico successo / Talor rappresentato in sú le tele, / Par, che Venere esclami: O’ Ciel crudele, / Chi così vivo ha il mio dolore espresso?”
of Adonis’s death in which Marino wrote that Adonis was wounded on his right side, not in the groin as stated in Ovid. Marino’s allegory thus conflates the dead Adonis with the crucified Christ who was also wounded on his right side. In Ribera’s painting, the wound is barely visible along Adonis’ right side just above the red drapery.

Aside from the autograph version in the Corsini Gallery, Ribera made various versions of the subject. The version of Venus Discovering the Death of Adonis in the Cleveland Art Museum is unsigned and the attribution to Ribera has long been questioned. Fernando Bouza has plausibly suggested that the Cleveland Death of Adonis (fig. 121), while painted by an anonymous artist, followed Ribera’s original for the Duke of Medina de las Torres as Viceroy of Naples and was recorded in an estate inventory of 1641.

Other representations of Ribera’s Venus and Adonis are mentioned in seventeenth-century documents and remain untraced, precluding a definite identification of the version Campanile knew. One version was commissioned by the Count of Monterrey as Viceroy of Naples and was recorded in his estate inventory of 1653. The Aragonese protonotary of Aragon, Jerónimo de Villanueva, bought a Venus and Adonis from Rodrigo Tapia for the decoration of the Buen Retiro Palace in 1634. A large canvas of Venus and Adonis was also listed in the dowry contract of September 21, 1677 of Micaela Zapata Chacón in Madrid at the time of her marriage to the Marquis of Mortara. Jeanne Chenault has also rightly noted that a Perseus by Ribera in
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40 Unlike the version of Ribera’s The Death of Adonis in the Corsini Gallery, the Cleveland painting shows Venus in green, gold and purple draperies lamenting the dead Adonis who lies upon a red robe, his body dramatically foreshortened with outstretched arms on either side. One of Adonis’ hounds appears in the foreground. In the upper left corner, Venus’ chariot is drawn by doves that are tied with cords to its bow. Putti are shown restraining the board. A hunter in the upper right corner appears to be an onlooker. The painting accords well to the entry in the 1641 inventory of the Duke’s collection that states: “Un’altro quadro con la figura d’Adone morto con una ferita al fianco con un spedo di caccia, e cano con quattro figure de puttini, et una Venere con carro appresso co’paese e tronchi con cornice d’oro transforata di lunghezza di palmi, e larghezza di mano del sud.” In Fernando Bouza, “De Rafael a Ribera y de Nápoles a Madrid. Nuevos inventarios de la colección Medina de las Torres-Stigliano (1641-1656),” Boletín del Museo Nacional del Prado 27 (2009): 64, no. 74.
41 Felton, 1982, cat. no. 23, 180.
the 1686 and 1700 inventories of the Alcazár of Madrid was actually a Venus and Adonis, since
the description says, “he is dead and a weeping goddess places a garland of flowers upon his
head.”

The eighth stanza offers further praise of Ribera as a famous painter. Campanile writes
that Apollo arises in Parnassus and praises Apelles, whose “splendor is the pride of the Iberian
people.”

Ribera had famously referred to himself as “Apelles” in the long inscription on his
renowned portrait of Magdalena Ventura (fig. 9), an established topos for court painters of the
highest rank.

The tenth and eleventh stanzas are dedicated to Matina and Ribera respectively.
Campanile’s lines record Matina’s own possible desire for eternal fame and renown. The poet
concludes with further praise of Ribera’s talent as a proficient colorist thus attesting to Ribera’s
enduring fame in Naples after his death.

Ribera in Silos’s Pinacotheca sive romana picture et sculptura

Ribera’s posthumous reputation and the success and acclaim with which his works were
still met in Rome are also evinced in Giovanni Michele Silos’ three epigrams on the painter’s
Christ Preaching Among the Doctors, Penitent Magdalene, and Saint John the Baptist Preaching
in his Pinacotheca sive romana picture et sculptura (Rome, 1673). In general, Silos’ ekphrases
describe some of the most famous works in the collection of Vicenzo Giustianini including those
by Ribera. With the exception of the Saint John the Baptist, Ribera’s Christ Preaching Among
the Doctors and Penitent Magdalene described in Silos’ ekphrases are two among the thirteen
works by the painter that were owned by Vincenzo Giustiniani. As Gianni Papi has noted, the

42 Chenault, 1971, 76.
43 Campanile, 1666: “Sorga Apollo in Parnaso, e lodi Apelle, Che lo splendor fu dela gente Ibera. . .”
44 Campanile, 1666: “Avido tra’ colori, io non sò come / Ozioso ne stai: alza l’ingegno; / Lascia il Pennello.
Il tuo canoro legno. / Può di RIVERA immortal ail nome.”
45 Salerno, 1960, 26.
Riberas in Giustianini’s collection might have been painted while the artist was in residence in Rome and were purchased later by the collector. The subjects of the two of the poems, the penitent Magdalene and Saint John the Baptist, in particular, correspond to two of the major themes of the art of the Counter Reformation which Ribera painted frequently and for which he was famous.

Ribera’s Christ Preaching Among the Doctors in Silos’ poem has been recently identified by Papi with a work in the 1638 inventory of the collection of Vincenzo Giustianini (fig. 122, c. 1612-13, Church of Saint Martin, Langres). The subject of the painting, which is also referred to as “The Finding in the Temple” or Disputation, is described in Luke 2:40-52. When Jesus was twelve or thirteen, he accompanied Mary and Joseph on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the celebration of the feast of Passover. On the day of their return, Jesus remained in the temple while Mary and Joseph headed back home presuming that Jesus had left ahead of them. When Mary and Joseph realized that Jesus was missing, they returned to Jerusalem and searched for him. They found him three days later in the temple, where he was engaged in discussion with the temple’s elders who were amazed at his learning given his young age. Ribera’s depiction of Jesus’ discussion with the doctors is one of his most complex history paintings that incorporates a variety of figures in dramatic and expressive poses. The composition is striking in its dynamic arrangement of thirteen figures in a single plane with the young Jesus surrounded by inquiring scholars.

Silos’ poem sensitively presents the Ribera painting, which might have been based on the poet’s direct knowledge of the work. Silos describes Jesus as a tender youth in the “first flower of
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47 Papi, 2011, cat. 7, 116-18; Salerno, 1960, 96, no. 46. “Un quadro grande in forma di sopraporto con Christo, che disputa nel tempo con molte figure intiegre dipinto in tela, alta palma 9 lar. 13 in circa di mano del Spagnoletti senza cornice.”
his age” surely based on Ribera’s compelling portrayal of the boy. The young Jesus appears to the right, pointing at the men in the temple and looking directly at the viewer. The wise men in the temple are visibly astounded by the boy’s precociousness but are also put to shame by his wisdom and profound learning. Ribera poses his figures in a variety of actions that reflect his interest in capturing the wide range of these men’s emotional responses. The non-idealized appearance of these figures indicates that they are also based on the study of models whose features reappear in other Roman works by Ribera. An older man with graying hair to the left is semi-draped and holds a heavy tome in his lap. His serious and wrinkled visage is reminiscent of Ribera’s Toronto Saint Jerome (fig.76). The profile of the younger man dressed in red who turns to speak to an older, bearded man recalls that of Ribera’s Saint Thomas (Fondazione di Studi di Storia dell’Arte Roberto Longhi, Florence). The wrinkled, aged man draped in yellow to the far right reminds one of the wizened, knife-wielding Saint Bartholomew that formed part of an early Apostolado or apostle series (Fondazione di Studi di Storia dell’Arte Roberto Longhi, Florence).

Ribera’s conceptualization of the men’s different expressions underscores his interest in the affetti, and his ability to paint a range of emotions is displayed in this early painting. The representation of the affetti, or passions, conveyed by physical gestures and movements of the body, was not only integral to Renaissance art theory but also to that of the Baroque. Both Alberti and Leonardo considered it an essential component of painting. By the seventeenth century, the term “passions” was more common as painters such as Ribera and also Caravaggio were interested in representing figures in heightened emotional states. In response to Ribera’s dramatic presentation of the figures, Silos’ poem illustrates a range of emotions evoked by the painting. The young Jesus’ words are mature, measured, and contain the essence of persuasion.

48 Silos, 1673: “Primo flore aevi Dominus puerilibus annis / Quae non didicerat, promit, et ore docet.”
while the elderly doctors of the temple are astonished by his poise and wisdom. The last line of the poem further expresses Silos’ response to Ribera’s remarkable skill. The poet proclaims “That we, Painter, are amazed by this work.”

Silos also emotionally responded to Ribera’s Penitent Magdalene that is also listed in the 1638 inventory of the Giustiniani collection. Ribera frequently painted the subject of the Magdalene, the dissolute woman who repented and retreated to a hermitage where she devoted her life to prayer and penance. The Magdalene appears in at least twenty autographs works (including drawings and a print) painted by Ribera and, or, his workshop. She is depicted as a single figure or in a supporting role in multi-figure compositions such as The Lamentation over the Dead Christ (123). While Giustianini’s Madgalene remains to be identified securely, examples that Silos possibly knew (figs. 124 and 125) show a young Mary Magdalene fully absorbed in the act of meditating upon a skull or praying with her hands folded on top of the skull in a melancholic posture. Silos’ ekphrastic poem about Ribera’s Magdalene not only vividly illustrates the powerful experience of viewing such devotional images but also how such a painting aided in the visualization of such sacred subjects in the early modern era:

The celebrated Magdalene, who, in the flower of her youth, Inebriated with her own beauty, languidly enjoyed many pleasures, Now sober, laments that very beauty, and detesting her dissolute behavior Seeks out other delights. Don’t you see? Tears have become her sweetest pleasure, And a skull supports her inclined head.

On the one hand, the tears that run down her cheek annul her former sins,

51 Silos, 1673: “Hoc nos, Pictor, opus cernimus attoniti.”
52 Salerno, 1960, 96, no. 76. “Un quadro sopraporto d’una Maddalena, che piange, e tiene appoggiata la testa, sopre una testa di morto alta pal. 4 lar. 9 in circa. di mano di Spagnoletti senza cornice.”
While on the other, the skull teaches her to live in a saintly fashion.
And thus it seems that, thanks to the artist’s skill, the Magdalene
is rendered more beautiful by the skull and more chaste by her tears.54

As Gabriele Finaldi has perceptively noted, the poem presents the Magdalene as a paradoxical figure who was both a sinner and saint, a contemplative and an ascetic who was considered a model of conversion and penitence. Silos rhapsodizes that the Magdalene’s tears of repentance provided her with greater pleasure than her former, sensual ones. The skull, a symbol of death and human frailty, offers a stark foil to her sensuous beauty. Furthermore, it is the painter’s skill and talent, or “Ingenio Artificis,” that makes this image of the Magdalene visually persuasive.55 The last two lines of the poem continue to emphasize Ribera’s ability to achieve a “visual counterpoint” in which the viewer experiences rather paradoxically a sense of “pious pleasure.”56

Another one of Silos’ poems responds to Ribera’s Saint John the Baptist. At least eight versions of the subject by Ribera, either autograph or copies, have been identified. According to extant inventories, Giustiniani did not own one of Ribera’s versions of Saint John the Baptist. Which version Silos directly knew is unascertainable as Ribera only began to paint the subject in the 1630s when he was residing in Naples. To my knowledge, Ribera did not produce an etching of this subject.

