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Introduction

Situated high in the northern Andes, Santa Fe de Bogotá had begun to emerge as an important artistic centre by the time its most famous colonial-era painter, Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos, was born on 9 May 1638. Vásquez’s family had come from Seville at the end of the sixteenth century, perhaps attracted by the opportunities offered by Bogotá’s commercial position as the hub of the Spanish viceroyalty of New Granada, a vast area of South America that included much of present-day Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, and Venezuela.1 By 1680, Gregorio Vásquez had become Bogotá’s most prominent and prolific artist; with the help of a workshop that included his brother, daughter, and son, he produced more than 500 paintings and drawings during his forty-year career. Vásquez is an important figure in the history of Spanish viceregal art, perhaps most notably due to his extensive corpus of drawings, of which at least 106 sheets survive. Best known for the work he did for various religious institutions in Bogotá, Tunja, and elsewhere in New Granada, Vásquez’s most important commission was for the decoration of the new Sagrario Chapel, which was constructed between 1660 and 1700, adjacent to the cathedral in Bogotá. The commission comprised dozens of paintings and occupied Vásquez and his workshop for several decades.

Exceptionally few drawings by other artists have surfaced from the viceregal period in Latin America, leaving the impression—perhaps inaccurate—that draftsmanship was rarely practised there, if at all. Vásquez’s body of work confirms that drawing was certainly an integral part of his artistic production, and a consideration of his studio practices suggests that it was also part of his own apprenticeship in Bogotá. The current study explores the working methods of Gregorio Vásquez, in particular the important and perhaps atypical role that draftsmanship played in his creative process. Vásquez’s workshop brings to mind those of Dutch artists like Rembrandt and his followers in its ability to exploit a growing art market, and the drawing academy of Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617–82) in its emphasis on draftsmanship, though with less demonstrable attention on life drawing. Close scholarly considerations of seventeenth-century artists’ workshop practices have proven especially enlightening in the case of Rubens, Rembrandt, and Poussin, among others. In particular, the production of multiples and variants by established studio assistants is common to these painters, including Gregorio Vásquez.

A consideration of four previously unidentified paintings in the collection of the Denver Art Museum, here attributed to Vásquez and his workshop for the first time, suggests that artistic production and pedagogy were inextricably linked in his studio practice. All four are variants of known Vásquez compositions. The paintings are _The Temptation of Saint Thomas Aquinas, The Death of Saint Dominic, The Virgin Mary in Prayer, and The Penitent Mary Magdalene_, all dating from the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Daniel Casey Stapleton (1855–1920), an Anglo-American businessman and adventurer, acquired the panels in the early twentieth century, along with several hundred other Spanish colonial objects, including furniture, silver, and sculptures, which he shipped to his wife’s Omaha, Nebraska, residence before 1914. Stapleton’s heirs gifted the collection to the Denver Art Museum in 1990.2 An examination of this small group of paintings, within the context of Spanish viceregal painting in general, provides new insight into this great painter’s studio practices and teaching methods, including the prominent role played by European prints and the master’s own drawings.
Gregorio Vásquez and Painting in Early Modern Latin America

Long a household name in Colombia, Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos is today a relatively obscure figure to most of the world despite the inclusion of his work in several important pan-Latin American art exhibitions in Europe and the United States. Debates about quality aside, Vásquez’s works certainly merit such representation on the global stage; by any objective measure, he was a successful and sought-after painter with a lasting impact on generations of artists in Colombia. However, his critical fortunes have largely been confined to and defined within Colombia’s borders. As Clara Bargellini has pointed out, he was the first artist in colonial Latin America to feature in a monographic study and catalogue raisonné, more than three decades before comparable treatments of Melchor Pérez Holguín (c. 1665–after 1732) or Cristóbal de Villalpando (c. 1649–1714) were to appear.³ Mexico and Peru have enjoyed an international scholarly attention to the history of viceregal Latin American art. For much of the twentieth century, the historiography of Latin American art was dominated by scholars within each country of origin, resulting in many separate narratives.⁴ Forming a unified narrative of the development of colonial Latin America’s artistic production has proved impractical if not entirely impossible; but here a few common threads provide some context for Gregorio Vásquez and his work.

