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ABSTRACT

During the last half of the nineteenth century, the Spanish central government undertook a series of reforms in the education, exhibition, and patronage of fine arts resulting in what may be considered the most prolific period of painting in Spain’s history.

As a part of broad national educational reform, Spain’s independent regional art academies came under the management of the Central Academia de Bellas Artes in Madrid, which was dominated by French-educated artist administrators. Under their leadership, arts education changed dramatically though an increasing the number of fine art academies — including an academy in Rome for the most promising Spanish artists — establishing a uniform curriculum, and dramatically expanding arts educational to regional and poor students.

Beginning in 1856, with the Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes — the Spanish equivalent of the Paris Salon — Spanish artists competed with one another for the first time on a national stage. The eighteen Exposiciones Nacionales held in Madrid between 1856 and 1897 coincided with turbulent political and social changes. By examining key works submitted and awarded the Exposición Nacional, this study maps the changes in patronage and audiences for the fine arts in Spain during the last half of the nineteenth century; from Spanish-history paintings predominantly made for and sponsored by the government to paintings of contemporary subjects made for and purchased by a growing private market.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction
This study began on October 30, 2007, with the dedication of the Prado Museum’s new wing. Fresh exhibition rooms were filled with nineteenth-century Spanish history paintings unseen in public for nearly 100 years. At the unveiling, the king and queen of Spain, flanked by the president and heirs apparent, posed before a large painting. The next day, the juxtaposition of leaders and art dominated the front pages of Spanish newspapers (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Uly Martín, photographer. Photograph. El País, 31 October 2007.

Even after a century, this nearly forgotten era of Spanish art could not

---

1 Designed by the architect Rafael Moneo (Spanish, 1937), it is the first amplification of the museum since opening in 1819. Source: Antón González-Capitel. “Moneo Vallés, José Rafael.” Enciclopedia online (Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado: https://www.museodelprado.es/enciclopedia/enciclopedia-on-line/voz/moneo-valles-jose-rafael/), accessed 4 December 2014.

2 Ángeles García. “El Rey, Zapatero y el consenso que hizo posible el nuevo Prado.” El País (Madrid: 31 Oct 2007), 1. Original text: “De izquierda a derecha, Plácido Arango, presidente del Patronato del Prado; César Antonio Molina, ministro de Cultura; Sonsoles Espinosa y Rodríguez Zapatero, los Reyes; los principes de Asturias; y el director del Prado, Miguel Zugaza, posando ante la pintura Fusilamiento de Torrijos y sus compañeros en las playas de Málaga, de Antonio Gisbert.”
escape political interpretations. The painting hung behind the nation’s leaders is *El Fusilamiento de Torrijos y sus compañeros en las playas de Málaga* (1888) by Antonio Gisbert Perez (1834-1901), whose name was omitted from all photos featuring his work. Despite the work and author having been long forgotten by most Spaniards, its title was clearly understood.

It featured General José María Torrijos (1791-1831), who was executed along with several other Spanish leaders for advocating the adoption of the country’s first constitution. Their king, Ferdinand VII (1784-1833 | Reign, 1813-1833), had recently reinstated the Inquisition and aggressively persecuted democratic movements. Yet in 2007, here was Ferdinand VII’s great-great-great-grandson, King Juan Carlos (1938 | Reign, 1975-present) — who transitioned the country from Franco’s dictatorship to a modern constitutional monarchy — standing in front of the image of massacred patriots, along with democratically elected leaders of Spain. The effective adaptation of the painting to the political narrative of 2007 was remarkable. No thirty-second commercial nor slogan could have communicated more than that single image.

Most publications that ran the photograph did not name the painter of the work nor correctly cite its title — an indication of the genre’s current obscurity. But, at the time of their creation, these works stood at the center of major national debates (see chapter four), served as international ambassadors of Spanish values (see chapter six), and were bellwethers of social change (see chapter eight). In other words, Spanish history paintings are essential to understanding the narrative of Spain’s emerging national identity.

History paintings became the principal goal of Spanish artistic production in 1856 with the first *Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes*, the Spanish

---

equivalent of the *Salon des Beaux Arts*. In large part the genre owes its structure to the eighteen *Exposiciones* between 1856 and 1897. These public events were the *raison d'être* for Spanish history paintings and were overseen by the formidable Federico de Madrazo y Kuntz (1815-1894). (The key role that Madrazo and his family played will be discussed in depth in chapter three, and throughout this study.)

Madrazo adapted French academic artistic training and oversaw its implementation in eighteen regional academies of fine art. In addition, the government opened a school in Rome for Spanish painting — a Spanish *Prix de Rôme* — in 1873 and granted scholarships to promising, early-career artists. Graduates of these institutions had significant artistic arsenals and were capable of creating monumental, multi-figural works on par with those by the best artists in England, France, Germany, and America at the time. French critics were delighted and shocked by the “quality,” “competence,” and “originality” of Spanish works on show at the *Exposition Universelle* of 1878,4 and Claude Monet proclaimed Joaquín Sorolla the “D’un joyeux de la lumière.”5 By the turn of the century, nearly 10 percent of all works exhibited in the French *Salon* were by Spanish artists.6

The Prado’s nineteenth-century Spanish art collection is twice as large as all its other collections combined. This is both because of and in spite of the nineteenth century being one of the most politically unstable and economically depressed in Spain’s history. In the absence of a robust

---


private art market, the government became the principal patron and the Prado the principal repository. The works themselves often reflect volatile political movements that controlled government purse strings.

As was true in other Western nations, Spanish critics and leaders of institutions came to value modernist, avant-garde movements led by artists like Pablo Picasso (1881-1973) and Salvador Dalí (1904-1989). Both were graduates from Spanish academies, and used their academic pedigrees and rejection of academism as part of their appeal. Picasso and Dalí both came to prominence in Spain as a result of their success in France. Ironically, this was also the case with Spanish history painters (e.g., Eduardo Rosales, Francisco Pradilla, Joaquín Sorolla) a generation earlier. The critical fortune of Spanish artists abroad, especially in France, had a significant influence on the critical and popular fortune of their works in Spain — often completely reversing opinions (see chapters five, six, and eight).

In addition to an increasing lack of institutional and scholarly interest in academic painting, several Spanish history paintings depicting key figures from the nation’s past were adopted by the French regime. These works were prominently placed in government buildings, reproduced on Falangist currency and stamps, and even inspired a few historical films. Unfortunately, this Franco-era stigma — which has nothing to do with the era in which the works were created — has persisted in academic institutions and led to a scholarly radioactivity, damaging those who touch the subject and keeping others away entirely. (Being a foreigner who researches and writes on the subject can be surprisingly advantageous.) Compared to scholarly work on academic painting in France, England, Germany, the United States and, even, Russia, there is a serious lack of examination of the creation, exhibition, and contemporary reaction to these Spanish works. For the public at large, the result has been amnesia rather than stigma.
Four recent developments have made this doctorate both possible and timely: public exhibition of paintings unseen for decades, distance in time and association from the Franco regime, new scholarship on nineteenth-century Spanish history, and a wider re-appreciation of nineteenth-century history paintings.

For the first time since the turn of the century, Spanish history paintings are being put in public view and within context. In 2009, following the 2007 exhibit *The Nineteenth-Century at the Prado,* the museum’s directors uprooted several rooms of sixteenth-century Venetian paintings adjacent to works by Francisco José de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828) and replaced them with nineteenth-century Spanish history paintings. The change put both collections within chronological and stylistic context for the first time. Also, the proximity of more than 100 unfamiliar works near the most visited works from Goya’s *oeuvre* generated significant curiosity. The decision was vindicated with a blockbuster retrospective of paintings by Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923), the first since his death. The exhibition ranked among the most visited in the Prado’s history.

The Prado’s bold move to give little-known, Spanish nineteenth-century paintings permanent and top billing has led other museums with sizable collections of mothballed works to dedicate significant wall space to the genre for the first time. These include the *Museo de Bellas Artes de Málaga,* which has just undergone a multi-euro renovation to display its local, nineteenth-century works; the *Museu Nacional d’Art de Catalunya,* which has recently held several major exhibitions on nineteenth-century artists from Barcelona (e.g., Ramón Casas, Mariano Fortuny); and a number of exhibitions sponsored by the *Banco de España* and *Caixa Forum.* The lack of informative labeling and outright incorrect information

---


presented in regional museums also indicates a dearth of available scholarly work on the subject.