However, Silos’ description of the young Baptist in the wilderness accompanied by a lamb best accords to Ribera’s signed, undated Saint John the Baptist (c. 1637-40, North Carolina

55 Finaldi, 2011a, 22.
According to Silos’ description, the young Baptist is a great preacher whose words teach the world. Ribera paints a young, gentle John who is draped in a red cloth and whose lower body is covered with a hair cloth. His shepherd’s staff is a traditional, long reed cross. He is seated on a rocky ledge. John leans to his left and points to the lamb. John looks out directly at the viewer, commanding him or her to behold the Lamb of God with his expressive gesture. Ribera might have known Caravaggio’s brooding young saint (Saint John the Baptist, 1604-5, Kansas City, The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art) but the lighter, silvery tonality and illuminated landscape in the background of Ribera’s canvas are more reminiscent of Bolognese examples, namely Guido Reni’s Saint John in the Wilderness (1640-41, London, Dulwich Picture Gallery).

Ribera and Spanish Poets and Playwrights

While Ribera’s direct association with the poets Fontanella, Campanile, and Silos is difficult to assess, as a court painter in Naples, Ribera did come into contact with the poets who were secretaries to the Spanish viceroys and in residence at the court. As discussed in chapter one, Ribera surely met the poet and viceregal secretary Francisco de Quevedo when the latter accompanied the Duke of Osuna to the Neapolitan court. Ribera’s own older brother Jerónimo has been said to have been a poet in his own right and dedicated a sonnet (written in Italian) to Quevedo upon his arrival in Naples on September 1616. The painter also knew the Mallorcan

---

57 Silos, 1673: “Egressus syluis post longa silentia Diuus, / Grandi velatum praedicatore Deum. Commonstratque Agnum digito, sub vellere puro/ Cui niuei mores, nullus & ore dolus. Scilicet, hoc Agno docetis mansuescere mundum, / Definat ut faeuis moribus esse Leo, \loannem pinxisse putas, Ribera, sed Agni / Expressit vocem sedulius iste labor.” Non clamasse soris, non fat clamasse per urbes; / Clamat & hac tabulà, & nobile laudat opus.”
59 Quevedo was also a member of the Accademia degli Oziosi when he resided in Naples. See Félix Fernández Murga, “Francisco de Quevedo, Academico oicioso,” In Homenaje a Quevedo: actas de la II Academia Literaria Renascentista, ed. Victor G. de la Concha (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1982), 45-52.
poet, Antonio Gual, who was secretary to the Duke of Medina de las Torres, one of Ribera’s prominent viceregal patrons. Gual also collected works by Ribera, owning four canvases: *San Anthony Abbot* (1644, Palma de Mallorca, Can Vivot); *The Rest on the Flight into Egypt* (c. 1644, Palma de Mallorca, private collection); *Saint Andrew the Apostle* (Palma de Mallorca, private collection); and *Saint Peter in Meditation* (Palma de Mallorca, private collection).

While Quevedo and Gual and their respective contemporaries such as Lope de Vega praised painters such as El Greco and Rubens among others, surprisingly they did not write about Ribera. Only the Grenadine poet Pedro Soto de Rojas mentioned Ribera in his *Paraíso cerrado para muchos. Jardines abiertos para pocos* (*Paradise closed for many, Open gardens for a few*), which was published in 1652, the same year the painter died. Although published in modern editions, the short poem has gone unnoticed in the literature on the painter. Pedro Soto de Rojas (1584-1658) was born in Granada and attended the university there receiving a degree in theology in 1610. While he was in residence in Madrid, he belonged to a literary academy, the Academia Selvaje, and assumed the pseudonym *Ardiente* (Sp. for “ardor” or “the ardent one”). While in residence in Madrid, he wrote his *Discourses on Poetry*. There he met the celebrated poets and playwrights Lope de Vega and Luis de Góngora at the Spanish court. Both Lope and Góngora were bitter rivals who disputed the merits of their respective literary styles. It is known Soto de

---

Both Jose Milicua and Gabriele Finaldi have identified the poet Jerónimo de Ribera as Ribera’s older brother who may have been living with him in Rome in 1615 (Milicua, 16, no. 12, and Finaldi, 1995, 31-32). The sonnet was published in P.A. Tarsia’s *Vida de Don Francisco de Quevedo y Villegas* (1658-62, reprinted in Quevedo 1932-43, II, 741-79). Tarsia said that Jerónimo de Ribera was one of the most accomplished men of letters in Naples (“los mas insignes en todo género de letras”) and was one of Quevedo’s closest friends in the viceroyalty. The sonnet appears below:

Mentre spiego novello Icaro audace / Al ciel de le tue lodi illustri in volo, / Il temarario ardir trà scorno, e duelo, / Al insoffribil peso ecco soggiace; / Ahi, che pensar dovea, quand’il vivace / Raggio del tuo splendor, ch’ammiro e co,

Francesco, horche m’aveggio, ch’a la vera / Meta del tuo gran metro, e del valore / Altri giunger non può chi’aquila altera. / S’altro non posso, al tempio del tuo onore / Humil m’inchino, e con la fè sincera


---

Rojas “sided” with Góngora. After his residence in Madrid, Soto de Rojas returned to Granada and was appointed canon of the church of San Salvador by 1616.\textsuperscript{61}

Soto de Rojas, like his contemporary Luis de Góngora, was an adherent of culteranismo, a type of poetry that was characterized by elaborate metaphors, complex constructions, and ornate language, often filled with euphemisms and mythological allusions. The sixth “mansion” or section of Soto de Rojas’ poem is dedicated to exphrases of paintings. The verses identify works in his collection that hung in a room on the lower floor of his home, the Casa de los Masacarones.\textsuperscript{62} The poet describes a marine landscape and a mythological painting of Pan with a nymph. He also mentions still-life paintings or bodegones by Blas de Ledesma. In describing the mimetic qualities of Ledesma’s paintings, he refers to the ancient topoi of Zeuxis and Parrhasios. Soto de Rojas also names two pictures by a “Bassan” and a certain “Alberto.” “Bassan” could be the Veneto painter Jacopo Bassano whose works were collected in Spain or possibly Pedro de Orrente who was nicknamed “Bassano español.” “Alberto” could refer to Albrecht Dürer whose prints were widely collected in Spain, to Antonio Alberto, a Ferrarese fifteenth-century Italian painter, or Bartolomé Alberto, a seventeenth-century Valencian artist who painted the frescoes of the Church and Convent of Orihuela.\textsuperscript{63}

Following the description of paintings in his home, Soto de Rojas then turns to the art of Ribera. In a seven-line stanza, Soto de Rojas celebrates Ribera’s status as a professional painter in Italy. The poet mentions that a late signed work dedicated to him by Ribera was displayed as the second work on the main wall of a room or “testero.”\textsuperscript{64} While Soto de Rojas praises Ribera’s art and fame, he does not mention any specific works by Ribera in his verses. To my knowledge,

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 125-26, no. 99.
\textsuperscript{63} Aurora Egidio suggests these artists as the ones that Soto de Rojas refers to in his poem. Ibid., 125-6.
\textsuperscript{64} Soto de Rojas, 1652 (1981), 127: Después ya que en la Italia generosa / lugar tomó el primero, / de la segunda pieza en el testero, / al justo dedicado, / pone, y su nombre al bronce encomendado, / Jusepe de Ribera / de su pincel en la estación postrera.
there is no documentary evidence of Soto de Rojas’ art collection in the form of an estate inventory. Nevertheless, as Aurora Egidio observes, Ribera’s realistic, half-length figures of anchorites and penitent saints such as Saints Jerome and Peter might have appealed to Soto de Rojas as the theme of solitude and retreat is repeated in his verses.

Ribera and Calderón de la Barca

In addition to the artistic literature considered in chapter four and the poems in the first part of this chapter, major Spanish Golden Age plays and texts also deal with the image of the painter, most notably the playwright Calderón de la Barca’s *The Painter of His Dishonor* (*El pintor de su deshonra*, 1640s). The second in a trilogy exploring honor, Calderón’s *Painter* has been well studied by scholars of Spanish Golden Age literature but merits further critical attention by art historians. It has been noted that Ribera might have been the model for Juan Roca, the painter-protagonist of Calderón’s play. In this section, I consider Calderón’s literary portrayal of the painter and the actual reality of painters’ experiences in Spain and Spanish Italy as can be understood from Ribera’s example. Ariadna Garcia-Bryce has written that, “Calderón de la Barca’s *The Painter of His Dishonor* makes sustained use of painting as a metaphor for the unstable relationship between seeing, and representing, and understanding. Its function as a lofty vehicle of knowledge and social fashioning is thereby questioned.” Calderón’s play not only defines an art theory that emphasizes major stylistic elements and themes of the Spanish Baroque such as tenebrism, the use of live models, but also “foregrounds the epistemological limitations as well as the social violence inherent in sensorial transmission.” Calderón’s later *Memorial dado a los profesores de pintura* eloquently voices his sustained defense of painting and painters.

65 It is known that Soto de Rojas owned a library and that his house was surrounded by extensive gardens. For a reconstruction of the gardens, see Andrés Soria Olmedo, “Paraiso cerrado para muchos, jardines abiertos para pocos,” In *Jardines y paisajes en el arte y en la historia* (Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1995), 245-58.
Although signed on July 8, 1677, postdating Ribera’s death by twenty five years, the *Memorial* is an important document that further delineates the playwright’s art theory and his support of painting as a liberal art.\(^69\)

Calderón’s profound interest in painting is well documented. His own collection of 119 paintings, drawings, and prints, inventoried shortly after his death by the court painter Claudio Coello, attests to his interests in collecting.\(^70\) While no firm evidence points to the fact that Calderón and Ribera knew each other personally, both men were certainly aware of each other. It is safe to assume that both men were familiar with each other’s works through court connections. Although Ribera spent his mature career in Naples, his works were well-represented in the Spanish royal collections. Calderón was in residence at the court of Philip IV and indubitably saw Ribera’s paintings first hand.

Calderón’s *El pintor de su deshonra* reflects the playwright’s interest in painters and painting. Set in Naples, the play’s principal protagonist, Don Juan Roca, is a talented painter who has married his much younger cousin, Serafina. Unfortunately, his love is unrequited: Serafina does not love him and has married him only after the death of Don Alvaro, to whom she had been secretly engaged. The couple visits the Governor of Naples, Alvaro’s father, whose daughter Porcia is Serafina’s best friend. Serafina confides to Porcia that she is unhappy and is unable to forget Alvaro. In a surprising twist, the Prince of Ursino appears with Alvaro, who apparently was rescued from a shipwreck. Although still in love with Alvaro, Serafina is resolute not to dishonor her marriage to Juan. As the play unfolds, her tears and confused emotions mislead Alvaro into thinking there is still hope for him. The Prince of Ursino, Porcia’s suitor, catches a glimpse of the beautiful Serafina and falls in love with her.