In the century following the Spanish conquest, the viceregalies witnessed a significant influx of artists from Italy, the Southern Netherlands, and Spain, who were charged with training an Indigenous workforce in European techniques and the visual language of Roman Catholicism. Many of the earliest immigrant artist-educators travelled with Franciscan and Augustinian missionaries or were friars themselves, and many brought engravings and illustrated emblem books from Europe as pedagogical aids. By the mid-sixteenth century, a second wave of immigration began, which included such influential figures in New Spain as Simón Pereyns (d. 1589) from Antwerp and Andrés de la Concha (1568–1612) from Seville, who arrived in 1566 and 1568 respectively. The Italian painters Bernardo Bitti (1548–1610), a mostly itinerant Jesuit, and Mateo Pérez de Alesio (1547–c. 1616), whose work survives in the Sistine Chapel and in the cathedral of Seville, were active in Peru in the final quarter of the sixteenth century. Another Italian, Angelino Medoro (1567–c. 1631), worked for several years in Tunja and Bogotá before relocating to Lima. Pérez de Alesio and Medoro, especially, left a lasting artistic impact on South America, not only through paintings but also through students and followers, resulting in an Italianate artistic foundation that stretched from Lima throughout the Andean world, including Bogotá and Quito.⁵ In 1588, Medoro married the daughter of a prominent Spanish official in Colombia and settled for several years in Bogotá.⁶ It was around this time that Gregorio Vásquez’s grandparents arrived in Santa Fe de Bogotá.

By about 1625, American-born painters had taken over the market in the major centres in Latin America.⁷ This is not to say that artistic ties to Europe had weakened. In fact, the transatlantic trade of artwork continued and grew exponentially until the late eighteenth century. Among the most powerful early European artistic influences in many Latin American urban centres was the assimilated blend of Italian and Flemish styles then prevalent in Seville. Flemish works poured into New Spain and South America through enterprising dealers like the Forchondt family, based in Antwerp, who exported prints and paintings to Seville and thence to the Americas.⁸ After about 1630, the work of Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) was well known throughout the viceroyalties. Later, Francisco de Zurbarán (1598–1664), who also acted as an exporter of Flemish and Spanish artworks, sent several major commissions to religious institutions in South America. The complicated impact Murillo had on the visual arts in the Americas has been clarified in recent studies, and his influence on Gregorio Vásquez has been noted throughout the literature on the Colombian painter. While Murillo himself had planned to travel to the New World in 1633, it is not clear that he ever undertook this trip. However, documents show his son Gabriel had arrived in Colombia by 1679, just as Vásquez’s career began to flourish; on 8 June 1681, Gabriel was married in Bogotá to Antonia López Nieto.⁹

While transatlantic trade and artistic transmission are crucial to understanding the development of colonial painting in the Spanish and Portuguese Americas, different styles and visual languages emerged in each centre of production, depending on many factors, including but not limited to, questions of patronage, the relative endurance of pre-Hispanic techniques, and the prevalence of Indigenous artists. For example, the predominant style of painting in Cuzco little resembles that which was produced in neighbouring Lima. Vásquez, who had trained in the studio of Baltasar de Figueroa, also of Sevillian origin, acquired an understanding of the painting of contemporary Seville that played a conspicuous role in his artistic development. To judge from his oeuvre, Vásquez was a sophisticated master of visual and iconographic synthesis. He also proved an adept judge of the Bogotá art market, which included both ecclesiastical and mercantile patrons, producing a consistent body of work for which demand never seemed to wane.
Gregorio Vásquez: Man and Myth

Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos is the most outstanding figure in hispano-American art of the colonial period. No other artist of that period can offer...a body of work that is greater in quantity, intrinsic merit, or enduring human significance. More prolific and consistent than the famous Echarles of New Spain...superior in technique and pictorial [quality] to the renowned Miguel de Santiago of Quito, with a gift incomparably higher than his predecessor and contemporaries.