For this doctorate, I have chosen six key works that illustrate the beginning, height, and decline of Spanish history painting. In chapter two, I report on the scholarship and available materials for the study of nineteenth-century Spanish artists.

Chapter three describes the establishment and structure of the Spanish Academy (i.e., those institutions that made the training of artists, funding of fine arts, and exhibition of works possible). From this point forward, each chapter is a case study, exploring the creation, exhibition, and reaction to key works that illustrate the evolution of Spanish history painting from 1856 to 1897. These are not arbitrary beginning and end points. In 1856, sweeping legislation simultaneously established a national art competition and a nationwide art education system. The subsequent money that poured into Spanish art from government coffers attracted a deluge of new artists dependent on governmental institutions. By 1897, as exemplified by the career of artists like Joaquín Sorolla (see chapter eight), Spanish artists became less dependent on government patronage and were working with both local and international audiences interested in the depiction of contemporary subjects rather than historical ones.

Chapter four is an exploration of how and why the first generation of graduates from this system were unprepared for national attention. Chapter five examines *El Testamento de Isabel la Católica*, considered by contemporaries to be the greatest Spanish history painting. Explaining why it was considered “the greatest” reveals the values Spanish artists had for themselves. However, it is *Juana la Loca*, the subject of chapter six and the “most popular Spanish history painting,”9 that demonstrates the increased influence of public opinion on Spanish artists. The transition

---

from academic to popular audiences had Spanish artists reaching for ever larger, epic, and sensational subjects from Spanish and classical history until a new generation of artists became successful in making contemporary subjects equally compelling. In chapter seven, this “mannerist” period of Spanish history painting is shown in all its bizarre permutations.

It was not until the 1890s that popular Spanish audiences, through the work of Joaquín Sorolla, simultaneously rediscovered their enthusiasm for painting and demonstrated a general lack of interest in historical painting. Trained as a history painter, Sorolla substituted historical subjects with people and narratives from contemporary Spanish culture. His work demonstrated social and economic shifts that spelled the demise of history painting.

In the months before the Spanish Civil war broke out, Prime Minister Manuel Azaña (1880-1940) famously said, “The Prado Museum is more important to Spain than the monarchy and the republic together.” The relationship between the Spanish people and its art is a fascinating and under-explored subject in any period. In particular, the artists separating — perhaps connecting — Goya and Picasso are the most prolific and least-understood generation of Spanish artists. It is my hope that this doctoral study of the invention, rise, and fall of Spanish nineteenth-century history painting will both stand on the shoulders of those who have helped me understand it better, and provide a footing for those who will far surpass the contribution of an American who learned Spanish in Chile, wrote in English, and fell in love with this subject by being a tourist the day a king stood in front of a painting for a photo op.

---

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Survey
In September of 2008, I was the first to sign the visitors’ ledger of the Archivo de la Real Academia de San Fernando de Bellas Artes (now housed at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid) in more than two years and the only non-Spaniard to appear since 1992. The Archivo contains the administrative records, including teaching plans and student materials, from Spain’s most prestigious academy for aspiring eighteenth- and nineteenth-century artists. The apparent lack of interest in the Archivo was, as my advisor suggested at the time, an indication that either I had stumbled onto a seriously neglected subject or one that had no inherent value. The scenario has often been repeated over the past five years, in more than two dozen archives and during forty-five research trips (thirty-six to Spain, five to France, two to Italy, and two to New York). In his recent autobiography, the great British historian John H. Elliott wrote of spending a great deal of time in Spanish archives, gathering research for what was then the neglected subject of seventeenth-century Spanish history. The large number of documents and desire to share all of them overwhelmed the young scholar, whose advisor at Cambridge, Herbert Butterfield, counseled him not to produce a “definitive” work. Instead, Butterfield suggested: “All histories are interim reports — and the question would be: Can you get us a step forward?” It is in this spirit that this doctoral study has been produced — as an interim report of where we are now. And this literature survey represents a reporting of what existed before and, perhaps just as important, how a study of this subject can be practically undertaken today.

This chapter will first address the accessibility of the works themselves; second, important archival resources from the period; third, art historical scholarship on the subject — addressing key theories, scholars, and

---


exhibitions; and, finally, a brief survey of scholarship in related subjects that have been instrumental to this study. While many literature surveys primarily focus on published writings in the field, the comparative dearth of published materials on this topic and the resulting heavy reliance on original documents merit a mapping of the museums and archives that have influenced what can be practically undertaken in the study of nineteenth-century Spanish history painting. In other words, this particular “interim” report would be incomplete without describing the significant archival and museological advances and gaps in the field. Prior to 2007, the study of nineteenth-century Spanish history painting would have been significantly more difficult. Works unseen for decades have recently been relocated, restored, and displayed. Archives containing significant original documentation relating to the period have received substantial funding that has resulted in unprecedented access to their holdings.

As discussed in the Introduction, this study of nineteenth-century Spanish history painting is rooted in the creation, exhibition, and reaction to seminal works created between 1856 and 1897. Consequently, writing about these paintings, for both formal and conceptual analysis, has depended upon first-hand, physical examination of the works themselves. Fortunately, most of these works were originally destined for and are still located at the Museo Nacional del Prado in Madrid. The Prado was and remains the most significant repository of Spanish nineteenth-century history paintings. Its nineteenth-century collection is almost all Spanish in origin and more than double the number of works in all other museum’s other collections combined (i.e., more than 50,000 objects). Under a new leadership since 2007, the museum has undertaken the herculean task of digitizing all nineteenth-century works, including studies, in its inventory and making them available either online or in person through their private digital archive. It is a work in progress.

Perhaps no two people have done more for the re-evaluation of nineteenth-century Spanish painting than Dr. José Luis Diez and Dr. Javier
Barón Thaidigsmann. They are, respectively, the director of Nineteenth-Century Collections and director of Nineteenth-Century Paintings at the Museo Nacional del Prado. Diez and Barón’s accomplishments have made possible the first permanent display of nineteenth-century works in nearly 100 years. They have orchestrated the availability of fifteen galleries in the museum’s main building for the permanent display of major nineteenth-century works, including one room for temporary exhibitions. All of these efforts have been accompanied by high-quality exhibitions and publications that have paired key works with preparatory studies and related original documents in the museum’s collections. The exhibitions have been popular and have drawn the attention and support of the political elite. The retrospective exhibition of Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (2011) was the most attended exhibition in the history of the Prado, with a half million visitors. Accompanying the exhibition was a museum-published catalogue — the most complete record of the artist’s work to date — that included a much-neglected reproduction of early academic works in private collections. The present study has benefited directly from José Luis Diez and Javier Barón’s generosity. At the start of my research, they spent several hours sharing their unique insights and personal libraries, and opened access to the Prado’s vast archival resources. On several occasions, they have used their influence to encourage other institutions to grant access to rare and otherwise publicly unavailable works for examination.

Under Diez and Barón’s leadership, the Prado has moved beyond its own collections to financially sponsor major touring and regional exhibitions in nineteenth-century art, and lent important works to other Spanish and non-Spanish museum exhibitions featuring nineteenth-century Spanish paintings. Much like the Getty Museum in Los Angeles, the Prado has borrowed from impoverished institutions in exchange for restoring objects to exhibitable condition. Indirectly, the increased emphasis on nineteenth-

century art at the country’s most prestigious museum and accompanying high attendance numbers to special exhibitions has led regional museums with nineteenth-century collections to dust off works, remodel buildings, and hold exhibitions on important local artists from the era. Despite the large archival collections held by the Prado and other regional Spanish museums, many works, whose significance is well known from contemporary documents, are missing altogether. They have been misplaced, lent out, stolen, or sold by institutions without public notice. Locating these works poses a challenge to undertaking a study of the period.