\(^{68}\) Ibid.  
Serafina returns home, resigned to being Juan’s faithful wife. When Juan is briefly absent from the house, Alvaro enters but is met with Serafina’s resistance. Juan suddenly returns, and Alvaro barely escapes the house. At a carnival party, Alvaro, in disguise, dances with Serafina, and she rejects him again. A fire breaks out, and in the confusion of the scene, Alvaro abducts Serafina to Spain and imprisons her at his father’s country estate. In the meantime, Juan Roca mistakenly concludes that Serafina has abandoned him for Alvaro and sets off for Barcelona to avenge his honor. Juan disguises himself as a humble painter when returns to Spain. While in Barcelona, the Prince of Ursino accidentally meets Serafina. Still attracted to her, the Prince commissions a painter, whose works he has been buying, to hide in the bushes and make a portrait of Serafina. The artist is Juan Roca in disguise. From his hiding place, Juan recognizes his wife. As Alvaro courts Serafina, Juan shoots both of them. The painter offers the sight of their murdered corpses as “a painting sketched in blood by the hand of one, the painter of dishonor” and the fathers of both Serafina and Alvaro find no fault with Juan who has “defend[ed] his honor.”

There are important parallels between the fictional reality of the play and Ribera’s own. Juan Roca, the painter-protagonist of The Painter of His Dishonor, is a noble Spanish painter residing in Naples, similarly to Ribera. Calderón’s play begins with Juan Roca’s arrival from Barcelona at the home of his friend Don Luis in Naples. The city is a fitting locale for the drama’s subject matter given its importance as a center of artistic production in Southern Italy, a vital source of paintings for developing the Spanish’s crown collections in the seventeenth century, and the seat of the Spanish viceroyalty in Italy. It has also been suggested that the supposed rape of one of Ribera’s close relatives – presumably his daughter or his niece – by Juan
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de Austria, Philip IV’s illegitimate son, might have been a source of inspiration for the abduction of the painter’s wife Serafina in The Painter of His Dishonor.\textsuperscript{72}

While such speculation is difficult to prove or to discount entirely, Calderón’s drama evokes the milieu of artistic production and collecting in seventeenth-century Naples. An avid collector of paintings, the character of the maecenas, the Duke of Ursina loosely recalls the Duke of Alcalá, and his patronage of the painter Juan Roca, whom he addresses as “Español” (2673), brings to mind Alcalá’s patronage of Ribera. Roca’s moniker also parallels Ribera’s nickname, Espagnoletto, and Ribera’s own reference to his Spanish nationality in his numerous signatures. As discussed in chapter one, among Ribera’s most important patrons and collectors was the third Duke of Alcalá, who served between 1629 and 1631 as the viceroy of Naples. As Jonathan Brown and Richard Kagan have documented, while Alcalá’s tenure as viceroy in Naples was unsuccessful, it represented a fruitful period in the development of his art collection. In the three years he resided in the city, the Duke acquired about seventy-six pictures, attributed to great Renaissance masters such as Titian, Raphael, Michelangelo, and Leonardo.\textsuperscript{73} As discussed in earlier chapters, the Duke had also directly commissioned Ribera’s Magdalena Ventura (fig. 9) and acquired at least four philosopher portraits from the artist.

Whereas the correspondences between fictional characters and real-life individuals are compelling, the play’s characterization of the art market and the status of Spanish painters offers further insight into the historical reality of the period as it was perceived in the play. As Laura Bass rightly observed in her recent study of Golden Age portraiture, “On a deeper level, the drama’s introduction of the figure of the professional painter within the aristocratic social structure paves the way for its commentary on socioeconomic stagnation.”\textsuperscript{74} While Calderón’s

\textsuperscript{72} Laura R. Bass, The Drama of the Portrait: Theater and Visual Culture in Early Modern Spain (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008), 68.

\textsuperscript{73} Brown and Kagan, 237-47.

\textsuperscript{74} Bass, 68.
play is part of a trilogy concerned with the pervasive theme of honor, Bass also demonstrates that the play is also deeply engaged with the broader, artistic culture of the period:

Juan Roca’s disguise [as a humble artisan upon his return to Spain] marks another one of the stress points in the socioeconomic structure of the drama. As we have seen, one of the biggest preoccupations of seventeenth-century Spanish painters was the ennoblement of their art (and themselves), which they sought with the support of writers including Calderón. Yet while the dramatist himself argued for the nobility of painting, his character Juan Roca still ascribes to an aristocratic value system that makes working as a professional painter – that is, for money – incompatible with a nobleman’s status. In Calderón’s *The Painter of His Dishonor*, Juan Roca’s disguise marks another one of the stress points in the socioeconomic structure of the drama.75

Thus, Calderón’s play introduces an interesting geographic nexus, i.e. the journey from Naples to Barcelona, in which the ideal, noble painter has to undergo a marked transformation upon his return to Spain. Though aspects of Ribera’s biography might have inspired Calderón’s presentation of Juan Roca, Ribera’s status as a prominent court painter who was well paid for his works and a knight of the Order of Christ does signal a change or attitude toward the social status of painters and complicates our view of artistic identity in the Golden Age. The attitudes toward the market system and artistic culture, which are accurately represented in Bass’ comments, reflect those of Baroque Madrid and the Spanish court in Naples, where a social stigma was still attached to the artistic profession.76

As Carmen Ripollés has recently argued, the fashioning of artistic identity in Spain and, by extension, Spanish Italy, was a complex process: “While constructions of artistic identity in the seventeenth century promote the assimilation of artistic values, they simultaneously endorse alternate forms of distinction and production that challenge the notion of the noble artist.”77 Geography might partly account for the professional success of Ribera, for a greater regard for painters in Italy compared to Spain apparently reflects a cultural predisposition toward the arts, which promoted more positive public perceptions and attitudes. However, Spanish attitudes

75 Bass, 72.
76 Ibid., 69-72.
toward painters and painting prevailed in the Neapolitan court. Furthermore, unlike the fictional Juan Roca, Ribera’s notion of artistic nobility was shaped by an alternate model in which economic success in the marketplace was compatible with traditional aristocratic values. This new paradigm for artistic identity was promoted not by the writings of Calderón, but those of rival playwright Lope de Vega, in his *El arte nuevo de hacer comedias* (*The new art of writing theater*) (1609). The *arte nuevo*, which was addressed to the Academy of Madrid, was simultaneously and paradoxically was an appeal to Madrid’s elite and a defense of the commercial nature of theater as a form of entertainment for the masses. 

While direct contact between Calderón and Lope and Ribera respectively has yet to be firmly established, Calderón’s *Painter of His Dishonor* suggests that the playwright was familiar with the painter and with some of the less honorable aspects of his reputation, namely the supposed abduction of his daughter or niece by the king’s son discussed in chapter four. It also seems that Ribera was also familiar with Calderon’s plays. As already mentioned earlier in this dissertation, the subjects of two of Ribera’s major works, *The Vision of Belshazzar* (fig. 91) and *Jacob’s Dream* (fig. 127) were inspired by Calderón’s plays. Other painters also turned to Calderón’s plays for inspiration, most famously Velázquez whose large-scale, history painting of *The Surrender of Breda* (1634-35, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado) was based on the playwright’s *El sitio de Breda* (1609).

Ribera completed his canvas, *Jacob’s Dream*, in 1639, four years after the appearance of Calderón de la Barca’s celebrated play *La vida es sueño* (*Life is a Dream*) (1635). Ribera depicted an episode from the Book of Genesis (28:11-22) recounting the dream of Jacob, who, on his way to Haran, saw a Heavenly Ladder on which angels were ascending and descending. In seventeenth-century painting, there are various representations of the ladder as an important element. However, Ribera places greater emphasis on the figure of the shepherd who is sleeping

---

77 Ripollés, 15.
against the rocks. The ladder is just slightly suggested in the golden-streaked clouds in the background. Ribera’s poetic presentation of Jacob dreaming echoes Calderón’s powerful presentation of the psychology of dreaming in *Life is a Dream*. In his soliloquy, the protagonist, the imprisoned prince Sigismund proclaims:

This is true; so we must repress this savage character, this fury, this ambition, just in case we dream again. And that will happen sooner or later, for we live in such an exceptional world that living is no more than dreaming; and experience teaches me that he who lives dreams what he is until he is waking.\(^{79}\)

This work by Ribera has particular interest because it conspicuously avoids the usual iconography of Jacob’s dream, involving the ascent to the Heavens on a ladder. Instead, the dream is hazily suggested by vaporous, golden figures who might almost be part of the real sky. But the setting of the dreamer, and the play of light on Jacob’s sleeping face, illustrates an ominous and mysterious mood to the scene that suggests Ribera’s familiarity with Calderón’s play.\(^{80}\)

Discussed in chapter three, Ribera’s *Vision of Belshazzar* (fig. 91) not only contains a remarkable signature but its subject relates to themes in Calderón’s plays. Although the theme of the painting is unusual in Neapolitan and Spanish Golden Age painting, the subject does appear in Spanish Golden Age plays. The same biblical episode was staged as an auto-sacramental, or a morality play, entitled *La cena del rey Baltasar (The Feast of King Belshazzar)* in the Palace of the Buen Retiro by Calderón de la Barca in 1634, a year before Ribera produced his painting for the Archbishop’s Palace in Milan.\(^{81}\) In Calderón’s play, King Belshazzar has married Vanity and Idolatry. The prophet Daniel is sent by God to warn Belshazzar to repent, giving him three warnings; on each occasion Belshazzar almost repents but cannot give up his brides. At a feast given by Belshazzar, Daniel comes as a guest, accompanied by Death disguised as his attendant.

\(^{78}\) Ibid.
\(^{80}\) Calderón’s plays were translated into Italian and performed in Naples. See Dinko Fabris, *Music in Seventeenth-Century Naples: Francesco Provenzale* (1624-1704) (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 160.
Death gives Belshazzar a poisoned drink to kill his soul, and then draws his knife to slay his body. They fight, and Belshazzar is dragged away by Death. He calls to Vanity and Idolatry to help him, but they are powerless.

In Calderón’s *La vida es sueño*, the education of the prince and the usurpation of political power are major themes. In a similar vein, Calderón’s allegorical *Feast of Belshazzar* serves a warning to kings and princes that political might is transitory and can be easily usurped. Interestingly enough, Ribera chose two themes that also appear in Calderón’s plays that deal with political power and authority, albeit his focus is on liminal images that he might have drawn from these plays.82

**Ribera in Nineteenth-Century Literature**

Unlike the fortunes of other Spanish Golden Age painters that peaked in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but declined into the nineteenth century, Ribera’s art and career continued to captivate the imagination of English and French Romantic poets and writers such as Lord Byron and Théophile Gautier who were fascinated by Ribera’s cruel scenes of martyrdom.83 These writers continued to fuel the “black legend” of Ribera that has its origins in Sandrart’s seventeenth-century biography of the painter. Although available in published editions, Spanish nineteenth-century plays on Ribera have received very little attention from Ribera specialists. As such, Ribera’s image in nineteenth-century Spanish plays, in particular, remains to be studied better. The choice of subjects drawn from the Spanish Golden Age in nineteenth-century Spain
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was re-contextualized, whereby these historical images accorded with the project or myths of nation-building in Spain.\(^{84}\)

The archetype of “the artist” was one of the central subjects of Spanish Romantic art and literature from 1830 to 1840, but remains to be considered more fully by art historians. The artist was of interest as a cultural exemplar in early nineteenth century Spain because of his status or condition as one of the principal makers of the “glory of the nation.” This concept subsequently gets grafted to the Romantic notion of the artist as a solitary genius or creator.\(^{85}\) As Susana Vedovato Ciaccia notes, at least eight plays in which the protagonist is generally referred to as “the artist” in the title were published and performed in Spain between 1830 and 1850.\(^{86}\) Between 1835 and 1895, four plays were written about Jusepe de Ribera, making him the favorite artist of Romantic playwrights in Spain, followed by the Spanish Golden Age painters Alonso Cano, Zurbarán, Murillo, and Velázquez and then the Italian Renaissance and Baroque artists Michelangelo, Cellini, Raphael, Pietro Torrigiano, and Salvator Rosa.\(^{87}\) The plays about Ribera include Jacinto de Salas y Quiroga, *El Spagnoletto* (1840); E. Asquerino, *Ribera el Espagnoletto*, (drama performed in Valencia in 1857 and unpublished); José Velázquez y Sánchez, *José Rivera* (1875); and Ricardo Vicente del Rey, *El Españoleto*, (1894). While these playwrights could avail themselves of reliable, published art biographies such as those written by Palomino and Ceán Bermúdez, they were not interested in them as a matter of fact or history but as fodder for the myths and romances that inspired their highly imaginative plays. The nobility of the painter and the universal recognition of his genius are some of the themes that drive these Spanish Romantic plays.