Gabriel Giraldo Jaramillo (1944)

While few details are known of Vásquez’s early life, he is hardly an obscure artist in his native Colombia. The first scholarly publication on the painter, Noticia descriptiva de algunos cuadros de Vásquez by José Manuel Groot, appeared in 1859, followed by a larger monograph by the same author later that year.10 Vásquez’s work was highlighted in major exhibitions in Bogotá in 1886 and 1914, and following Francisco Pizano Restrepo’s seminal catalogue of 1926, a generation of noteworthy Colombian scholars continued to publish on Vásquez and his oeuvre in the mid-twentieth century.11 This group of historians included Gabriel Giraldo Jaramillo, Guillermo Hernández de Alba, Francisco Gil Tovar, and the renowned Spanish scholar, Diego Angulo Iñíguez. While Vásquez has enjoyed continuous popularity in Colombia, even gracing Colombia’s postage stamps in the mid-twentieth century, he has remained all but neglected by North American art historians until recently.12 Since their inclusion in the 1999 exhibition, Los Siglos de Oro en los Virreinatos de América, 1550–1700 (Museo de América, Madrid), Vásquez’s works have been shown in several exhibitions in the United States, Mexico, and Canada, including those organized by the Philadelphia Museum of Art and the Cantor Arts Center (Stanford University, California), both in 2006.13

As Luisa Elena Alcalá notes, the early historiography of Gregorio Vásquez is marked by personal mythology and a tendency to define the artist within the framework of an idealized national character.14 The propensity to claim an artist as evidence of national cultural excellence was prevalent on both sides of the Atlantic from the eighteenth century until as recently as the 1970s. Such an introspective regional vision has occasionally caused misidentifications of artists in Spain and its American viceregalities, as was the case in the early twentieth century, when works by Josepe de Ribera were mistakenly attributed to the more definitively Spanish Murillo. In the case of Vásquez, his contemporaries were avid consumers of his specifically Sevillian style, while in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, post-Bolivar intellectuals and collectors sought value in promoting the artist and glamourizing his biography to ensure his entry into the pantheon of the world’s greatest artists. In the process, a number of overly optimistic attributions may have been made in order to capitalize on the artist’s renown. The rediscovery and conservation of the Denver panels has helped to clarify some of the distinctions between master and studio.

A host of undisputed genealogical information adds context to Vásquez’s artistic development and later biography. The artist’s grandfather and great-grandfather left Seville for New Granada, arriving in Cartagena de Indias sometime around 1598. The artist’s father, Bartolomé Vásquez de Arce y Varo, was most likely born in Bogotá around 1600. Gregorio was born in 1638, about eight years after his older brother, Juan Bautista, and two years before his younger brother, Diego. In 1665, Gregorio married a native of Bogotá, Jerónima Bernal Esguerra, and together they had four children: Diego (b. 1667), Feliciana (b. 1675), Bartolomé Luís (b. 1680), and Pedro (1683–1746). Diego and Feliciana were both documented painters, while Pedro was listed as a silversmith.15 Vásquez’s principal artistic training took place in the Bogotá workshop of Baltasar de Figueroa, son of Gaspar, the founding patriarch of an important family of painters also from Seville. While receiving what must have been a competent education in the art of painting, Vásquez also had access, in the Figueroa studio, to many illustrated books and to around 1,800 prints.16 The story of Vásquez’s expulsion from the Figueroa studio for “correcting” one of the master’s works may be apocryphal, but in any event Vásquez had his own workshop by 1658, around the time of his earliest signed paintings.17 His impressive, broad understanding of artistic trends in Golden Age Spain, likely first cultivated within the Figueroa studio and its library of engravings, was crucial to his working method and technical development. Prints and drawings would become fundamental to his own workshop, which he organized around his nuclear family, as was common throughout early modern Spain and Latin America.