One of the first exercises for this study was identifying the winners of a national contest (see Appendix 3: Award-Winning Works from Exposiciones Nacionales from 1856 through 1899). From 1856 to the end of the century, Spain’s central showcase for history paintings was the Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes, the Spanish equivalent of the Paris Salon. As will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three, nearly all prize-winning works at the Exposiciones were acquired by the state and made property of the Museo de Arte Moderno, which was later folded into the collections of the Museo Nacional del Prado. Bernardino de Pantorba’s History and Criticism of the Exposiciones Nacionales of Fine Arts in Spain (1980), has been a very useful jumping-off point. Beginning with the first Exposición Nacional in 1856, Pantorba summarizes the award-winning works, triumphs, and controversies associated with each contest. Pantorba’s sources are often not cited, leading to lengthy searches in periodical archives.

The next step was to determine which award-winning works were considered by contemporaries to be most important throughout the period. (It could easily be argued that steps one and two should be reversed and,

---

in this investigation, they occasionally were.) Then, it was important to view or, at the very least, find good reproductions of the works themselves. This was more difficult than anticipated. Of the 200-plus works that had won a major award at the eighteen contests between 1856 and 1900, less than 30 percent were readily findable.\textsuperscript{15} But, after consulting with the Prado, it became clear that a large number of works had disappeared throughout the decades. To date, as a result of this study, twenty-three works from the “unknown whereabouts” list have been located. Where had they gone? Many, because of their large sizes and patriotic themes, were lent to government buildings in lieu of repairing walls.

A handful were illegally sold from public collections. Some have surfaced in auction houses. Unlike the French Salon, very few works from the Spanish Exposición Nacional were sold in private markets then or now. Both \textit{El Último Testamento de Isabel la Católica} (1864) and \textit{Juana la Loca} (1882), for example, had specific laws legislated in order to bar their exportation or private sale. Some works, however, were commissioned by foreign patrons or submitted to Paris Salons and subsequently sold on the private market. The auction houses Sotheby’s, Christie’s, and Bonham’s have been particularly helpful in tracing the current whereabouts of related works in private collections. And two museums, The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, and the Hispanic Society of America, have actively purchased Spanish nineteenth-century works throughout the years, amassing useful study collections. Although the current locations of many works are still unknown, contemporary reproductions in arts journals, such as the \textit{Ilustración Española y Americana}, have been extremely useful.

Although this thesis focuses primarily on prize-winning works, a significant time is spent on formative works and studies. The historical record is clear that preparatory studies and sketches were required by the national and regional Academy supervisors and produced for all judged works. In the

\textsuperscript{15} See Appendix “Exposición Nacional Award Winners by Year, 1856-1899.” APPENDIX NUMBER?
case of Rosales, whose family donated his private sketchbooks to the Prado Museum, a *catalogue raisonné* has been authored by José Luis Diez. The two-volume work is dedicated only to drawing — not oils — and is one of only two *catalogues raisonnées* on Spanish history painters. The volumes are invaluable in providing information on the narrative of Rosales’s making of key works (see chapter four for a discussion of *Isabel La Católica dictando su testamento*). But in most cases, like that of the celebrated artist Pradilla, his sketches were given away to friends and patrons, lost to accidents (e.g., floods and fires), or occasionally show up in auction houses and private galleries with little to no context.

In addition to the works — final and preparatory — themselves, this study builds on a wide range of contemporary documents from government institutions; for example, the Office of Foreign Affairs in Madrid, which has the travel records of Spanish scholarship holders traveling abroad in the nineteenth century, or the Municipality of Valencia, which has records from its efforts to fund local artists working abroad. The resources for the study of nineteenth-century Spanish painting is heavily territorial, demarcated into specific collections, and there is little or no coordination between the individuals who maintain them. While legally obligated to share the contents of their public archives in exchange for public funding, it was common to find administrators arbitrarily limiting the number of hours of access or creating temporary policies barring computers and photography. Despite these obstacles, rich, untapped resources are available to those willing to make frequent visits.

The creation and exhibition of history painting in Spain was meticulously managed by the Spanish Academy (see chapter three). In 1863, all administration of the eighteen regional fine arts schools was taken over by the Academy of San Fernando in Madrid. Curriculum design and delivery, hiring of teachers, national contests, and scholarships were all funded and overseen in Madrid. Until the 1950s, all of the central Academy’s archives were held at the *Archivo-Biblioteca de La Real Academia de San*
**Fernando** in Madrid. At that time, student and classroom records were sent to the *Universidad Complutense* (Madrid), part of the inventory — mainly valuable books used as teaching materials — stayed at the Academy’s *Archivo-Biblioteca*, and works from the collection that were considered “rare books” are in storage at the *Biblioteca Nacional* (Madrid). The logistics and favored access required for study has led to a dearth of foreign scholarship on the subject. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, this meant taking multiple trips, sometimes just to establish relationships that would eventually lead to access in key archives. What follows is a brief description of each principal archive.

All that remains of the once-supreme archive for study of the Spanish history paintings, the *Archivo-Biblioteca de la Real Academia de San Fernando*, is printed books. In other words, the correspondence, handwritten documents, and administrative records produced during the nineteenth century have been sent to the *Universidad Complutense*. The current head librarian of the *Archivo-Biblioteca* of the *Academia de San Fernando* is the author of a remarkable book on the Academy’s history from its inception to 1850. Despite references from the Prado and others, this author has consistently blocked access to the archive’s most valuable asset: catalogues from the *Exposiciones Nacionales*. However, this obstacle has been overcome by slowly buying up those catalogues on abebooks.co.uk and at rare books dealers in Madrid, Lyon, and Paris. (Given that these works are well past copyright protection, I plan to digitize and make these works available on archive.org.)

The collection at the *Universidad Complutense* is a treasure trove of information of which little is published. It contains the day-to-day classroom activities of nearly all those who passed through the Academy from the 1860s to the 1930s (e.g., year-end student evaluations, annual budgets for classroom materials, teacher schedules). Cataloguing is scant
and contents are often misplaced.16

Studying in Rome was the supreme achievement for Spanish artists (discussed in chapter three). When, in 1873, the Spanish established their own Academy for the liberal arts in the Eternal City, it slowly amassed important documentation, including preparatory drawings by students and correspondence between officials in Rome and Madrid (i.e., reports on students who were under strict scholarship requirements). At one time, it was a repository of thousands of preparatory drawings for some of the most important works of the century. But, during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), government funding for the distant institution stopped and did not resume until the mid-1950s. According to the current director of the Academy’s archive, her predecessors sold books, documents, and, unfortunately, thousands of drawings in order to keep the lights on.

By 2011, the Biblioteca Nacional de España (Madrid) had digitized every newspaper published in the country since the seventeenth century and made them searchable and available online free of charge. Public announcements of contests, acquisitions of works by the government, the formation of committees for competitions, reproductions of steel-plate engraved etchings of works made for public consumption, and the reactions to works by national and regional art critics are all now available online (http://hemerotecadigital.bne.es).

From the sixteenth to late-nineteenth centuries, all Spaniards working abroad were required to send copies of their commercial dealings and personal correspondence to the Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores (Ministry of Foreign Relations). Although not everyone was consistent in sending information to the ministry, the result is a rich record of those Spanish artists who worked in Italy, France, and, to a lesser extent,

---

16 Personal Note: In October 2009, while looking at a folder labeled “Reglamento 1861,” I stumbled across a complete set of year-end grades and teacher evaluations for the student “Salvador Dalí.” Dali studied at the Academy later in the century. And, to my knowledge, no one has published a detailed account of his early education there.
England and Germany. Researchers are able to request information pertaining to a single person. In the case of Federico de Madrazo, for example, one can place the artist in Florence in 1835, while Paul Delaroche’s *Execution of Lady Jane Grey* (1833) was briefly on display in the collection of the eccentric Italo-Russo noble Anatole Demidov (1813-1870).\(^{17}\)

Another archive rich in nineteenth-century Spanish documents is the Hispanic Society of America. The American industrialist Arthur Huntington (1870-1955) spent a fortune collecting historical Spanish objects, documents, and art, and famously commissioned Joaquin Sorolla (1863-1923) to create the *Vision de España* (1913-1919) — a series of fourteen multi-figural, large-scale paintings that captured the customs, landscapes, and dress of each region of Spain. Huntington’s personal correspondence with several contemporary artists, including Sorolla, has been a rich resource for how Spanish artists considered their place within the larger world. But it is a limited archive that is more a reflection of Huntington’s enthusiasm than a complete picture of Spanish arts at the end of the century. For example, Huntington was less enthusiastic about the work of so-called “negra” Spanish artists — those who tied themselves into a tradition of Goya’s “black paintings,” such as Ignacio Zuloaga (1870-1935) and Hermenegildo Anglada Camarasa (1871-1959) — and more enthusiastic about “blanca” artists like Sorolla.

