

nau Watteau sie gekannt haben muß, ohne deshalb auch nur eine Spur seiner gestalterischen Freiheit aufzugeben.

Zum Abschluß schildert Helmut Börsch-Supan die Persönlichkeit Friedrichs II., des bedeutenden Watteau-Sammlers außerhalb Frankreichs. Bei Übernahme der Ausstellung nach Schloß Charlottenburg wird der Autor Gelegenheit haben, dank dem dortigen Ambiente wie den verfügbaren Sammlungsbeständen, seine Ausführungen zu veranschaulichen und so dem in seinem Umfang verringerten Unternehmen eine neue Komponente hinzuzufügen.

Das Stichwort „Ambiente“ will keineswegs als Einwand gegen die National Gallery oder das Grand Palais verstanden sein, sondern nach Watteau selbst fragen. Bei allem bewundernden Respekt vor der großen Leistung der Kollegen und für den unzweifelhaften Nutzen der Ausstellung wird man am Ort das Gefühl nicht los — Rosenberg hat es vorausgesagt —, Watteau doch nicht wirklich erfaßt zu haben, daß der Künstler sich dem großen Apparat und seinem Publikum so entzieht, wie er es seinen Zeitgenossen gegenüber getan hat.

Dies kann auch keine noch so genaue kunsthistorische Wissenschaft oder Dokumentation verhindern. Der Eindruck historischer Ferne verstärkt sich auch, weil der Katalog bei all seinem Reichtum die Informationen vereinzelt stehen läßt und keine Synthese versucht, welche vielleicht auch gar nicht intendiert war. Man hat alle Mühe darauf verwendet, Watteaus Platz in der zeitgenössischen Geschichte zu präzisieren und ihn so in der Reihe der großen Meister erneut zu bestätigen. Weniger hat man jedoch nach dem gefragt, was Watteau an Neuem gebracht hat, oder ob er vielleicht — wie uns scheint — den Bezug zwischen dem Kunstwerk und seinem Betrachter verändert hat und damit ein neues, anderes Bildverständnis verlangt.

Problematisch am Katalog erscheint uns auch die Art und Weise seines Umgangs mit der Rezeption von Watteaus Kunst im 19. Jahrhundert. Meist wird sie nur schriftstellerisch zitierend verwendet, anstatt mit ihrer Hilfe die Frage weiterzuführen, inwiefern Außenseitertum, Empfindsamkeit, Melancholie nicht allein romantische Stilisierung des Künstlers sind, sondern auch heute wesentlicher Ausgangspunkt für seine Kreativität.

Margret Stuffmann

Rezensionen

MARIANNA HARASZTI-TAKÁCS, *Spanish Genre Painting in the Seventeenth Century*. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1983. P. 283, pls. 96, figs. 47. DM 110,—.

It has long been recognized that Spain played a relatively small part in the rise of genre painting in seventeenth-century Europe. Perhaps this is why the scholarly literature is correspondingly scarce. As a matter of fact, this book, to the best of

my knowledge, is the first ever to attempt a comprehensive study of the subject. Thus, Marianna Haraszi-Takács, who has recently retired from a distinguished career as curator of Spanish painting at the Budapest Museum, has performed an important service to the field by collecting a virtual encyclopedia of Spanish genre painting of the Golden Age.

The book is comprised of two sections — a long study of the origins and evolution of genre painting first in Europe, then in Spain, and a catalogue of works, including 264 entries. This number includes both extant and recorded lost works and is the most convincing proof of the indifference of Spanish Baroque painters to scenes of everyday life. It is probably no exaggeration to say that Dutch and Flemish painters of the period produced at least this number of genre paintings in any given year, if not many more.