Early scholars speculated that Vásquez may have visited his ancestral home in Seville, yet no evidence has come to light that he ever crossed the Atlantic; furthermore, Bogotá’s thriving Sevillian community and its active commercial ties to the Spanish metropolis probably obviated the need for such a dangerous and expensive trip. Gabriel Murillo brought works of art, including paintings, from Seville, though nothing by his famous father is listed in his 1700 inventory. However, Gabriel’s brother Gaspar sent two paintings by the elder Murillo to Bogotá following the master’s death in 1682.18 The constant influx of friars, Jesuits (with whom Vásquez had studied as a boy), churchmen from Spain and Italy, along with merchants (and presumably artists) from Seville and elsewhere, meant that Bogotá, like Mexico City, was closely connected to contemporary artistic
and cultural trends in Europe. Gregorio Vásquez, to judge from his vast extant oeuvre and its stylistic consistency, was among the most adept artists at synthesizing these European influences for a growing clientele who leaned unequivocally towards Sevillian taste. We find a powerful example of this affinity in his 1685 masterpiece *House of Nazareth* (fig. 1), especially when compared with Murillo’s earlier treatment of a similar subject in his *Holy Family with the Infant Saint John the Baptist* (fig. 2). Vásquez’s scene shares Murillo’s sense of tranquillity, and adds several quotidian details that foster a human connection with the viewer, such as the cat warming itself by the hearth and the Christ Child helping sweep the floor. Even the two angels present are assisting the holy family in their chores. The image encapsulates Vásquez’s artistic vision, which was based on sound draftsmanship, sophisticated naturalism, convincing still-life and landscape details, and a thorough understanding of the visual language of the Counter-Reformation.

Draftsmanship lay at the heart of Vásquez’s creative process. In drawings, he was able to explore facial types, anatomy, and complex poses with a remarkable economy of line. Many of his drawings are characterized by bold contour lines and feature single-figure or small group studies that may be found...
Figure 2. Bartolomé Esteban Murillo, *Holy Family with the Infant Saint John the Baptist*, 1655–59. Oil on canvas, 156 x 126 cm. Fine Arts Museum, Budapest (photo: Fine Arts Museum, Budapest).
in finished paintings. This was an unusual approach during this period in the Spanish colonies, contrasting most starkly with the lack of extant drawings by Vásquez's prolific contemporary in Mexico, the idiosyncratic master Cristóbal de Villalpando (c. 1649–1714). The notion that artists in Latin America did not produce or employ drawings may be a misconception arising simply from survival rates and other accidents of history; perhaps for this reason studies of draftsmanship in early modern Latin America are also all but absent from the scholarly literature. In its consistent use and production of pen drawings, Vásquez's Bogotá workshop superficially resembles Murillo's in Seville, though there is little stylistic similarity in their drawings; we might speculate that the practice was modelled more closely on that of Vásquez's master, Figueroa.

The Denver Panels

The Temptation of Saint Thomas Aquinas is the largest of the four panels in the Denver Art Museum (fig. 3). It depicts an episode from the established hagiography of the Dominican theologian as compiled by Jacobus de Voragine in the Golden Legend and elsewhere. The event occurred early in Thomas's spiritual life, around 1250, when he decided, against his noble family's wishes, to enter the Dominican Order of Preachers. Thomas's mother intervened: she had his two brothers hire a beguiling prostitute to seduce her son, in an attempt to end his Dominican novitiate. Wielding a blazing torch, Thomas chased the young woman from his quarters. He was rewarded for his chastity with a visit from the Virgin Mary and Christ Child and a symbolic chastity belt given to him by two angels. The angels' bestowal of the belt, not readily legible before the painting's recent cleaning, provides the scene's iconographical and dramatic climax. The saint's resolute chastity is paralleled by his own persistence in joining the Dominican order in the face of his family's opposition. Vásquez's panel presents Thomas as an exemplum virtutis to be emulated by faithful viewers, and especially by fellow Dominican novices or seminarians contemplating the devotional life. Thomas Aquinas went on to become one of the most renowned Roman Catholic theologians, a doctor of the Church, and a seminal figure in modern Western thought. Though an uncommon topic in Spanish and Latin American painting at the time, the episode is now often encountered among Hispanists, mainly as a result of Diego de Velázquez's famous treatment of the same scene in a large canvas for the Dominican college in Orihuela, Spain (Museo Diocesano).

The Denver painting's composition is based on an engraving by Benoît Thiboust (French, active in Italy from c. 1655) after Giacinto Calandrucci (Italian, 1646–1707), from whom Vásquez took his preparatory drawing of the figure of Thomas Aquinas (fig. 4). The inscription states that the print was produced in Rome during the sixteen-month reign of Pope Alexander VIII (1689–91) to commemorate the founding of the Dominican College of San Fernando in Quito. Thiboust's graphic work must have been available in New Granada as there are other instances of Vásquez's use of his prints, including a Saint Rose of Lima (fig. 5) adapted from an image published in Serafino Bertolini's La Rosa peruana of 1666. The iconographic and commemorative ties to South America that these works share, along with others by Thiboust, indicate that they would have found a ready audience in New Granada and Peru.