Sorolla is one of only two Spanish artists from the period whose personal correspondence has been published. The other is Federico de Madrazo. Their writings have been essential for understanding the period from inside studios and institutions. The son of a court painter, he worked in the Roman studio of Jean Auguste Dominique Ingres (1780-1867) and, later, in Paris under Paul Delaroche (1797-1856). Madrazo’s fifty-year career was much more fruitful in administrative papers than artistic treasures. He

served in a number of key administrative positions that shaped the creation, exhibition, and patronage of art. Just a few of his titles include: director of the Central Academy of Fine Arts, director of the *Museo Nacional del Prado*, court painter, head of the *Real Academia Española* Scholarship Committee, and president of the jury for successive *Exposiciones Nacionales*. The recent two-volume publication of Madrazo’s personal letters, I believe, will become a watershed moment. While some of these letters have been used by Prado curators to illuminate the intentions behind particular works by Madrazo, this thesis is the first to use them as a tool for understanding the philosophical underpinnings of the institutions he orchestrated.

The three volumes of letters by Joaquín Sorolla — recently published by his granddaughter, in cooperation with the Hispanic Society of America — offer a very different point of view than Madrazo. Sorolla’s career took him from humble origins as a regional painter to an internationally acclaimed artist befriended by others such as John Singer Sargent (1856-1925) and Anders Zorn (1860-1920). His letters reflect his narrative to succeed as a Spanish artist within Spain, and what it meant to be a Spanish artist confronting the international art zeitgeist. Besides the works published on Federico de Madrazo and Joaquín Sorolla, there are no other published writings of contemporary artists. A few biographical pamphlets have been written on other important artists of the time (e.g., Antonio Gisbert, José Casado del Alisal, Francisco Pradilla). These occasionally contain reproductions of letters or journal entries, but most were written just before the Spanish Civil War. Their authors — and sources — have long since disappeared.

During their lifetimes, a few Spanish history painters enjoyed national press, often receiving attention for the political content of their works rather than artistic merit (see chapter four). There were a handful of serious art critics and even fewer art historians; two standouts are Pedro de Madrazo, brother of Federico de Madrazo, and the landscape artist Aureliano
Beruete. Both Madrazo and Beruete actively wrote art history while serving as directors of the Prado Museum. Their writings were centered on contextualizing museum acquisitions within the framework of existing collections.

Outside of Spain, commentary on Spanish artists corresponded to those rare events in which high-quality Spanish artworks were on display in prominent international forums (see chapter six). Richard Muther dedicated a section to Spain in his ambitious study, *Geschichte der modernen Malerei* (*History of Modern Painting*), Vols. 1-4 (1899-1902), writing that, “Just as France, to-day [sic.] shows such a wealth of talent, Spain, correspondingly, can scarcely be said to come into the question of modern art ….”

Such limiting characterizations are contradicted by the growing numbers of Spanish artists working both inside and outside of Spain. By the end of the century, nearly 10 percent of works accepted in the Paris *Salon des Artistes Français* were by Spanish-trained artists.

The first scholarly books written about nineteenth-century Spanish history artists appeared in the 1970s, when the Prado Museum put several works on display for the first time since the turn of the century. From the 1920s to the 1970s, first right-wing monarchists then, after the Civil War, Spanish Falangists sympathetic to or working with the dictator Francisco Franco (1892-1975) used several Spanish history paintings for purposes of propaganda (see chapter four). The Falangist government also employed classically trained figurative artists (i.e., graduates of the *Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*) to assist in the creation of monuments such as the *Valle de los Caidos*, the tomb for Franco, Miguel Primo de Rivera (1870-1930), and other important Falangist leaders. As a result, the study of Spanish academic painters — contemporary or historical — was

---

associated with Falangists. Following the death of Franco, many Spanish history paintings were kept in storage.

This contemptuous association between Spanish nineteenth-century history painting and right-wing politics began to thaw shortly before Franco’s death in 1975. In 1971, the former palace of the Casón del Buen Retiro was given to the Museo Nacional del Prado and, for a few years, used as a temporary gallery space. Important works from the nineteenth-century collection were put on display. The event caused interest among some scholars who established themselves as experts on the period and dominated the field for the past thirty years.

With the exception of a small number of universities, few institutions or journals are dedicated to publishing scholarly, art-historical work on Spanish history painting. As a result, within Spain it is necessary to become familiar with individual scholars, whose work often appears in exhibition catalogues, master’s and doctoral writings, university textbooks, or self-published titles. Outside of Spain, there appears to be a growing interest in the period.

Bernardino de Pantorba (1896-1990) was invited to write an essay at the opening of the Casón del Buen Retiro. Trained under Joaquín Sorolla, Pantorba’s own painting career was only moderately successful. He wrote several pamphlets about the work of Sorolla and Francisco Pradilla, but his most serious contribution to the historiography was the Historia y Crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes Celebradas en España (1980). The book summarizes chronologically the winners and controversies surrounding each contest. While there are no footnotes and quotes are made without even referencing names (e.g., “… a critic said …”), Pantorba’s work was the first to attempt to place the works within the socio-political context of the time.

Carlos Reyero Hermosilla, a professor of art history at the prestigious Universidad Autónoma (Madrid), has done more than anyone else to research, publish, and educate on nineteenth-century Spanish academic painting. He is perhaps the most-cited single author in this study. Reyero has authored ten books, written more than forty articles, and co-authored an additional sixty articles on Spanish history painting. His topics range from biographies of artists to foreign criticism of Spanish history paintings and how Spanish works can be contextualized within larger, international movements. From 1990, nearly every public and private exhibition of nineteenth-century Spanish academic works has been accompanied by a text from Reyero. His strength is an unmatched familiarity with works from the period. Long before paintings were on view to the public, Reyero had gained access to storage facilities and private collections. His doctoral thesis, Imagen histórica de España (1850-1900) (1985) was the launching point of his career. It reproduces eighty history paintings created between 1850 and 1900. His study was principally focused on the narratives of each work, grouping together paintings by historical subject, such as Juana la Loca. Within it, he briefly describes their iconography and authorship. By contrast, this study is more focused on the institutional dynamics relating to a few key paintings that are listed in Imágen histórica de España. Overall, Reyero’s work is descriptive and contextualizing, revealing works lost from collective memory for more than a generation, then placing them within the framework of well-known movements (e.g., neo-classicism, romanticism, naturalism, academism, realism). Other Spanish art historians have focused more specifically on particular artists and institutions.

Esteban Casado Alcalde, professor of art history at the Universidad Politécnica (Madrid), has written two helpful studies on the first generation of artists accepted to the Real Academia Española en Roma and the only biography of the artist Antonio Gisbert (see chapter four). Wifredo Rincón, a member of the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (Madrid),
has authored a well-illustrated biography of Francisco Pradilla (see chapter six) that reproduces letters from the artist found only in private collections. Finally, Blanca Pons-Sorolla, granddaughter of Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida, has published a number of books and exhibition catalogue essays that offer a clearer narrative of the painter who played an influential role in the transition from historical to contemporary subjects in painting (see chapter eight). This handful of scholars accounts for the lion’s share of art-historical writing by Spanish art historians.