Three of the seven chapters of the first section are devoted to the genesis of genre painting in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, with emphasis on Flanders and Italy. Here the author takes an inclusive view of the subject as she competently summarizes the state of knowledge. Then she narrows the focus to Spain and considers the problem of the principal sources of influence on Spanish genre painters. In her view, genre painting first appears in Seville, guided by the inspiration of Caravaggio. In recent years, scholars have tended to be increasingly cautious in attributing the influence of Caravaggio on painters in other parts of Europe. This caution also could be applied to Seville, because concrete evidence of the knowledge of his art in that city is hard to find.

As Richard E. Spear noted in his review of the book (*Times Literary Supplement*, March 23, 1984, p. 318), there is now considerable reason to doubt that Camillo Contreras, the Spanish priest mentioned by Mancini, ever sent paintings by Caravaggio to Seville. More abundant evidence of the virtually complete ignorance of his work is found in recent studies of Sevillian painting of the first third of the century. For instance, in the catalogue of the exhibition, *La época de Murillo* (Seville, 1982), Enrique Valdivieso and Juan M. Serrera published a sample of pictures by painters such as Juan de Uceda Castroverde, Alonso Vázquez, Juan de Roelas, Miguel de Esquivel, Antonio Mohedano, and others. These painters, the contemporaries of Velázquez, appear to have been totally untouched by newer artistic developments from outside Seville.

But if Caravaggio is discarded as a catalyst, especially for the young Velázquez, then who is left? Beginning with a negative answer, we can safely discard Juan Sánchez Cotán, one of Haraszi's secondary protagonists. There were, in fact, two painters of this name active in Spain in the early years of the seventeenth century. One was the famous still-life painter of Toledo, who finished his career in Granada and never, as far as is known, was in Seville. The other was a conservative religious painter who is documented in Seville from 1614—31, and who is confused by the author with his more innovative homonym.

How, then, to account for the apparently unprecedented genre paintings which Velázquez began to paint around 1616? Haraszti points the way to an answer by the rediscovery of a painting (unfortunately not reproduced) which was first published by Cavestany and then lost to view. This is the crude, largescale canvas by Juan Esteban de Úbeda, signed and dated 1606, now in the Museo de Bellas Artes, Granada. This painting is significant for two reasons. First, it demonstrates that genre paintings were being painted in Andalucía before the inception of Velázquez' career. Second, it points unmistakably to North Italy as the source of inspiration. In one way or another, this obscure Juan Esteban came to know paintings by or after Campi, Passarroti, and other North Italian genre painters. Such paintings, in principle, could also have been known to Velázquez, as well as other sources long-recognized in the literature, notably the works of Aertsen, Bueckelaer, and the Bassano family. In other words, Velázquez' early *bodegones* stem from this tradition of gritty, earthy naturalism and not the polished, sophisticated works of Caravaggio. (By the way, the suggestion that Velázquez' genre paintings were intended as signboards is unproven.)

The last two chapters, which cover genre painting from the middle to the end of the century, are more narrative than analytical. In particular, one misses a discussion of the second wave of influence from abroad which, among other things, inspired the genre paintings of Murillo. I have recently argued (*Goya*, nos. 169—71, 1982, pp. 35—43) that Murillo was aware of paintings by the *bamboccianti* as well as by later seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish artists. Whatever the truth of the matter, it seems clear that Murillo's famous genre paintings, which together with those of Velázquez are the great achievements of the Spanish contribution, cannot be explained by purely internal developments.

Finally, there is one question which is never raised in the book, but which strikes me as almost inescapable — why didn't Spanish artists paint more genre scenes? The answer may be implicit in what has been said above. There was a highly-developed taste for genre painting among Spanish collectors; of this fact the inventories of collections leave no doubt. But the inventories also show that the taste was satisfied by genre paintings from other lands, notably Flanders, which was politically allied with Spain, and also from Italy. Spanish artists were never able to break the hold of foreigners on this market; thus the absence of specialists and the paucity of works.

Nevertheless, there are more distinctive Spanish genre paintings than is generally recognized, and it is the great merit of this book to have brought them together for the first time in what will be considered the basic reference work on the subject.

Jonathan Brown