The sustained interest in Ribera was also spurred by the collecting activities of prominent grandees in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Manuel Godoy, Charles IV’s minister, was said to have owned forty-five paintings by Ribera. The nineteenth century was also witness to the creation of a Spanish national school of painting. In shaping the canon of early modern art, critics and historians saw Ribera as one of the major exponents of Spanish realism.

As José Álvarez Lopera rightly observes, Spanish nineteenth-century playwrights also chose these artists as the subjects of their plays because of their fascinating personalities or “the strength of their characters.” These artists had eventful lives as they were the perpetrators or victims of crimes as in the case of Cellini, were the victims of cruel fates or injustices as in the case of Alonso Cano who was wrongly accused of murdering his wife, or, as in the case of Raphael, were famous for their love affairs. In Salas y Quiroga’s and Vicente del Rey’s respective plays, the young Ribera falls in love with a young woman and enters into duel with an arch-rival to win her love. In this section, I will focus on select themes presented in Salas y Quiroga’s and Vicente del Rey’s respective plays, that specifically deal with the shaping of Ribera’s image in nineteenth-century Spain as they relate to themes I explored in my discussion of Ribera’s biographies in chapter four: his quest for fame and social status and the related issues of honor, pride, and nationalism.

Salas y Quiroga’s *El Spagnoletto* is set in seventeenth-century Florence, not Naples, with an unusual cast of characters that include Count Andrea Pisano, Ribera’s arch-rival, whose name recalls the celebrated thirteenth-century sculptor but resembles him in no historically accurate way, and the architect Filippo Brunelleschi, who also appears as an anachronistic, supporting...

89 Maria de los Santos García Felguera, *La fortuna de Murillo (1682-1900)* (Seville: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1989), 225.
90 Álvarez Lopera, 380.
character. The first scene and act of Salas y Quiroga’s play opens with a soliloquy in which the ambitious and young Ribera states his aspirations to become a famous and successful painter. He has painted a *Saint Jerome*, a subject for which the real Ribera was renowned, for entry into an exhibition that he hopes will help him to establish his reputation in Florence:

My canvas is ... I have conquered ... oh, holy glory
Heaven reserves me its glory!
From the man I have learned,
Self-mortification and penitence.
This is Saint Jerome! ... his eyes
Reveal faith, his flesh abstinence.
Give me, give me a laurel for my brow,
And I will deeply make my mark in the world

I burn my wings in my cruel poverty
Come to me, o Canvas: help me, I want to soar
Until I reach her
I want to be rich and opulent and great
And tell me rapt in my madness:
We are all equal before the world, the same;
Yes, you have inherited your riches from your parents,
and I have earned my mine with my hands;
And we both have equal nobility;
Yours made with the power of your grandparents
And mine with my brushes and palette (I, 1)\(^91\)

In these lines, the playwright gives voice to Ribera’s desire for wealth, status, and nobility and emphasizes that Ribera will achieve this by means of his art instead of through an inheritance.

The lines also refer to the Marquesa, the woman with whom Ribera falls in love, and of whom the Count Andrea Pisano is enamored too. Count Andrea Pisano challenges Ribera to a duel, which he gladly agrees to in act two, scene four. The related concepts of honor and social status central

\(^91\) Mi lienzo está...vencí...bendita gloria, / La gloria que los cielos me reservan!
Al hombre he comprendido del estudio,  De la maceracion y penitencia. / Es este San Geronimo! ... Sus ojos / Revelan fé, sus carnes continencia. / Dadme, dadme un laurel para mi frente,
Y honda en el mundo imprimiré mi huella [...] / Mis alas quemo en mi cruel pobreza
Ven a mí, o lienzo: ayúdame, yo quiero / Subir hasta llegar a ella / Quiero ser rico y opulent y grande / Y decirle arrobado en mi demencia: /Iguales somos ante el mundo, iguales;
Si, de tus padres con tú con las riquezas, / Yo con las que mis manos han ganado;
Y tenemos también igual nobleza; / Tú la de abuelos poderosos, Y la de mis pinceles y paleta (I, 1)
to identity and self-fashioning in the seventeenth century are revisited here in Ribera’s confrontation with the Count:

We are alone, sir.  
You are young and a gentleman; 
You will not forget, I hope 
The hard law of honor.  
You were bold 
With the woman I love; 
I am returning to defend her honor  
Speaking more is not necessary. (II, 4)\(^\text{92}\)

Furthermore, Ribera’s national pride and his identification with his native land are proclaimed in three lines in which the painter claims: “Never has my hand shook, / Because my arm is Castilian, / And my soul is Spanish.”\(^\text{93}\) The playwright here identifies Ribera’s identity as Castilian, not Valencian, thus identifying him with a more uniform concept of Spanish national identity.\(^\text{94}\)

The play also specifically deals with the issues of spectatorship and the viewing of art objects. The third act is set in the Medici gallery decorated with different paintings and statues. Curious visitors look at the objects in the collection. A painting by Ribera, described in the play as standing at four feet in height, shows Saint Jerome praying in the desert. Many visitors appreciate Ribera’s new work that is on display. Among the gallery visitors are Leoni (whether it is Leone or Pompeo, the sixteenth-century sculptors, remains to be identified) and Brunelleschi, who proclaim their admiration of Ribera’s new painting in the Medici gallery. While in the gallery, Brunelleschi offers ebullient praise of Ribera as a painter of an extraordinarily realistic portrait of the saint:

My Lord! My eyes deceive me!  
What! Has Titian been resurrected!  
What morbidity in the flesh!  
What correctness of the hands!  
Those eyes filled with inspiration

---

\(^{92}\) Ya estamos solos, señor. / Jóven sois y caballero; / Que no olvidareis, espero / La dura ley del honor. / Anduvisteis temerario / Con la mujer que adoro; / Yo vuelvo por su decoro / Hablar mas no es necesario. (II, 4)

\(^{93}\) Nunca a temblado mi mano, / Que mi brazo es castellano / Y mi alma es española (II, 4)

And those lips with penitence
Who is, fellow Florentines,
The painter of this miracle? \(^{95}\)

Brunelleschi’s declaration that the painting is a “miracle” suggests the continued association of
Ribera’s realism with notions of the marvelous: that his brush enlivened the surface of the canvas
with animate, flesh-like forms.

The play concludes in scene four of act three, when Ribera appears before Count Andrea
Pisano, the Marquesa, and the Prince of Urbino. Ribera’s art is praised by the prince and the
count. They honor the painter by crowning him with a wreath of laurel. The Marquesa, in turn,
asks Ribera to sign a Saint Jerome, which he painted, to which the painter graciously acquiesces.

Unlike Salas y Quiroga’s play, Vicente del Rey’s is set in Naples at the end of the
seventeenth century. The play follows a similar theme in that the young Ribera falls in love with
a young woman whom he pursues. Nevertheless, the play deals with the very same themes
encountered in Salas y Quiroga: the myth of national identity and character, honor, status and
purity of blood.

In act I, scene IV, the playwright introduces Ribera and correctly identifies the birthplace.
In this scene, Ribera nostalgically rhapsodizes about his birthplace:

And in Játiva, in Valencia
In the land where the sun
always shines the brightest
and where God left a copy
of paradise on earth. \(^{96}\)

In the following act, Ribera arrives with his canvas and brushes in hand, tired and dismayed by
his current circumstances. He is presented as an artist who is struggling to achieve a modest
modicum of success and whose genius cannot be bound by the forces that be:

\(^{95}\) Mi Dios! me engañan mis ojos!.../Que! resucitó el Ticiano? / Qué morvidéz en las carnes!
Qué correccion en las manos! / Los ojos de inspiracion / De penitencia los labios
Quien es, quien es, florentinos / El autor de este milagro? (III, 2)
When has artistic genius yielded to the norms of his time? It is the burden of art, and you are seeing it, detours everywhere, jealousies and ambushes, and selfishness And later, if ever genius is impeded, its brightness is then dulled by flattery and Bribes, and praise and servility.  

He further vents his frustrations that if he is not successful in Naples, he will soon depart for Spain:  

I do not deny it; my enthusiasm is abated by the cold blow of chilly reality If I cannot achieve my hopes, as I fear, I will return to Spain this very day. Begging if necessary, As I am poor in hope, But rich in disappointments.  

The play though ends with Ribera’s happy union with his beloved, Angelica, and Ribera boldly proclaims his name. One of the supporting characters shouts “español” while another character confers him the nickname “españoleto,” affirming Ribera’s nationality.  

Conclusion  

Ribera’s art captured the imagination of early modern poets and playwrights. This chapter has considered how Ribera’s art and fame were celebrated in early modern poems and plays, which have been little studied, and has also examined odes and epigrams that concentrate on subjects made famous by the painter. Fontanella’s praise of Ribera’s Saint Jerome and Silos’  

---  

96 Y de Játiva, en Valencia En la tierra del sol / Brilla siempre con más fuerza, / y donde Dios dejó copia del paraíso en la tierra.  
97 Act II, scene XI: ¿Y desde cuándo á la edad / el genio se ha sometido? / Es el calvario del arte,/ ya lo estaí viendo, desvíos / por todas partes, y envidias / y emboscadas, y egoísmos. / Y luego, si alguna vez se impone el genio, á su brillo, / adulaciones, y ofertas, y halagos, y servilismos.  
98 Act II, scene XI: No lo niego; mi entusiasmo / se apaga ya al soplo frío / de la fría realidad. / Si aquí tampoco consigo / dar cima á mis esperanzas,/ como estoy temiendo, hoy mismo / de España el camino emprendo, / mendigando si es preciso; / y si en esperanzas pobre en desencantos muy rico.
exphrases are powerful examples of how viewers responded to the compelling realism of his works. In particular, Silos’ sensitive meditation on Ribera’s early Christ Among the Doctors and evocative response to the painter’s The Penitent Magdalene and Saint John the Baptist Preaching not only shed light on Ribera’s effective portrayal of emotions but also on the power of painting in the shaping of religious experience in the early modern era. Even though Campanile’s panegyric ode describes what might be imaginary paintings attributed to Ribera, the poet’s effusive praise of the painter attests to Ribera’s posthumous fame. In Spain, knowledge of Ribera’s reputation was surely shaped by Calderón’s presentation of the painter and the artistic profession in The Painter of His Dishonor.