Two outliers of art-historical studies of Spanish art that relate to this thesis are Inventing the Art Collection: Patrons, Markets and the State in Nineteenth-Century Spain by Oscar Vázquez (2001) and The Galerie Espagnole and the Museo Nacional (1835-1853): Saving Spanish Art, or the Politics of Patrimony (2010) by Alisa Luxenberg. Both are U.S.-based scholars (Vázquez in Illinois and Luxenberg in Georgia). Both books explore the economics of Spanish art in the period pre-dating this thesis (i.e., neither goes beyond 1855 and this study begins in 1856). There will be references to their work and other scholars whose work relates to Spanish history painting in related fields, such as economics or politics. However, nothing in recent scholarly literature appears to constitute a paradigm shift or opening of new interpretive resources on the subject of history paintings or the Spanish Academy in the nineteenth century.

Gabriella Tortella’s The Development of Modern Spain: An Economic History of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (2000) and David Ringrose’s Spain, Europe and the “Spanish Miracle”: 1700-1900 (1996) are the best descriptions of Spanish economics available. Where there have been many political histories of the Spanish nineteenth century, these two studies produce a practical understanding of how the Spanish government and economy operated.

The book that had the greatest influence on this study’s perception of nineteenth-century Spain was José Álvarez-Junco’s Spanish Identity in the
Age of Nations (2001; first published in 1999 in Spain as Mater dolorosa: La idea de España en el siglo XIX), for which the author received Spain’s highest award for scholars. Although he only occasionally cites specific works, Álvarez-Junco frequently refers to the importance of painting and literature as symptomatic to the development of Spanish national identity.

Besides the work of Álvarez-Junco, scholarly general histories of Spain are surprisingly rare and, perhaps just as unusual, throughout history have been authored almost exclusively by non-Spaniards. Joseph Elliott’s large oeuvre on Spanish history has been useful but, like almost all general history books on Spain, lacks details on the turbulent period between 1833 and the World War I. Three books in particular — The Birth of Modern Politics in Spain: Democracy, Association and Revolution, 1854-75 (2010) by Guy Thomson; Historia Patria: Politics, History, and National Identity in Spain, 1875-1975 (1997) by Carolyn P. Boyd; and Imagining Spain: Historical Myth & National Identity (2008) by Henry Kamen — have done for politics and literature what this study hopes to do for Spanish history painting. Rather than generalize Spanish events as part of larger, international events, these studies have made special efforts to use contemporary Spanish accounts and understandings of Spanish events.

Thus far, this literature survey has detailed the archives, individuals, and key works of art history and more general historiography that have been resources in this study of Spanish nineteenth-century history painting. I would now like to briefly discuss those authors whose works have inspired my particular approach to the subject. Some are never cited in the study, but were essential for establishing a paradigm.

The first section undertaken in this book was chapter six, which explores the creation, exhibition, and reaction to Francisco Pradilla’s Doña Juana la Loca (1878). The painting treatment of a queen gone insane led to an extensive study of historical theories regarding madness. This led me to
Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique (Madness & Civilization, 1965) by Michel Foucault (1926-1984) and, later, to his book Surveiller et punir (Discipline and Punish, 1975). Foucault’s writings often defy categorization and are difficult to summarize into simple arguments. Therefore, it would be similarly difficult to claim that his writings provided a clear framework to the development of this study of Spanish painting. But, I became very taken with Foucault’s persistence in linking “power and knowledge,” which led to remarkable insights into the fluid relationship between those who had control — defined in this study at times as individuals leading governments and institutions, and at other times, as the large audience targeted by those creating art — and how the art was defined. Clearly, some works explored in this study were selected as masterworks not purely for their aesthetic qualities, but for their ability to capture the interest of those who were in power.  

Long before I selected the topic of Spanish nineteenth-century painting, I read Albert Boime’s (1933-2008) The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century (1971). Sharing my admiration for his work with others is often met with open derision, which seems to stem from his interest in subjects that were considered out of step with contemporary sensibilities. Dr. Boime was famously prolific, producing several articles a year on topics as diverse as contemporary black artists and pigments used by Velázquez. But, through Boime’s work on French academic institutions, I found a community of artists and art historians who were working outside of the more popular publishing houses and journals to study nineteenth-century academic practice. Boime and his simpaticos eschewed the dominant modernist and post-modernist approaches of his day, which were heavily critical of the nineteenth-century Academy and celebrated those who resisted its institutions and aesthetics. Instead of discussing artistic genius or aesthetic theory, Boime used his understanding of institutional and government policy to demonstrate how systems and institutions influenced individuals. In particular his article, “The Teaching

Reforms of 1863 and the Origins of Modernism in France” (The Art Quarterly, 1977), served as a model for the kind of institutional knowledge I hoped to gain about Spanish art. Unfortunately, Boime was in poor health as I started my doctorate and died in 2008.

I did, however, become acquainted with one of Boime’s colleagues, Gerald Ackerman. Ackerman is considered one of the foremost experts on nineteenth-century French academic painting in general, and on the artist Jean-Leon Gérôme (1824-1904) in particular. As many of the Spanish artists I was writing about had either studied, worked, or emulated French art of the time, it was invaluable to spend days with Dr. Ackerman, who could instantly retrieve from his encyclopedic memory anecdotes in French, German, English, and Italian that would bring to life nineteenth-century debates as clearly as today’s news. Ackerman’s thesis advisor was Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968). They shared a lifelong friendship and mutual interest in what they believed was the continuation of classicism (e.g., Platonism) as a major force in Western art until the late nineteenth century.

Throughout my writing, I kept a copy of Panofsky’s Idea, A Concept in Art Theory: A study of the changes in the definition & conception of the term “idea,” from Plato to the 17th century, when the modern definition emerged (1968) and Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic theory of painting (1967) by Rensslear W. Lee (1898-1984). For most, these books would seem very old fashioned and out of touch with current aesthetic theories. Yet, Panofsky and Lee — both born in the nineteenth century — were able to clearly articulate the classical tradition in ways that would have been familiar to nineteenth-century academic painters. These books became constant companions, making me more sensitive to the language used by Spanish history painters and their critics. They were especially useful for understanding what I came to see as the tension between French classical ideals grafted into a longstanding Spanish tradition of art that often tended toward direct observation.
Although, in the beginning, my intention was to focus on aesthetics and the technical education of Spanish artists, it became clear that writing about these works required a broader understanding of the times. As previously mentioned, the study of Spain’s nineteenth century has been largely the domain of narrow specialists or overly broad generalists. This is despite Spain having experienced major social and economic upheavals that have produced a great deal of scholarship in France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Italy. My advisor, Dr. Tom Gretton, was a constant and rich resource for showing me models from other countries and disciplines. These include Fritz Stern’s *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of Germanic Ideology* (1961), which provided a remarkable insight into the dynamics between idealism and anti-modernity — a regular theme in this study. *The Cult of Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (2003) by David A. Bell; David Blackbourn’s *History of Germany, 1780-1918: The Long Nineteenth Century* (2002); and *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (1992) by Linda Colley all provided models for understanding the development of national identity. Two studies were immensely helpful in showing how nationalism in other countries were expressed in the development of the arts: June Hargrove’s *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870-1914* (2005) and, just recently, *In Olden Time: Victorians the British Past* (2013) by Andrew Sanders. Sanders’s book was particularly strong, documenting how, much like in Spain, historians in England actively shape history in order to favor contemporary outcomes. This resulted in Romantic and often misguided re-creations of historical subjects and buildings among British artists and architects.