While the identification of Thiboust's print as Vásquez's pictorial source has much scholarly value, including its determination of the painting's terminus post quem to about 1690, of greater significance is how the artist employed the print in his artistic modus operandi. The widespread use of European prints by artists in Spain's American colonies is well studied: most notable is the work of the late historian of Colombia, Santiago Sebastián; Sabine MacCormack has recently made important contributions to our understanding of the use of print sources in Lima, specifically a series of engravings by Schelte à Bolswert employed by Basilio Pacheco; likewise, Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt has identified numerous engraved sources for viceregal paintings in Quito. In the case of Vásquez's employment of such models, we are aided by the existence of a partially painted impression on paper of The Temptation of Saint Thomas Aquinas by Thiboust in the Denver Art Museum, which was acquired by Daniel Stapleton at the same time he bought the Vásquez panels. In spite of its poor condition and the clumsiness of the application of the oil paint, this object sheds a great deal of light on the practices of the Vásquez workshop. The painted print appears to have been done by a studio hand at an early stage of his or her apprenticeship.

At some point, the master himself produced the study drawing in sepia ink of the central figure of Saint Thomas Aquinas (fig. 4). With its clear, bold lines and large format, it appears to have served as a model for the painting's composition, while surplus impressions of Thiboust's engraving could have been used for training exercises and further drawing studies. Vásquez is unique among Spanish Colonial painters in having a large extant corpus of autograph drawings (all in the collection of the Museo de Arte Colonial, Bogotá), many of which may be identified as models for his compositions. Vásquez's drawings are notable for their large size, clearly defined outlines, and lack of subtle shading. In short, they are bold and didactic—the type of drawing a studio assistant (or indeed, the master) might use as a guide in the execution of larger painted compositions. Stylistically, the drawings do not appear to have been executed as independent works of art, and they lack the finish and shading of drawings by Murillo or Rubens. Like many of Rubens's drawings, Vásquez's appear to be sketches with well-defined outlines,
Figure 3. Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos, *The Temptation of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 1690s. Oil on paper on wood panel, 52.7 x 36.8 cm. Denver Art Museum, Gift of the Stapleton Foundation of Latin American Colonial Art, made possible by the Renchard Family (photo: Jeff Wells, Denver Art Museum).
Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos, Saint Thomas Aquinas, 1690s. Sepia ink on paper, 42 x 31 cm. Museo de Arte Colonial, Bogotá (photo: Museo Colonial y Museo Santa Clara).

but without the Flemish master’s various washes and highlights. Vásquez’s drawings were ideal for copying and tracing (some drawings may themselves even be tracings). During conservation treatment of the Saint Thomas Aquinas panel, it was discovered that the painting’s principal support is paper affixed to the wood panel, suggesting that an underdrawing or “story-board” technique was employed. Because most of Vásquez’s sketches are for single figures and anatomical details such as hands and feet, rather than full compositions, it may be that the master’s intention was to impose a level of quality control on the most difficult elements of large-scale commissions.

The second panel in Denver (fig. 6) that may now be attributed to Gregorio Vásquez depicts the founder of the Dominican monastic order, Domingo Félix de Guzmán (1170–1221), who was born in the province of Burgos, Spain, and canonized in 1234. He is shown contemplating Scripture as he prepares for a peaceful and dignified death in the Italian countryside. Following conservation treatment in 2012, the painting was found to exhibit brushwork and palette consistent with The Temptation of Saint Thomas Aquinas. After cleaning, details such as the rosary beads, an important attribute of Dominic’s iconography, became readily visible. The Saint Dominic panel, which is not signed, may be attributed to the master, based in part on stylistic comparisons to other known works by the artist, but also on its close similarity to a panel by Vásquez of the same subject and composition and nearly identical dimensions in a private collection in Colombia. The very slight (about 1 cm) difference in the width of the two panels is explained by the fact that the Denver Saint Dominic shows signs that it was trimmed on the right side, presumably to fit a frame. The painting probably dates from the 1680s, when Vásquez was occupied with commissions for the church and monastery of Santo Domingo in Bogotá.