While Ribera’s relation to literature and also to the literati of his day, whether it is to the poets who were members of the Accademia degli Oziosi or to the poets who were in residence at the vice-regal court, remains to be established more fully, Ribera’s paintings reflect his interest in literary themes. Celebrated by the poet Campanile, Ribera’s Venus Discovering the Dead Adonis borrows elements from Marino’s epic, L’Adone. It is tantalizing to think that Ribera might have been the model for Calderón de la Barca’s painter-protagonist in The Painter of His Dishonor, and the portrayal of the painter in Calderón’s play in fact establishes an important paradigm for the nobility of painters and painting. Furthermore, the plays of Calderón also inspired major canvases by the painter such as the Vision of Belshezzar and Jacob’s Dream.

Ribera’s image also prompted a range of varied responses from different audiences in the nineteenth century. Whereas the image of Ribera as a painter of cruel themes of martyrdom fueled the imagination of English and French Romantic poets, Spanish playwrights presented the painter as an artist-hero whose image was conditioned by historical myth and legend. In conclusion, in examining Ribera’s relationship to literature, we can find fruitful ways to consider how poets and playwrights contributed to the shaping of the painter’s reputation and the critical reception of his art.
Conclusion

The social status of the artist remains a fundamental topic in the study of early modern Spanish art history. Through the seventeenth century, artists in Spain strove to be recognized as intellectuals and their profession as a noble one, rather than being regarded as mere artisans and their art as craft. Ribera’s case offers an alternative presentation of the narrative of the status of Spanish painters. Paradoxically, the painter was able to achieve a higher social status because he left Spain for Italy, cognizant that painters and paintings were more fully valued in Italy. As can be gleaned in a now famous quotation from Martínez’s interview, Ribera was fully aware that success as an artist might not have been fully attainable in Spain given his cultural and economic circumstances.

My own approach to understanding or constructing Ribera’s artistic identity also considers the general discourse of artistic nobility and aristocratic values. Ribera served the Spanish viceroys who ruled Naples and acted as their de-facto court painter. The viceroys were the highest patrons in Naples and representatives of the king. The viceroys also served as agents who collected art on behalf of the Spanish Crown and exported numerous paintings and sculptures that were housed in Spanish royal complexes and palaces such as the Alcazár, the Escorial, and the Buen Retiro. Ribera’s prominence as a court painter in Naples, I would argue, served as an important model for Velázquez’s own quest for status. Both artists met in Naples in 1630: Velázquez was a young and ambitious court painter and Ribera was already a well-established artist who had been recently knighted by the Italian Order of Christ in Rome in 1626. Although Ribera’s artistic identity and the trajectory of his career are quite distinct from Velázquez’s, Ribera’s achievement of a knighthood did provide an important example for the young Velázquez.

This dissertation has focused on the ways that Ribera fashioned his artistic identity through a number of different strategies. As discussed in chapter one, Ribera took practical steps to ensure his commercial and financial success by becoming a court painter to the viceroys,
building a professional diversification as a painter and printmaker, making forays into the art market, acquiring property, developing marketing strategies, and, more importantly, earning a knighthood. This case study of Ribera offers a distinct model for the nobility of the Spanish painter, one in which commercial success was not necessarily incompatible with nobility.

Ribera’s intellectual self-fashioning is evidenced in his cultivation of a style of naturalism that not only draws from the powerful model of Caravaggio but that also demonstrates the painter’s engagement with the art of the Renaissance, as discussed in chapter two. For the most part, Ribera is best known as the painter par excellence of the Catholic establishment in Naples and his graphic violent subject matter has informed a popular perception that Ribera did not have any intellectual leanings, without interests in literary or theoretical issues. This has been a pervasive generalization of the painter that has persisted in the art historical literature. As evinced in his novel philosopher portraits and his mythologies, his naturalism does not necessarily reject classicism but rather seeks to re-interpret it. Furthermore, as a vice-regal painter, Ribera worked for grandees who had fairly sophisticated tastes and humanist interests, as was clearly the case with the Duke of Alcalá. Ribera cultivated a “learned naturalism” that appealed to these high-ranking patrons. Ribera emerges in my research as an artist of great pictorial intelligence, who in his paintings, drawings and prints, created striking reinterpretations of the antique and works by Renaissance painters including Leonardo, Albrecht Dürer, and Titian. Ribera was well aware of classical topoi and signed himself as Apelles in the famed inscription of his Magdalena Ventura (fig. 9). The Neapolitan Baroque poet Giuseppe Campanile praised him as the “Spanish Zeuxis.” Ribera’s etchings for a didactic anatomical treatise, although limited in number, proved to be influential and were circulated in a number of engraved copies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The main vehicle of his self-fashioning was his signature that figures prominently in his work. Ribera demonstrated remarkable consistency in signing his work. In chapter three, I have carefully considered the importance that Ribera accorded to his signature as a marker of his
identity. Through his varied and often lengthy signatures, the painter signed himself as an academician to promote himself as an established and learned painter in his Latin signatures. His Spanish signatures, with their insistence on his “Spanishness,” illustrate how he cultivated his personal identity as a Spanish painter working in Naples and used his nationality to market his works to the Spanish viceroys who ruled the city. The subject of Ribera’s self-portrait still remains a provocative one as no secure self-portrait of the artist has been uncovered.

Ribera’s reputation was namely constructed by his seventeenth- and eighteenth-century biographers and his fame endured, as shown in chapter four. Ribera’s talent was recognized early in his career by such figures as the biographer Giulio Mancini and the painter Ludovico Carracci. Ribera’s rank and nobility were praised by Spanish art theorists and artists such as Jusepe Martínez, Francisco Pacheco and Antonio Palomino who sought to raise the profile of Spanish painters. In contrast, Joachim von Sandrart’s “black legend” of the painter circulated an image of Ribera as a painter of dark, violent, and cruel subjects that was later perpetuated by French Romantic artists and painters. Furthermore, Ribera’s reputation suffered at the hands of his Neapolitan biographer, Bernardo De Dominici. De Dominici, who was a classicist and nationalist, sought to elevate the rank of Naples’ native-born artists such as Massimo Stanzione. Owing to nationalist biases, he portrayed Ribera, as Stanzione’s nemesis, and in doing so, generated a negative image of the painter that persisted for almost two centuries.

In the seventeenth century, Ribera’s life and work appealed to the Neapolitan and Spanish literati. Chapter five of this dissertation links Ribera to the intellectual life of Naples, and, more specifically, to that of the vice-regal court. Ribera came into contact with the court poets Francisco de Quevedo and Antonio Gual. Verses celebrating Ribera’s remarkable naturalism were penned by the academicians Giuseppe Campanile and Girolamo Fontanella. Giovanni Michele Silos’ three epigrams on three of Ribera’s best known religious subjects, Saint Jerome, Mary Magdalene, and Saint John the Baptist, not only illuminate the painter’s commanding portrayal of emotions but also how the power of painting shaped religious
experience in the early modern era. Pedro Soto de Rojas’ poem praises Ribera’s fame as a painter. When read in context, these poems add to our understanding of Ribera’s reception in Naples and Spain. Furthermore, knowledge of Ribera’s reputation surely shaped the Spanish court playwright Calderón de la Barca’s presentation of the painter and the artistic profession in *The Painter of His Dishonor* (1640s). The second in a trilogy exploring honor, Calderón’s portrayal of the painter Juan Roca might have been modeled after Ribera. In considering the relation between literature and art, I have examined Calderón’s literary portrayal of a Spanish painter (who also worked and resided in Naples) and the actual reality of painters’ experiences in Spain and Spanish Italy as can be understood from Ribera’s example.

Ribera’s image also prompted a range of varied responses from different audiences in the nineteenth century. Whereas the persistent image of Ribera as a painter of cruel themes of martyrdom fueled the imagination of English and French Romantic poets, Spanish playwrights presented the painter as an artist-hero whose image was conditioned by historical myth and legend to conform to the nationalist ideology of Spanish cultural institutions. Although available in published editions, Spanish nineteenth-century plays on Ribera have received very little attention from Ribera specialists. The two plays on Ribera I examined, respectively written by Jacinto Salas y Quiroga and Ricardo Vicente del Rey, further illuminate Ribera’s image in nineteenth-century Spain as they relate to themes I explored in this study: his quest for fame and social status and the related issues of honor, pride, and nationalism. In the end, the varied and often contradictory images of Ribera that emerge in this dissertation suggest that paradigms of artistic identity in Spain are complex, multivalent cultural phenomena.
Appendix I: Jusepe de Ribera’s Signatures

My study of Ribera’s inscriptions has been based on my observation of paintings, drawings, and prints in various European and American museums. The signatures have also been carefully transcribed by Nicola Spinosa in his revised 2006 Italian and recent 2008 Spanish versions of his catalogue raisonné of Ribera’s oeuvre. For ease of reference, I have provided the catalogue numbers for both publications. NB: There are some paintings that Spinosa rejects as autograph, but, based on my study of the signatures, either first-hand or in photographs, I claim are original.

Ribera’s drawings and prints have been published in catalogues edited by Alonso E. Pérez Sanchez and Nicola Spinosa for the comprehensive, monographic exhibitions held in 1992 in Naples, Madrid, and New York (referred to here as Naples, 1992; Madrid, 1992; or New York, 1992). Catalogues of Ribera’s drawings and prints also include Jonathan Brown’s standard study of Ribera’s works on paper (referred to here as Brown, 1973) Measurements for paintings are given in centimeters, and drawings and prints in millimeters.

Unless otherwise indicated, the medium for paintings is oil on canvas. The location for Ribera’s prints is the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Regarding impressions of Ribera’s etchings, I have primarily consulted the first state of a given design, unless otherwise indicated.