From the beginning of this study, it has been clear that the investigation of Spanish history painting is met by a twofold challenge: a wealth of artworks and a dearth of interest over a long period of time. This lack of interest had less to do with the works themselves than with their being the product of a relatively unexplored period in Spanish history and its
perceived association with Spanish fascism. The recent and dramatically increased access to works is due, in large part, to the efforts of a few people — notably José Luis Diez and Javier Barón of the Museo Nacional del Prado — who had institutional clout, impeccable timing, and enthusiasm for the work. Despite the obstacles and lack of interest in the subject, a handful of scholars have been instrumental in maintaining and providing an understanding of key artists, works, and institutions from the period, most especially Carlos Reyero and Bernardino Pantorba. It is perhaps fair to say that, from my perspective, this work is an attempt to share and synthesize the unsurpassable understanding of nineteenth-century Spanish paintings by Diez, Barón, Reyero, and Pantorba with the kind of pressures placed on these artists by contemporary institutions and audiences, as has been done for French artists in the work of Albert Boime. It is the aim of this study to stand on their shoulders and combine unprecedented access to works, archives, and new understandings of nineteenth-century Spanish socio-economic and political investigations. In other words, it is an interim report.
CHAPTER THREE

The Spanish Academy

In 1885, José Casado del Alisal (1832-1886) was inducted into the
Spanish Academy of Fine Arts. Casado was a prominent history painter who had recently stepped down as director of the Spanish Royal Academy in Rome, the nation’s most prestigious school for fine arts. On the day of his induction, some 100 of Spain’s most well-known painters met to hear Casado speak on “Modern Spanish Painting.” Thirty years earlier this gathering of artists, from nearly all of Spain’s seventeen regions, would not have been possible. Before 1850, there was no unified “Spanish” Academy, no regular meeting of Spanish artists, and no Royal Academy in Rome. All these institutions had formed between 1856 and 1874 as a result of government legislation and the efforts of a handful of artists who oversaw the nationalization of the fine arts. In his remarks to fellow artists, Casado outlined these efforts and the nature of the Spanish Academy, forming an historical narrative from the Spanish Golden Age of art to the “renaissance” of his day. Although his version of events is selective, as one of the Academy’s most admired leaders, Casado’s views are revelatory. This chapter is an annotated version of Casado’s speech, which serves as a primer for the institutions, key individuals, and theories that led to development of Spanish history painting.

Nearly every year since 1864, members of the Spanish Academy of Fine Arts have gathered in Plenary Hall at the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in Madrid. On the day of his induction speech, 15 November 1885, José Casado del Alisal would have been among the youngest in attendance. Some, like Federico de Madrazo (1815-1894), had known Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828), and witnessed the transformation of Spanish art from a divided, regional system to a united, national organization. To older academicians, Casado represented the first generation of artists to participate in and benefit from

21 A great deal more will be said about Federico de Madrazo, a key figure in the institutional and pedagogical development of the Spanish Academy. Madrazo was the son of José de Madrazo (1781-1859), who served as court painter at the same time as Goya. From a young age, Federico regularly visited the court and was acquainted with fellow artists like Goya. Source: Carlos, González López and Monterrat Martí Ayxelà, eds. El Mundo de Los Madrazo: Colección de la Comunidad de Madrid (exh. cat. Comunidad de Madrid, 2008), 13-30.
an integrated fine arts system. He had climbed every rung of the ladder. After graduating from the Royal Academy in Madrid, Casado competed for and won a government scholarship to study in Rome. Three years later, he returned to compete in the first national art contests, the *Exposiciones Nacionales*, where he received top prizes for his work. (See chapter four for an in-depth discussion of Casado’s award-winning works.) Competitive success was followed by government commissions on building projects and regular work as a portraitist of Madrid’s elite. When the artist Eduardo Rosales (1836-1873) unexpectedly died in 1873, Casado was named the first acting director of the Spanish Royal Academy in Rome. Rome, which had always been a destination for aspiring Spanish artists, became even more of a draw. Hundreds of Spanish artists, supported by federal and municipal scholarships, flooded the new Academy.

During Casado’s tenure, many of these artists — among them Alejandro Ferrant Fischermans (1834-1917), Manuel Castellano (1826-1880), Francisco Pradilla (1848-1921), and Casto Plasencia Maestro (1846-1890) — came to dominate the national aesthetic, winning nearly all of the top prizes at subsequent *Exposiciones Nacionales* and becoming the face of Spanish art in several high-profile International Expositions (see chapters six and seven). As a result of both his personal accomplishments and his experience on the front lines of the Spanish *avant garde*, Casado could authoritatively offer some “considerations regarding modern Spanish painting.”

Casado began by projecting a shared sense of identity, which is repeated throughout his speech:

---


Given, gentlemen, the modern impulse of Spanish painting, the inspiration our masters derive from the romantic renaissance, to which not only the Fine Arts owe their happy development, but also our Literature and Politics ...

The term “renaissance,” (i.e., rebirth) was frequently used by Spanish artists and critics of the time to describe the dramatic developments in Spanish art during the last half of the nineteenth century. Given increased numbers of academies, students in attendance, and museums, it is likely that the last half of the nineteenth century was the most productive in the history of Spanish fine arts. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the nineteenth-century collections of the Museo Nacional del Prado are more than twice the size of all of the museum’s other collections combined. This is not just true of the Prado. Regional academies and municipalities were plentifully endowed with works by local artists. Today, many of these institutions have dedicated more square feet to displaying nineteenth-century painting than to any other activity.

Before 1862, there were some dozen regional academies of fine art in Spain, each with a few dozen students. By 1885, more than 8,000 students attended thirty nationalized academies. These do not include traditional ateliers, nor drawing, watercolor, and artisan schools and societies — some long-lived, others fleeting — that sprung up at the

25 Ibid., 10. Full quote: “Dada, señores, el moderno impulso de la pintura española, del aliento que prestó á nuestros maestros el renacimiento romántico de su tiempo, al que no sólo las Bellas Artes debieron su feliz desarrollo, sino que también nuestra Literatura y nuestra Política …”


28 Just to name two: the Museo de Bellas Artes de Málaga, currently under renovations, and the Museo de Bellas Artes de San Carlos in Valencia.

29 See Appendix III, Spanish Academies of Fine Art, for a complete list of Spanish academies of fine art, with names, locations, and founding dates.

time. Nor does it include academies in Latin America and the Philippines, many of which were founded, directed, or staffed with graduates from Spanish academies. This dramatic increase is owed in large measure to sweeping government legislation affecting both education in general and fine-arts academies specifically.

In 1857, the Spanish central government voted in sweeping educational reform. The Law of Public Instruction, better known as the Ley Moyano, was one of the most important steps taken by the moderate, liberal politicians in the central government to establish the hegemony of Madrid. Based on the French Loi Falloux (1850), this legislation transferred authority away from regional governments and, most controversially, Church leaders, and gave it to the minister of development. This included the power to create and regulate curricula, textbooks, degrees, personnel, and construction in all educational institutions, including primary schools, ecclesiastical colleges, law schools, medical schools, and fine-arts academies.

---

31 The scholar Pablo Guijarro Salvador did a wonderful study on the local culture of “drawing clubs” in Tedula, Navarre, which gives an idea of how such clubs would have functioned in other parts of Spain. Pablo Guijarro Salvador. “La enseñanza del dibujo en Tedula durante el siglo XIX.” Príncipe de Viana, No. 246 (2009), 67-104.

32 The Chilean, Argentine, Venezuelan, Peruvian, Ecuadorian, and Uruguayan academies of fine art were all at one time directed by alumni of the Academia de San Fernando in Madrid. Source: Fernando Álvarez de Sotomayor. “Nuestras relaciones artísticas con América.” Discurso leído en su recepción pública en la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando y con, estado por don Marceliano de Santamaría. (Madrid: Mateu, 1922).

33 Claudio Moyano (1809-1890) was the minister of development under Queen Isabel II during a political period widely known as the Bienio Progresista. From 1854 to 1856 a small, influential group of moderate progressives attempted to reform government policy. Moyano was an educational reformer who proposed and wrote much of the Law of Public Instruction with the explicit goal to Modernize Spain. Source: Manuel de Puelles Benítez. Historia de la Educación en España: de las Cortes de Cadiz a la Revolución de 1868, Vol. II. (Madrid: Ministerio de Fomento, 1982).