Bolstering the credibility of the attribution is the landscape in the background of the composition and the rendering of the lilies and book in the foreground. A similar treatment of
landscape and still-life elements is found in many works by Vásquez, most notably perhaps in his Institution of the Rosary, in which the Virgin and Child appear before Saints Dominic and Anthony of Padua. In this work, the landscape is painted in the long, sweeping strokes of diluted pigment that we find in the Saint Dominic panel. Likewise, the lilies and book of Scripture are treated with great similarity in both works. The white petals of the flower are nearly diaphanous, deftly rendered with one or two touches of the brush. In the landscape and sky of both paintings, the artist makes use of the reddish-pink ground, leaving it visible to create a soft atmosphere and sense of depth. The application of paint is especially sophisticated in the foliage on the left side of the Saint Dominic painting, bearing a close resemblance to the handling of the trees and leaves in Vásquez’s large Saint Francis Xavier (fig. 7). In both works, the artist uses a technique of single dabs of white impasto to convey a naturalistic light source and sense of volume in the trees. Likewise, a comparison to the nude figure of Adam in Vásquez’s Creation of Eve, who is depicted in a similar reclining position in the immediate foreground, reveals further stylistic consistencies, such as the modeling of the feet, with highlighted soles and pronounced heels, which is nearly identical in both, and the languid left hand, the two middle fingers of which rest one on top of the other. Details like these are also found in several of Vásquez’s study drawings of hands and feet, apparently taken from life. The Denver Art Museum’s panel depicting The Virgin Mary in Prayer (fig. 8) is a variation of Vásquez’s work in the Sagrario chapel. The Sagrario commission, which comprised more than
Figure 7. Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos, Saint Francis Xavier, 1680–1700. Oil on canvas, 153 x 104 cm. Museo de Arte Colonial, Bogotá (photo: Museo Colonial y Museo Santa Clara).
more closely resembles the master’s original painting. This suggests that the painting’s author had direct knowledge of both works and that the picture was probably executed under the master’s watchful eye.

As Pizano Restrepo recognized as early as 1921, Vásquez had access to a broad range of European painting through print sources, as well as works copied after Italian and Spanish masters. Among these, works by Guido Reni, Rubens, Zurbarán, and Murillo figure prominently in Vásquez’s oeuvre. The Denver Art Museum’s **Virgin in Prayer** is a competent realization of this workshop, which produced at least nine extant versions on wood panel of this composition, mostly of similar dimensions. The panels in Denver and the Sagrario, which show a bust-length Virgin Mary with hands clasped elegantly in prayer, correspond to Vásquez’s preparatory drawing (fig. 9). The Denver painting clearly relies on the drawing for stylistic and compositional details, including the heavy-lidded eyes, carefully modelled chin, clearly delineated nose structure, and deft brushstroke that defines both the Virgin’s neck and her suprasternal notch. Most of the drapery folds also follow the general outlines of the drawing. However, in details such as the pursed lips and overall fall of the headdress, the Denver panel fifty paintings, occupied Vásquez for much of his career. In order to meet the demands of such ambitious projects, Vásquez likely employed his brother, Juan Bautista, and later his own children, Feliciana and Diego, as workshop assistants. The Denver Art Museum’s **Virgin in Prayer** is modelled on works by the Italian Giovanni Battista Salvi da Sassoferrato (1609–85). Sassoferrato produced at least seven so-called Northern Headdress Madonnas (named for their similarity to Albrecht Dürer’s work), a replica of which arrived in Colombia during the viceregal period. It is plausible that Vásquez employed the Sassoferrato copy as the model for his drawing, which in turn spawned the many workshop replicas that must have been in high demand in colonial Colombia.
Figure 10. Workshop of Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos, *The Penitent Mary Magdalene*, second half of the seventeenth century. Oil on panel, 33 x 27.9 cm. Denver Art Museum. Gift of the Stapleton Foundation of Latin American Colonial Art, made possible by the Renchard Family (photo: Jeff Wells, Denver Art Museum).
The fourth panel in Denver that may be associated with the workshop of Gregorio Vásquez is *The Penitent Mary Magdalene* (fig. 10). While no drawing has surfaced that may be associated with it, the composition relies entirely on a larger version signed by Vásquez and dated August 1680. The iconography of this image is notably austere: the Magdalene sinks her head in her left hand in an echo of Dürer’s *Melencolia I* (1514), while her right hand rests atop a human skull. There is very little peripheral detail, few still-life elements besides the skull and a book of Scripture that symbolize the Magdalene's contemplative inner struggle. This is in stark contrast to later examples of the same scene in which the figure is a pared-down Counter-Reformation model of the sacrament of penance.