Paintings


3) Ecce Homo, Madrid, Royal Academy of San Fernando, Madrid, 97 x 81 [signed with interlocking initials “JR”] (Spinosa, A63, 2006, p. 283; A55, 2008, p. 332)
4) *Saint Andrew in Meditation*, Munich, Konrad Bernheimer, Kunsthandel (now London, Colnaghi), 111.1 x 93 [signed: Josefus ribera valen(ci?) fec.] (Spinosa A68, 2006, p. 286; A88, 2008, p. 357)

5) *Saint Sebastian Attended by Holy Women*, Bilbao, Museo de Bellas Artes, 180 x 228 [signed: Jusepe de Ribera, de Spanolet F. 1621 (?) signature is barely legible] (Spinosa, A61, 2006, p. 262; A81, 2008, p. 315)


8) *Saint Jerome and the Angel of the Judgment*, 1626, Saint Petersburg, the Hermitage, 185 x 133 [signature is very dark: Josephus a Ribera / Valentinus / et Accademicus Romanus / faciebat 1626] (Spinosa A66, 2006, p. 284-5; A86, 2008, p. 355)


12) *Saint Jerome and the Trumpet of Justice*, 1629, Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphilj [signed: Jusepe de Ribera / Español F / 1629]


16) *Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew*, 1644, Barcelona, Museo de Catalunya [signed: Jusepe de Ribera espa(…) F. 1644 (?)]
17) *Penitent Saint Peter*, Chicago, The Art Institute, 126 x 97  
[signed: Jusepe R...] (Spinosa A80, 2006, p. 292; A100, 2008, p. 364)

18) *Saint Peter Weeping*, Milan, Collezione Koelliker, 56 x 69  

19) *Democritus*, 1630, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 125 x 81  

20) *Saint Onufrius*, 1630, Baltimore, formerly Dohme Collection, 96 x 74  
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / espanol 1630] (Spinosa A99, 2006, p. 300; A120, 2008, p. 374)

21) *Philosopher*, 1631, Tucson, University of Arizona Art Museum, 129 x 91  
[signed on the sheet of paper held by the philosopher: 1631 Jusepe de Ribera] (Spinosa A87, 2006, p. 295; A107, 2008, 367)

22) *Philosopher*, Santa Monica, J. Paul Getty Museum, 124.9 x 92.1  

23) *Pythagoras*, Valencia, Museo San Pio V, 118 x 93  
[signed: Josep de Ribera / esp...] (Spinosa A94, 2006, p. 299; A114, 2008, pp. 371-2)

24) *Penitent Saint Peter*, Mexico City, Museo Soumaya, 77 x 64.8  

25) *The Bearded Woman (Magdalena Ventura and Her Husband)*, 1631, Toledo, Palacio Lerma, Fundacion Casa Ducal de Medinaceli, 196 x 127  
(Spinosa A120, 2006, p. 305; A141, 2008, p. 382-3)

26) *Saint Roch*, 1631, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 212 x 144  

27) *Saint James the Greater*, 1631, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 202 x 146  

28) *Ecce Homo*, 1631, Venice, Pier Luigi Pizzi Collection, 33 x 24  

29) *A Man with a Flask of Wine and a Tambourine (An Allegory of Taste and Hearing)*, Mänttä, Gösta Serlachius, 52.5 x 75
[signed: Jusepe Ribera / español 1631; inscription on the flask: Moscatello di Saragosa]

30) An Apostle (Saint Matthew?), 1632, Fort Worth, TX, Kimball Art Museum, 126 x 95
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera espanol / F. 1632; A152, 2008, p. 387]

31) Saint Joseph and the Christ Child, Signed, Signature illegible, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado

32) Vision of Saint Francis of Assisi, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado
[Inscription on the stone plinth: Josephf...de Ribera Hispanus / Setaben...faciebat Partenope]

33) Saint Paul, New York, The Hispanic Society of America, 125 x 99
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español F 1632] (Spinosa A130, 2006, p. 309; A151, 2008, p. 387)

34) Saint John the Baptist, Naples, Private collection, 82 x 110

35) Blind Beggar with a Young Man, Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum, R.T. Miller, Jr., 125 x 98
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español F 1632] (Spinosa A140, 2006, p. 312; A161, 2008, pp. 390-91)

36) Saint Francis of Assisi with an Angel Holding of a Flask of Christ’s Blood
Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 120 x 98
[signed: Josephf de Ribera Hispanus / Setaben...faciebat Partenope] (Spinosa A142, 2006, p. 312; A163, 2008, p. 392)

37) The Sense of Touch (The Blind Man of Gambassi), 1632, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 125 x 98

38) Ixion, 1632, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 301 x 220

39) Tityus, 1632, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 227 x 301
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / F. 1632] (Spinosa A144, 2006, p. 313-4; A165, 2008, p. 393)

40) Prometheus, Monte Carlo, formerly in the collection of Barbara Piasecka Johnson, 194 x 155
[Signed: Joseph Ribera Hispano...F. 1632; A166, 2008, p. 393]

41) Jacob and Laban’s Flock, 1632, Patrimonio Nacional de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, 174 x 219 [Signed: Jusepe de Ribera español/ F. 1632; A168, 2008, p. 394]

42) Pietà, 1633, Madrid, Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, 157 x 210

43) Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, 1634, Washington, DC, National Gallery of Art, 104 x 113
44) *Pietà*, 1634, Salamanca, Iglesia del Convento de las Agustinas Recoletas de Monterrey, 172 x 121 [Signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1634] (Spinosa A190, 2008, p. 404)

45) *Saint Matthew*, Solothurn, Stadtmuseum, 64 x 52

46) *Saint Jerome*, Madrid, Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, 78 x 126

47) *Saint Zachariah*, Rouen, Musée des Beaux-Arts, 98 x 80

48) *Saint Peter*, Oviedo, Museo de Bellas Artes de Asturias, 64 x 55

49) *Ecce Homo*, Rome, Collezione Malgeri, 60 x 45

50) *Mater Dolorosa*, Private collection, 61.5 x 48
[Signed: Jusepeus Ribe…] (Spinosa A157, 2006, p. 318; A177, 2008, p. 398)

51) *Saint Bartholomew*, Riverdale on Hudson, New York, Stanley Moss & Company, 127 x 101.6

52) *Heraclitus*, Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini, 125 x 95

53) *Democritus*, Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini, 121 x 95

54) *Vision of Belshazzar*, Milan, Archbishop’s Palace, 52 x 64

55) *Saint Lucy*, New York, Knoedler Gallery, 73.6 x 60.4

56) *Immaculate Conception*, 1635, Salamanca, Iglesia del Convento de las Agustinas Recoletas de Monterrey, 502 x 329

57) *Saint Augustine*, Salamanca, Iglesia del Convento de las Agustinas Recoletas de Monterrey, 213 x 106

58) *The Ascension of Mary Magdalene*, 1636, Madrid, Museo de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, 256 x 193
59) *Democritus*, 1635, Salisbury (Wiltshire), Wilton House, Earl of Pembroke, 154.8 x 119.4
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español Valenciano / F: 1635] (Spinosa A177, 2006, p. 325; A197, 2008, p. 407)

60) *Saint Sebastian*, 1636, Berlin, Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum (destroyed in 1945), 200 x 149

61) *Saint Sebastian*, 1636, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 127 x 100
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español Ft. / 1636] (Spinosa A179, 2006, p. 314; A199, 2008, p. 408)

62) *Duel Between Two Women*, 1636, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 235 x 212

63) *Apparition of the Infant Jesus to Saint Anthony of Padua*
Madrid, Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, 262 x 206
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / F 1636] (Spinosa A181, 2006, p. 327; A201, 2008, p. 409)

64) *Diogenes*, 1636, Private collection, 120 x 95

65) *Saint Jerome*, 1636, Paris, Musée du Luxembourg, 73.5 x 59.5

66) *Anaxagoras*, 1636, Private collection, 120 x 95

67) *Crates*, 1636, Tokyo, National Museum of Western Art, 1 24 x 98.5

68) *Philosopher* [Plato?], 1637, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 124 x 99

69) *[Saint] Christopher*, 1637, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 127 x 100
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / espanol F. Ano 1637] (Spinosa A184, 2006, p.328; A204, 2008, p. 409)

70) *Apollo and Marysas*, 1637, Naples, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, 182 x 232
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera, espanol, valenciano / F. 1637] (Spinosa A185, 2006, pp. 328-9; A205, 2008, pp. 411-12)

71) *Apollo and Marysas*, 1637, Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-arts, 202 x 256

72) *Venus and Adonis*, Rome, Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica di Palazzo Corsini, 179 x 262
73) **Saint Lucy**, Madrid, Coleccion Colomer, 72.5 x 61

74) **Cleopatra**, Madrid, Collection of Lois Strom, 60 x 49
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / F. 1637; A211, 2008, p. 415]

75) **Jacob’s Blessing**, 1637, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 129 x 289

76) **Immaculate Conception**, 1637, Schloss Rohrau, Graf Harrach’sche Familiensammlung, 294 x 164
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera español F. 1637] (Spinosa A188, 2006, p. 329; A208, 2008, pp. 413-14)

77) **The Drunkard (Sense of Taste)**, 1637, Madrid Private collection, 59 x 46
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / F. 1637] (Spinosa A224, 2008, p. 420)

78) **Girl with a Tambourine (Sense of Hearing)**, London, Private collection, 59 x 45
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español F. 1637] (Spinosa A225, 2008, p. 420)

79) **Saint Peter**, 1637, Vitoria, Museo de Bellas Artes de Álava, 205 x 112
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español F. 1637] (Spinosa A228, 2008, pp. 421-22)

80) **Saint Paul**, 1637, Vitoria, Museo de Bellas Artes de Álava, 205 x 111
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / Valentiano F. 1637] (Spinosa A229, 2008, p. 422)

81) **Pietà**, 1637, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, Cappella del Tesoro, 264 x 170
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español F. 1637] (Spinosa A230, 2008, p. 422)

82) **Saint Onuphrius**, Saint Petersburg, The Hermitage, 130 x 104
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español F. 1637] (Spinosa A227, 2008, p. 421)

83) **Protagoras**, Hartford, Wadsworth Atheneum, Ella Gallup Sumner and Mary Caitlin Summer Collection, 124.1 x 98.3

84) **Aristotle**, Indianapolis Museum of Art, 124 x 99

85) **Diogenes**, Dresden, Gemäldegalerie, 76 x 61

86) **Immaculate Conception**, Columbus Museum of Art, Samuel H. Kress Collection, 255 x 177
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1637] (Spinosa A200, 2006, p. 333; A221, 2008, p. 419)

87) **The Drunkard (The Sense of Taste)**, Madrid, Private collection, 59 x 46
88) *Girl with a Tambourine (The Sense of Hearing)*, Newcastle, Laing Art Gallery, 59 x 45

89) *Saint Augustine with a Spanish Page*, Poznan, National Museum, 126 x 102

90) *Saint Onofrius*, Saint Petersburg, The Hermitage, 130 x 104
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español F. / 1637] (Spinosa A206, 2006, p. 335; A227, 2008, p. 421)

91) *Saint Anthony Abbot*, Milano, De Vito Collection, 78 x 66

92) *Moses*, 1638, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 168 x 97

93) *Elijah*, 1638, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 168 x 97

94) *Noah*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 271 x 254

95) *Joel*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 272 x 252

96) *Amos*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 272 x 256

97) *Josiah*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 270 x 254

98) *Habbakuk*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 267 x 236

99) *Sofonia*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 266 x 236

100) *Jonah*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 276 x 236

101) *Daniel*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 267 x 236

102) *Micheah*, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, 268 x 243

103) *Saint Gennaro*, Private collection, 70 x 60, 205 x 155
104) *Jesuit Missionary*, Milan, Museo Poldi Pezzoli, 195 x 110
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español valenciano / F. 1638] (Spinosa A248, 2008, p. 428)

105) *Saint John the Baptist*, 1638, Barcelona, Private collection, 125 x 100
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1638] (Spinosa A260, 2008, p. 433)

106) *Martyrdom of Saint Philip*, 1639, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 179 x 233
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1639] (Spinosa A269, 2008, p. 436)

107) *Jacob’s Dream*, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 177 x 233
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1639] (Spinosa A271, 2008, p. 437)

108) *The Liberation of Saint Peter*, 1639, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 177 x 232
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1639] (Spinosa A270, 2008, p. 437)

109) *Saint Pantaleon*, Naples, Private collection
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1638]

110) *The Music Teacher*, Toledo, OH, Toledo Museum of Art, 72.2 x 62.5

111) *The Old Usurer*, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 76 x 62