By the 1860s, fine arts in Spain, as in other European countries, had become a national priority, both as a matter of national pride and as an integral element of economic growth. This is perhaps most clearly evident in the rise of the Universal Expositions (also called Great Exhibitions and, later, World Fairs), which, every few years from the late-eighteenth century, invited western nations to showcase their industrial and fine-art accomplishments. By the mid-nineteenth century, these events drew millions of visitors from around the world, and provided significant economic opportunities for host-nations.36 Among the most successful was the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations (also known as The Great Exhibition or Crystal Palace Exhibition), staged in London in 1851. The combined strength of England’s inventors and designers at the event set off panic in other nations, especially France. In response, the French government formed a committee to review the English fair to determine what could be done to modernize France in order to compete with England.37 As part of his extensive report, the committee’s director, Count Léon de Laborde (1807-1869), called for increased investment in programs that would bring greater government involvement to regional fine arts institutions, including centralization:

I am only concerned with the arts, nevertheless, I do not separate it from industry, letters, nor the sciences. In my eyes, the arts, letters, and sciences are one with industry. And, the edifice of industry is in peril when any of these three lose their footings.38


It was not until 1863 that the French government implemented reforms along the lines of the committee’s recommendations, which included replacing positions traditionally held by experienced artists with state-appointed administrators and establishing a uniform arts curriculum.39

In parallel, and in collaboration with artists at Madrid’s Academia de San Fernando, progressive leaders in the Spanish central government instituted similar reforms to Spain’s loose confederacy of art academies. In 1862, as a result of sweeping education reform, called the Ley Moyano, the Minister of Development was appointed head of all arts institutions. The biographies of those appointed to the Ministry of Development clearly demonstrate that none had significant experience with the fine arts.40 Management of the more than a dozen regional academies in Spain, each with longstanding self-management, would have proved difficult and, perhaps, beyond the skill set of these ministers. This is perhaps the reason, from the onset of the Ley Moyano, that the Ministry of Development worked closely with leaders of the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in Madrid to unite and supervise the nearly dozen regional academies that had just come under central control. The Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando thus became the Academia de Central de Bellas Artes de San Fernando.41

From the perspective of leaders in the capital, making Madrid’s Academia de San Fernando the overseer of Spain’s other academies of fine art was, perhaps, the only choice. The Academia de San Fernando, since its creation in 1744, had been a training ground for court painters. Much like the French Academy, which was heavily influenced by foreign artists


41 Francisco Esteve y Botey. La Escuela Central de Bellas Artes de San Fernando de Madrid, Apuntado de su historia y resumen de su plan de estudios y del reglamento de régimen interior. (Madrid: Blass, 1950), 1-10.
brought to build Versailles, the Academia de San Fernando was founded by foreign artists brought by the Bourbon King to build the Royal Palace in Madrid. Since its inception, many of the professors teaching at the Academy had studied in France and, as will be discussed further, brought French institutional practices.42

The Academia de San Fernando, despite being the “central academy,” was far from Spain’s oldest fine-arts institution. That distinction belonged to the Academia de Santa Isabel de Hungría, founded in 1660 in Seville.43 It was among the oldest academies in Europe, with a foundation built on the leadership of Francisco Pacheco (1564-1644) and the influence of Diego Velázquez (1599-1660) and Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-1682). Although the Academia de San Carlos in Valencia was only founded in 1768, the community had a long artistic tradition as a center of ceramic and the textile industries.44 It was also the birthplace of José de Ribera (1591-1652), with strong ties to Neapolitan art. For these schools, along with those in Barcelona, Burgos, Granada, Valladolid, Huelva, and Málaga, the centralization of arts education under the Central Academy in Madrid, which itself was beholden to the Ministry of Interior, was an unwelcome development in terms of administrative independence.45 Perhaps even more concerning, centralization threatened to supplant longstanding regional and distinct approaches to the instruction and production of art with the approach of a single academy that itself was hugely influenced by French art. This homogenization of art largely came


as a result of two new institutions — the *Exposición Nacional* and the *Real Academia de Bellas Artes en Roma*.

In 1856, the Ministry of Development held Spain’s first national fine arts competition, the *Exposición Nacional*.\(^6\) Held biennially in Madrid, the *Exposición Nacional* was open to all Spanish artists, who were allowed to submit a limited number of works that would be judged and awarded by a jury of artist and government appointees.\(^7\) Before 1856, each academy typically held its own arts competition among current and former students,\(^8\) but there was little interaction or knowledge of the work being done by artists in other academies. In Madrid, all Spanish artists, including those working abroad or in current and former colonies, were allowed to participate. Paintings, sculptures, and architectural works were submitted to a jury of academics, made up of leaders from the *Academia de San Fernando* and others — often political or popular figures — appointed by the minister of development. As a rule, award-winning works were purchased by the central government, either for placement in the *Museo del Prado* or for display in government buildings.

Between 1856 and 1899, eighteen *Exposiciones Nacionales* were held, with more than ninety-five percent of top prizes awarded to large, multi-figural history paintings.\(^9\) As will be shown in subsequent chapters and admitted in Casado’s speech to the Academy in 1885, history painting was not native to Spain, but transplanted from France. Nevertheless, as the *Exposición Nacional* became a greater draw for regional artists seeking


\(^{7}\) More about how the *Exposición Nacional* was governed and how artists participated will be discussed in subsequent chapters.


careers, it became necessary to paint large, multi-figural works in order to
win prizes in Madrid, which also doled out teaching positions, government
commissions, and foreign scholarships. In a nation with no strong private
market, the central government was the principal patron of the arts.\(^{50}\) (This
was all despite Spain’s government being bankrupt and the main form of
travel until 1870 being by horseback or “diligence,”\(^ {51}\) — as opposed to rail
lines used for travel and commerce throughout England and France from
the 1830s.\(^ {52}\)

Holding the biennial contest in the capital eventually led to a Madrid-
centric arts culture in Spain and what could be considered a national style
of art. Talented artists departed from regional academies for the capital,
and the plurality of regional styles were subsumed by those that would be
successful on the national stage. (The exception to this was Catalonia,
which, with a strong economy and artistic identity of its own, established its
own arts contest independent from the \textit{Exposición Nacional} and limited to
Catalan artists.\(^ {53}\)) This tension between the national academy and the
often older, regional academies was ongoing.\(^ {54}\) In his speech, Casado did
not directly address this tension. Instead, he went to enormous effort to
connect the contemporary “renaissance” with a shared historical narrative,
leading from the Golden Age of Spanish art to his day:

\begin{quote}
Far from us, gentlemen, is the seventeenth century, which gave our
\end{quote}

\(^ {50}\) Oscar Vázquez. \textit{Inventing the Art Collection: Patrons, Markets, and the State in
Nineteenth-Century Spain.} (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press,
2001), 9, 14.

\(^ {51}\) In her book that captures the adventures of many American artists from the period,
Elizabeth Boone writes: “Construction of a Spanish railway system did not begin until
1855, and most travel before 1870 was made on horseback or by diligence ...” M.

\(^ {52}\) Frank Dobbin. \textit{Forging Industrial Policy: The United States, Britain, and France in the
Railway Age.} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

\(^ {53}\) Bernardino de Pantorba. \textit{Historia y Crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas

\(^ {54}\) See Appendix III, \textit{Spanish Academies of Fine Art.}
patria a legacy of immortal monuments of Art and Literature, encircling our colossus with outmoded purple robes. From the fifteenth century, it shone before the world with triumphal splendors, with genius and prosperity. Velázquez, Murillo, Ribera, Zurbarán, and Cano, whose works, like the great poets — their illustrious contemporaries — were the ultimate expression of our greatness ...

This triumphant communal tone (i.e., “our patria,” “our colossus,” “our greatness”) is indicative of nineteenth-century nationalistic language used not only to unite the confederacy of fine-arts academies, but in the effort to unite Spain. As progressives increasingly gained power in the central government and enacted national policy, Spain’s regional governments and autonomous regions became increasingly threatened. The creation of a central bank, the Law of Public Instruction, policies that gave the central government control to take and sell Church lands are just a few of the policies that stoked regionalism.