In his iconography, Vásquez may have been informed by prints and illustrated chapbooks, which were often produced and exported by the religious orders in Rome.39 The presence of Italian painters in South America is well studied; Angelino Medoro (1567–1633) enjoyed the patronage of both the Dominicans and Franciscans in Bogotá and Tunja before moving on to Peru. It is possible an artist like Medoro or his monastic patrons could have brought this type of Magdalene to New Granada in the form of chapbooks or other printed material. The cleaning of the Magdalene panel in the Denver Art Museum confirmed that the paint surface was in good condition, but it also revealed the figure's awkward anatomy and flawed, inconsistent modelling. It is surely not the work of the master, nor is it likely to have originated from the hand of a mature workshop assistant. However, this should not detract from the work’s intrinsic art-historical value, as it suggests a thriving workshop in which many artists operated at varying stages of training. It would be tempting to associate this work with the juvenilia of Diego, Vásquez’s eldest son, who would have been in his mid-teens when his father was composing the original. This must remain speculation, however, as no surviving painting has yet been linked to Diego, or for that matter to his younger sister, Feliciana.

Conclusions

Gregorio Vásquez de Arce y Ceballos’s commercial success, as indicated by the quantity of his commissions and the prestige of his patrons, seems to have been cut short in 1701 by an extended incarceration on charges of accessory to rape.40 Whatever the merits or political motivations of these charges, the canons of the cathedral in Bogotá saw fit to bury Vásquez within the sanctuary upon his death in 1711, suggesting his reputa-

tion had survived intact. As for the four rediscovered panels in the Denver Art Museum, two—*The Temptation of Saint Thomas Aquinas* and *The Death of Saint Dominic*—appear to be the work of the master himself. The other two—*The Virgin Mary in Prayer* and *The Penitent Mary Magdalene*—are here ascribed to two different hands in the Vásquez studio. All four are variants of compositions employed by Vásquez in other paintings, and two, the *Thomas Aquinas* and the *Virgin in Prayer*, also correspond closely to extant preparatory drawings of undoubted authenticity. What can these paintings tell us?

First, the panel paintings in Denver indicate that Vásquez’s studio practice was based on a proto-academic notion of the primacy of draftsmanship, which appears to have been highly unusual in viceregal Latin America. His print collection did not just provide compositional or iconographical models; it now appears that he encouraged his students to paint directly on surplus impressions and that he used them for figure drawings, which in turn served as models during the execution of both autograph masterpieces and workshop paintings. Second, Vásquez’s production of profitable copies and variants, often carried out by studio assistants, would certainly have insured his family’s financial security, but it also points to a thriving art market in Bogotá. While the importation of thousands of Flemish paintings (often copies) to the Spanish American colonies continued, the demand for Vásquez’s work flourished, resulting in the production en masse of many small-scale variants and copies. Lastly, this brief study of Vásquez and his career brings up questions regarding the status of the artist in early modern Latin American society. Vásquez was held in high esteem by his patrons during his lifetime, by the cathedral chapter at the time of his death, and by artists and writers in Colombia in the centuries after his death. His vast oeuvre, fuelled by a fertile artistic imagination that was thriving on both sides of the Atlantic, is ripe for further scholarship, and the more general issue of global artistic transmission in the Spanish world warrants broader consideration. In tying together some of these varied threads of national art-historical studies, we find that Gregorio Vásquez’s world was much smaller and more connected than we had previously imagined.
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