112) *The Astronomer [Ptolemy or Anaxagoras]*, Worcester Art Museum, 78.5 x 98

113) *Ecce Homo*, Greenville, S.C., Bob Jones University, 76 x 63.5

114) *Woman Pulling Her Hair*, Bayonne, Musée Bonnat, 103 x 84

115) *Mater Dolorosa*, Kassel, Gemäldegalerie, 76 x 62

116) *Saint Paul the Hermit*, Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 132 x 106
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español valencianus / F. 1638] (Spinosa A236, 2006, p. 344; A257, 2008, p. 432)

117) *Saint John the Baptist in the Desert*, Madrid, Real Monasterio de la Encarnación, 208 x 158

118) *Saint John the Baptist*, Madrid, Private collection, 183.5 x 132.5
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera faciebat] (Spinosa A238, 2006, p. 345; A259, 2008, p. 432)

119) *Saint John the Baptist*, Barcelona, Private collection, 205 x 155

120) *Saint Jerome and the Angel of Judgment*, 1637-39, Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphilj, 125 x 100
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / Español F/] (Spinosa A240, 2006, pp. 345-6)

121) *Jacob and His Flock*, 1638, London, National Gallery of Art, 132 x 118

122) *Saint Jerome*, Cleveland Museum of Art, William H. Marlatt Fund, 129 x 100

123) *Saint Joseph*, Madrid, Placido Arango Collection, 131 x 105

124) *Saint Joseph*, Brooklyn Museum of Art, 115 x 88

125) *Executioner with the Head of the Baptist*, Milan, Koelliker Collection, 126 x 101

126) *Martyrdom of Saint Philip*, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 234 x 234

127) *The Liberation of Saint Peter*, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 177 x 232
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1639] (Spinosa A249, 2006, pp. 348-9; A270, 2008, p. 437)

128) *The Dream of Jacob*, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 179 x 223
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español F./1639] (Spinosa A250, 2006, p. 349); A271, 2008, pp. 437-38)

129) *The Holy Family with Saint John the Baptist in Joseph’s Workshop*, Rome, The Sovereign Military Order of Malta, 256 x 201
Signature illegible (Spinosa A252, 2006, p. 350; A273, 2008, p. 439)

130) *Landscape with a Small Fort*, Spain, Collection of the Casa de Alba, 127 x 269

131) *Saint Onofrius*, Escorial, Monastery of San Lorenzo, 198.5 x 151
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español / Fecit 1639] (Spinosa A255, 2006, p. 351; A276, 2008, p. 440)

132) *Penitent Saint Jerome*, Escorial, Monastery of San Lorenzo, 95 x 125

133) *Saint Francis of Paola*, Geneva, Private collection, 73.5 x 65.5

134) *Saint Andrew*, 1641, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado
[Signed: Jusepe de Ribera 1641]
135) *Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1640, Patrimonio Nacional, Monasterio de San Lorenzo el Real del Escorial, 226 x 317 [signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español, valenciano de la ciudad de Xativa / Academico Romano / F. 1640; A279, 2008, p. 441]


137) *The Old Beggar*, Knowley Hall, Earl of Derby, 76 x 64 [signed on a cartellino: Vo señor mio compatisca la ve / ecciaya et la cattive Estrada / Jusepe de Ribera español valenciano / F / 1640] (Spinosa A261, 2006, p. 353; A282, 2008, p. 443)


143) *Head of Saint John the Baptist*, Naples, Private collection, 62.2 x 72.7 [signed: Jusepe de Ribera espanol 1640] (Spinosa A267, 2006, p. 355; A292, 2008, p. 446)


147) *Saint Andrew*, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 69.9 x 55.9 [signed: Giusepe de Ribera / F. 1641] (Spinosa A278, 2006, p. 359; A305, 2008, p. 451)


149) *The Ecstasy of Saint Francis*, 1642, Patrimonio Nacional, Monasterio de San Lorenzo el Real de El Escorial, 200 x 162
The Clubfooted Boy, 1642, Paris, Louvre, 164 x 93
[signed on the earth toward the lower right: Jusepe de Ribera Espanol / F. 1642] (Spinosa A281, p. 360; A270, 2008, p. 452)

Dwarf with a Cane, Wherabouts unknown, 150 x 80

Saint Onofrius, London, Derek Johns, Ltd., 76 x 62
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español F. 1643] (Spinosa A285, 2006, p. 361; A312, 2008, p. 455)

Saint Bruno Receives the Law, Oil on copper, Naples, Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte, 38 x 27

Baptism of Christ, Nancy, Musée des Beaux-Arts, 235 x 160

Madonna and Child, Sarasota, Ringling Museum of Art, 111 x 101

The Crucifixion, Vitoria, Palacio de Diputacion, 292 x 192
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / F 1643] (Spinosa A293, 2006, p. 364; A320, 2008, p. 458)

Saint Francis of Assisi, Florence, Palazzo Pitti, 103 x 77

Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, Barcelona, Museu Nacional d’Art de Catalunya, 202 x 153

Ecce Homo, Mentana (Rome), Federico Zeri Collection
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera espanol]

Saint Jerome, 1644, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera espanol / 1644]

Saint Anthony Abbot, 1644, Mallorca, Excmo. Sr. D. Pedro Montaner, Conde de Zavella, 206 x 156

Saint Andrew, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 76 x 63
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera 1641 (?)] (Spinosa A297, 2006, p. 366; A324, 2008, p. 461)

Saint Jerome, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 109 x 90

Saint Paul the Hermit, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, 208 x 157
165) *Saint Matthew*, Madrid, Private collection


167) *Saint Peter*, Private collection, 70.5 x 56

168) *Adoration of the Shepherds*, Valencia, formerly in the Cathedral (destroyed by fire during the Spanish Civil War), 128 x 180
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / F. 1643] (Spinosa 2008, A319, 458)

169) *Saint Theresa of Avila*, Madrid, Fundación Cultural Fórum Filatélico, 123 x 97

170) *Saint Paul*, Vienna, formerly Galleria Saint Lukas, 75 x 53

171) *Saint Jerome in his Study*, 1646, Prague, National Gallery, 146 x 198

172) *Head of Saint John the Baptist*, Naples, Museo Civico Gaetano Filangieri, 66 x 78
[signed on the plinth: Jusepe de Ribera espanol / F. 1646] (Spinosa A308, 2006, p. 370; A335, 2008, pp. 465-6)

173) *Saint Gennaro Escaping from the Fiery Furnace*, Oil on copper, Naples, Duomo, Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro, 320 x 220

174) *Saint Diego of Alcalá*, Toledo, Cathedral, 131 x 106
[signed: Joseph de Ribera / el español F 1646] (Spinosa A310,2006, p. 371; A337, 2008, p. 467)

175) *Saint Diego of Alcalá*, Naples, Santa Maria la Nova, 180 x 118

176) *Saint Jerome*, Bergamo, Private collection, 131 x 103

177) *Saint Anthony the Anchorite*, Moscow, Pushkin Museum, 75 x 64

178) *Saint James the Greater*, Moscow, Pushkin Museum, 92 x 72

179) *Saint Simeon and the Christ Child*, Madrid, Placido Arango Collection, 121 x 99
180) **Saint Paul the Hermit**, Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, 130 x 104
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / F. 1647] (Spinosa A318, 2006, p. 373; A345, 2008, p. 470)

181) **Saint Jerome**, Cambridge, MA, Fogg Art Museum, 120 x 100

182) **The Penitent Saint Jerome**, London, 63 x 55
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español F…] (Spinosa A321, 2006, p. 374; A348, 2008, p. 472)

183) **The Penitent Saint Jerome**, Mexico City, Private collection, 76 x 65


186) **Don Juan de Austria**, Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional. Palacio Real de Madrid, 319 x 251

187) **Adoration of the Shepherds**, Paris, Louvre, 238 x 179

188) **Saint Peter Hermit**, Paris, Louvre, 199 x 154
[signed: Jusepe de Ribera español f.] (Spinosa A328, 2006, p. 377; A355, 2008, p. 476)

189) **The Immaculate Conception**, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 258 x 178

190) **The Communion of the Apostles**, Naples, Choir of the Certosa di San Martino, 400 x 400

191) **Saint Jerome**, 1651, Naples, Museum and Certosa di San Martino, 125 x 100
[signed on the paper: Jusepe de Ribera español F. 1651] (Spinosa A333, 2006, p. 379; A360, 2008, p. 479)

192) **Saint Sebastian**, 1651, Naples, Museum and Certosa di San Martino, 121 x 100

193) **Saint Mary of Egypt**, 1651, Naples, Museo Civico Gaetano Filangieri, 88 x 71
194) *The Penitent Saint Jerome*, 1652, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 77 x 71

195) *The Miracle of Saint Donatus of Arezzo*, 1652, Amiens, Musée Picardy, 190 x 153

196) *Saint Anthony Abbot*, 1638, Milan, Private collection
[signed: Jusepe de Robera es/panol F. 1638]

**Drawings:**
1) *Saint Irene*, Red and white chalk on yellow on beige paper, Oxford, Christ Church, 311 x 207
[signed in chalk: Joseph a Ribera Hisp. s.f.] (Brown, 1973, cat. 5, 155-57; Madrid, 1992, D2, 410)

[signed lower right corner in red chalk: Jusepe de ribera fe.t. 1626] (Brown, 1973, cat. 9, 159-60; Madrid, 1992, D13, 422-23)

3) *Crucifixion of Saint Peter*, Pen and red ink on beige paper, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 144 x 166 [inscriptions: signed by Ribera in various places and with his monogram, JRa; in the lower section,.....ph Ribera; and center, 12Rs.] (Brown, 1973, cat. 14, 162-63; Madrid, 1992, D19, 429)

4) *Man Bound to a Stake*, Pen and brown wash, Achenbach Foundation for Graphic Arts, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco, 216 x 163


6) *Study of Three Figures (Saint Joachim, Saint Anne and the Virgin?)*, c. 1620s, Red chalk on paper, 90 x 120, destroyed, Gijon [Spain], Collection of the Institute Jovellanos de Gijon [damaged signature in the upper right corner “Jus…Ribe..” and intact inscription in the lower right corner: “Ribera”]

7) *Drapery Study*, c. 1620s, Red chalk on paper, 110 x 80, destroyed, Gijon [Spain], Collection of the Institute Jovellanos de Gijon [signed lower left: “Juseppe de Ribera”]

8) *Christ Recognized by the Apostles*, c. 1630s, Pen on yellowed paper, Florence, Uffizi [inscribed: “Jusep”]

**Prints:**
1) *Saint Jerome Hearing the Trumpet of the Last Judgment*, Etching with drypoint and burin, 328 x 243 [Signed with a monogram and dated 1621] (Brown, 1973, cat. 4, 66-67; New York, 1992, cat. 74, 176-78)

3) *The Penitence of Saint Peter*, Etching with engraving, 324 x 248 [Signed with a monogram and dated 1621] (Brown, 1973, cat. 6, 68-69; New York, 1992, cat. 76, 179)


7) *Small Grotesque Head*, Etching, 142 x 113 [Signed with a monogram and dated 1622] (Brown, 1973, cat. 10, 72; New York, 1992, cat. 80, 182-83)

8) *Large Grotesque Head*, Etching with some engraving, 223 x 150 [Signed with a monogram and the adjective *hispanus*] (Brown, 1973, cat. 11, 72-73; New York, 1992, cat. 81, 183-84)


11) *Equestrian Portrait of Don Juan de Austria*, Etching, 350 x 270 mm [Signed and dated: Jusepe de Ribera f./1648] (Brown, 1973, 16, 77-78; New York, 1992, cat. 86, 189-90)
Appendix II: Jusepe de Ribera’s Philosophers

1. *Origen*, Oil on canvas, 123.5 x 95.5, ca. 1615, Urbino, Galleria Nazionale delle Marche (Spinosa, 2008, A34)
2. *Philosopher with a Book or Plato*, Oil on canvas, 118 x 90, ca. 1615-16, Torella dei Lombardi, Ruspoli Collection (Spinosa, A40, 326)
3. *Democritus*, Oil on canvas, 120 x 90, ca. 1615-18, Lugano, Private collection (Spinosa, 2008, 334, A58)
5. *Heraclitus*, Oil on canvas, 140 x 131, ca. 1615-18, formerly Madrid, Coll & Cortes Fine Arts Dealers (Spinosa, 2008, A60, 335)
6. *Aesop*, Oil on canvas, 125 x 92, ca. 1629-31, New York, Private collection (Spinosa, 2008, A102)
7. *Euclid*, Oil on canvas, 116.5 x 92 cm, ca. 1629-31, Santiago de Chile, Apelles Collection (Spinosa, 2008, A103, 365-6)
8. *Archimedes*, Oil on canvas, 117 x 90, ca. 1629-31, Private collection (Spinosa, 2008, A104, 366)
9. *Plato*, Oil on canvas, 120 x 93 cm, 1630, Amiens, Musee de Picardie (Spinosa, 2008, A105, 366, Signed: Jusepe de Ribera español / f. 1630)
13. *Thales*, Oil on canvas, 117.5 x 95.5 cm, ca. 1629-31, Paris, Private collection (Spinosa, 2008, A109, 369)
14. *Philosopher (or Archimedes?)*, Oil on canvas, 126 x 92 cm, ca. 1629-31, Madrid, Eufemio Diez, (Spinosa, 2008, A110, 370)
15. *Philosopher*, Oil on canvas, 129.5 x 100.5 cm, ca. 1630-35, Paris, Private collection (Spinosa, 2008, A111, 370)
16. *Heraclitus*, Oil on canvas, 125 x 95 cm, ca. 1634, formerly New York, Christie’s (Spinosa, 2008, A112, 370)
17. *Socrates at the Mirror*, Oil on canvas, 102.3 x 78.1, ca. 1629-31, Dallas, Meadows Art Museum (Spinosa, 2008, A113, 371 – Spinosa identifies this painting as *Philosopher in the Mirror or Archimedes*)
21. *Philosopher*, Oil on canvas, 125 x 88, ca. 1635, Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini (Spinosa, 2008, A156, 389)
22. *Heraclitus*, Oil on canvas, 121 x 95, 1635, Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini (Spinosa, 2008, A180, 399, Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español valenciano / f. 1635)

99 The painting was formerly owned by the Galeria Corsini in Monaco.
23. *Democritus*, Oil on canvas, 121 x 95, 1635, Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini (Spinosa, 2008, A181, 400, Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español valenciano / f. 1635)


26. *Anaxagoras*, Oil on canvas, 120 x 95, 1636, Private collection (Spinosa, 2008, A214, 416, Signed: Josephs a Ribera Yspanus Valentinus / F. 1636)


31. *Diogenes*, Oil on canvas, 76 x 61, 1637, Dresden, Gemäldegalerie (Spinosa, 2008, A219, 418, Signed: Jusepe de Ribera / español f. 1637)

32. *Philosopher with a Globe (Anaxagoras?)*, 1630, Oil on canvas, 51 1/8 x 41 3/4 in. (130 x 106 cm); 50 x 36 5/8 in (127 x 93 cm) without added strips, Private collection
Appendix III - The Spanish Viceroy in Naples (1595-1672)

The Spanish Viceroy in Naples – (1595-1672)
Enrique de Guzman, Count of Olivares 1595-1599
Fernando Ruiz de Castro, Count of Lemos 1599-1601
Francisco de Castro (Regent) 1601-1603
Juan Alonso Pimentel, Count of Benavente 1603-1610
Pedro Fernandez de Castro e Andrada, count of Lemos 1610-1616
Pedro Giron, duke of Osuna 1616-1620
Cardinal Antonio Zapata (delegate) 1620-1622
Antonio Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alba 1622-1629
Fernando Afan de Ribera, Duke of Alcalá 1629-1631
Manuel de Fonseca y Zuñiga, Count of Monterrey 1631-1637
Ramiro de Guzman, Duke of Medina de las Torres 1637-1644
Juan Alfonso Enriquez de Ribera, Admiral of Castile 1644-1646
Rodrigo Ponce de Leon, Duke of Los Arcos 1646-1648
Don Juan Jose of Austria 1648
Iñigo Velez de Guevara, Count of Oñate 1648-1653
Garcia de Avellaneda y Haro, count of Castrillo 1653-1658
Gaspar de Bracamonte, Count of Penaranda 1658-1664
Pascual, Cardinal of Aragon 1664-1666
Pedro Antonio de Aragon 1662-1672
Appendix IV – Poems in Praise of Jusepe de Ribera

I. Girolamo Fontanella, *Nove cieli*, 1646, 257

Poem 13
“Ritratto di S. Girolamo del Cavalier Giospep Riviera”

Finta nò, ma verace, ecco si mira
Meraviglia de l’Arte alma fattura
Priva di senso à l’huomo il senso fura
E muta parla, & insensata spira.
In si bella’opra attenta i lumi gira,
E se stessa trovar non sà Natura:
Stà dubbia l’Arte, e’n si gentil figura
La tua bell’Arte invidiosa ammira.
Forse Angelica man mossa fra noi
Di quella espresso ogni ben fatta parte,
Che’l Ciel sà pinger sol celesti Heroi.
Ma pale si la Fama in ogni parte,
Che Riviera la fè per far dapoi
Coi miracoli suoi più bella l’Arte.


Al Sig. Antonio Matina

Ispano Zeusi in animar Figure,
A ‘Pittori di Europa i pregi involi;
Che se t’ingegni à linear l Poli,
Fan l’Arte insuperbir le tue Pitture.

Dai col vivo color morte a la Morte,
E’l Tempo rio, che la memoria imbruna,
Le tue rischiara, ad onta Fortuna,
Et à la Eternità ti apre le porte.

Se del Padre Lico tra balza inculta,
O’tra fronde di pampano Tebano,
Esprimi tu con maestosa mano
L’allegrezza del core i fronte esculta.

Se Galatea dipingi in grembo à Teti,
Moto ridente hanno l’ondose Ninfe,

---

E la schiera gentil dele sue Ninfe,
Lascia per festeggiar gli antri segreti.

Se tu nel Regno dele spume amare
Solo intento al tradir fingi Bireno,
Mormora ancor nel’agitato seno
De’ tradimenti suoi torbido il mare.

Se di Adon miro il tragico successo
Talor rappresentato in sú le tele,
Par, che Venere esclami: O’ Ciel crudele,
Chi così vivo ha il mio dolore espresso?

Corra fulgido il Tago e gli ori suoi
Mandi prodigo à te dal’auree sponde,
E’l mio debito in note alme, e giaconde
Alzi al’Eternità gli elogii tuoi.

Sorga Apollo in Parnaso, e lodi Apelle,
Che lo splendor fù dela gente Ibera,
El il Motor dela stellata Sfera
Componga al capo tuo ferto di Stelle.

È strale il tuo Pennel, mentre consunto
È tra’ suoi ciechi abissi Oblio letale,
Che se delinea, e congiunge eguale
A la linea di Onor di Gloria il punto.

Antonio, tu se hai di eternar desio
Gli avanzi illustri del Amico estinto,
Su glia l’Arpa, ch’invidia oggi Aracinto,
Ch’emula di Permessò il maggior Dio.

Avido tra’ colori, io non sò come
Ozioso ne stai: alza l’ingegno;
Lascia il Pennello. Il tuo canoro legno.
Può di RIVERA immortal ail nome.


A. CHRISTUS D. INTER DOCTORES
Riberae Hispani apud eundem [principem Iustinianum]
EPIGR. CCXIII.
Primo flore aevi Dominus puerilibus annis
Quae non didicerat, promit, et ore docet.
Cancies menti; pondus, suadeque medulla
Est dictis, fandi et copia fusa labris.
Stant aure attonita circum, doctique profundos
Ad Pueri sensus erubere Senes.
Abramidae at stupeant facundì Numinis ora:
Hoc nos, Pictor, opus cernimus attoniti.

B. […] MAGDALENA flens, et caput in calva emortuali reclinans.
Riberae Hispani apud eundem Principem [Justinianum]
EPIGR. CCXVI.
Quae genio blandita sou florèntibus annis,
Ebria tot marcet Magdela delicijs;
Nunc genio indignata suo, moresque perosa
Discinctos, mutat sobrias delicias.
Aspictis? Lachrymae sunt illi summa voluptas,
Et recline fovet mostra calva caput.
Eluit hinc prisas decurrents lachryma noxas;
Mortua hinc sancte vivere calva docet.
Ingenio Artificis sic Magdalis ipsa videtur,
Pulchior a calva, purior a lachryma.

C. D. IOANNES BAPTISTA
praedicans.
Riberae Hispani, vulgò lo Spagnoletto,
apud eundem.
EPIGR. CXXIII.
Egressus syluis post longa silentia Dìuus,
Grandi velatum praedicatore Deum.
Commonstratque Agnum digito, sub vellere puro
Cui niuei mores, nullus & ore dolus.
Scilicet, hoc Agno docetis mansuescere mundum,
Definat ut faeuis moribus esse Leo,
\Ioannem pinxisse putas, Ribera, sed Agni
Expressit vocem sedulus iste labor.
Non clamasse soris, non fat clamasse per urbes;
Clamat & hac tabulà, & nobile laudat opus.
Illustrations

Fig 1. Francisco Ribalta, *The Preparation for the Crucifixion*, 1582, Oil on canvas, The State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg
Fig. 2. Copy after Jusepe de Ribera, *Saint Martin and the Beggar*, oil on canvas, Galleria Nazionale, Parma
Fig 3. Francesco Rosaspina after Ribera, *Saint Martin and the Beggar*, engraving, Biblioteca Palatina, Parma
Fig. 4 El Greco, *Saint Martin and the Beggar*, 1597-99, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
Fig. 5 Jusepe de Ribera, *The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew*, 1618-19. oil on canvas, Patronato de Arte de Osuna, Seville
Fig. 6 Jusepe de Ribera, *Crucifixion*, c. 1618, oil on canvas, Patronato de Arte de Osuna, Seville
Fig. 7 Michelangelo, *Crucifixion*, c. 1534-41, black chalk, The British Museum, London
Fig. 8 Jusepe de Ribera, *Preparation for the Crucifixion*, 1622-24, oil on canvas, Parish Church of Santa María, Colgolludo (Guadalajara)
Fig. 9 Jusepe de Ribera, *The Bearded Woman (Magdalena Ventura with Her Husband)*, oil on canvas, 1631, Palacio Lerma, Fundación Casa Ducal de Medinaceli, Toledo
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