José Casado del Alisal. *Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 6-7. Full quote: “Lejos, señores, está ya de nosotros el siglo XVII, que pasó legando á nuestra patria los monumentos inmortales de Arte y Literatura, que fueron el manto de púrpura con que encubrió decadencia el gigantesco coloso que, desde el siglo XV, brillara ante el mundo con los esplendores del triunfo, del genio y de la prosperidad; y Vélazquez, y Murillo, y Ribera, y Zurbarán y Cano, como los grandes poetas, sus ilustres coetáneos, última expresión de nuestra grandeza .... y Carreño y Coello, en quienes alienta aún el espíritu de los buenos tiempos, no dejando tras de sí discípulos ni continuadores de las mermosas pasadas tradiciones ...”
An official 1850 map of Spain shows there were 48 recognized provinces (excluding Madrid), each with its own capital, plus two autonomous cities (see Figure 1 for map). These political boundaries are further complicated by eight national identities in Spain, each with its own recognized language. The often conflicting effort to unite and recognize these varied Spanish identities was and continues to be an issue in Spain. The Second Article of the current Spanish Constitution (1978) states:

The Constitution is based on the indissoluble unity of the Spanish Nation, the common and indivisible patria of all Spaniards, it recognizes and guarantees the right to self-government of the nationalities and regions of which it is composed and the solidarity among them.56

These problems were not unique to Spain. France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Russia, the United States, and Italy all struggled to unite their peoples under common identities. The historian José Álvarez-Junco called this effort the establishment of a “permanent community.”

... nineteenth-century national histories dealt with the origins and vicissitudes of a permanent community, the nation whose unity and permanence they sought to demonstrate. To this end, a collective saga was written, beginning with the founding fathers and distinguished thereafter by heroes and martyrs, defenders of the original community, who became the central part of the shared culture that integrated individuals into the new nation-state.

As will be demonstrated throughout the course of this study, the Spanish government’s enthusiastic support of the Spanish Academy included the promotion of history paintings. Depiction of heroes and tragedies from the distant past reinforced nationalist narratives of a shared, permanent community. Just as the nation needed a permanent community, so did the new Spanish Academy.

In his remarks to members of the Academy, Casado named several Spanish artists who inhabit the communal Spanish pantheon: Diego Velázquez de Silva (1599-1660), Esteban Bartolomé Murillo (1617-1682), José de Ribera (1591-1652), Francisco de Zurbarán (1598-1664), and Alonso Cano (1601-1667). In contradiction to Casado’s grouping, in their lifetimes many of these artists would not have associated with one another. Velázquez, Murillo, and Cano were all court painters with very different aesthetic approaches to their work. Neither Zurbarán nor Ribera was favored by the court and, as a result, they spent their lives developing styles that met their patrons’ very different tastes. Zurbarán worked

---

57 Several books on nineteenth-century nationalization will be referenced throughout this study. These include David Blackbourn’s *History of Germany 1780-1918: The Long Nineteenth Century*, 2nd Edition (2003); David A. Bell’s *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism*, 1680-1800 (2001); and Linda Colley’s *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (ed., 2012).

principally for Carthusian monks. In 1625, the Aragonese painter José Martínez (1600-1682) — also known as Jusepe Nicolás Martínez y Lurbez or José Martí — met and recorded a meeting with Ribera, whom he considered “an illustrious painter, a highly talented imitator of nature and a fellow countryman of mine from the Kingdom of Valencia.” He noted that Ribera was reluctant to return to Spain, “where his works were greatly venerated,” because the country was “a generous mother to foreigners but a cruel stepmother to her own scions.” By the nineteenth-century, José de Ribera was more widely known by the Italian names Giuseppe di Ribera or Lo Spagnoletto, and therefore associated more with Neapolitan artists like Luca Giordano (1634-1705) and Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio (1571-1610).

Casado was not the first to group these artists together or attempt to create a permanent community of Spanish artists. Arguably, the list of Spanish artists that should belong to the permanent community began with those collected by the royal family and unintentionally expanded throughout the nineteenth century with the troubling influence of the French, who were both admired and despised by the Spanish for their accomplishments. As Napoleon Bonaparte’s armies “liberated” people throughout Europe, he also “liberated” art destined to be put on view at the Louvre, with sections dedicated the glory of each nation.

When the French occupied Spain (1808-1814), Joseph Bonaparte (1768-1844 | King of Spain, 1808-1813) tasked a network of agents with collecting key works from the peninsula's greatest artists. The Spanish were successful at keeping the French from finding and taking most works. After the French

60 José Martínez. Discursos practicables del noblísima arte de la pintura. (Zaragoza: M. Peiro Coso,1853), 179-180.
occupation, several efforts were made to protect Spanish art from future harm, which resulted in a series of institutional and public attempts to identify those Spanish artists worth protecting. Laws were made banning the sale of Spanish art to foreigners. Two new museums were founded: the Real Museo del Prado (1819), made up of selections from the Royal Collection; and the Museo de La Trinidad (1837) in Madrid, which became a warehouse for art taken from religious institutions throughout Spain. In 1818, the king commissioned a group of Spanish artists and Italian etchers to create the Colección litográfica de cuadros del Rey de España el Señor Don Fernando VII, the first reproduction of the Spanish royal collections, which became an educational resource for Academies of Fine Art throughout Spain. Eleven years after its opening, the Royal Academy commissioned the sculptor Ramón Barba (1767-1831) to create a series of sixteen medallions depicting architects, sculptors, and painters (i.e., the three fine arts) who were “founders of the Spanish School.” Barba’s names and likenesses would be placed around the exterior of the Prado Museum (see figure 2).

---

63 These include the Real Orden por la que prohibía la exportación de antigüedades de España (1806) and the Real Cédula de 28 de 1837 (1837) by Felipe VII, which kept “antique painting, books, and manuscripts” from being sold or exported. Source: Soledad Gómez Vílchez. Tráfico ilícito de bienes culturales: Evolución histórica, situación actual y medidas de protección. (Madrid: Patrimonio Nacional, 2011), 3-4.

64 The creation of the Museo de la Trinidad was a direct result of concerns about the safety of important artworks — works being sold off by poor institutions, theifs, accidents, etc. — in provincial collections. The collections of the Museo de la Trinidad were eventually combined with the Museo Nacional del Prado. Source: José Álvarez Lopera. El Museo de la Trinidad: historia, obras y documentos, 1838-1872. (Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 2009), 1-10.


66 The eleven painters and sculptors — including four architects not listed here — depicted by Barba: Alonso Berruguete (Castile, 1488-1561), Gaspar Becerra (Andalucia, 1520-1570), José Álvarez Cubero (Cordoba, 1768-1827), Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-1682), Claudio Coello (1642-1693), Diego Velázquez de Silva (1599-1660), Francisco Zurbarán (1598-1664), José de Ribera (1591-1652), Juan de Juanes (1475-1579), Juan de Toledo (c. 1515-1567), Alonso Cano ((1601-2667)
But, if we are looking for foundations of the Spanish school, it surely must include the prominent artists — both domestic and foreign — commissioned and collected by the Habsburgs and Bourbons, whose work was influential to both contemporary and subsequent Spaniards. The Habsburgs were among the greatest patrons of art in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Their collections of works by Raphael, Adriaen de Vries, Rubens, Anthony Van Dyke, Titian, Tintoretto, and Luca Giordano are perhaps the greatest number, highest quality, and best condition of any collection in the world. Rubens was a direct influence on Velázquez, who at the Flemish painter’s suggestion traveled to Italy for greater
development. But none of these Italian and Flemish artists were Barba’s medallions for the Prado Museum, neither does Casado mention them in his speech.

Following the Habsburgs and the accidental fire that destroyed the palace in Madrid in 1734, the Bourbons employed a new cast of remarkable and international artists. King Carlos III (1716-1788 | Reign, 1734-1759) was the nephew of Louis XIV and was raised in Versailles. The king employed both foreign and native artists to rebuild and refill the Palace of Madrid. Anton Raphael Mengs (1728-1779) and Giambattista Tiepolo (1696-1770) are two artists whose names remain famous today. Tiepolo, argued by some as the greatest European painter of the eighteenth century, died in Madrid after working on the Royal Palace. Much like the Académie française benefited by a number foreign masters brought to build the Royal Palace of Versailles, the Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in Madrid was founded by an Italian sculptor, Giovanni Domenico Olivieri (1706-1762), brought to rebuild the Palace of Madrid.

Rather than acknowledge the contributions of these foreign artists, Casado did his best to expunge their memory from the permanent community. He referred to the “past century” (i.e., the eighteenth century) as:

... nights whose shadows clouded our land for a long period of decadence; during which not just art but the entire patria was inert. The bastardization of its institutions, its reverses, the constant emigration of its children who, for a length of centuries, spilled their blood in discoveries, in conquests. They have emaciated and bled

---

67 More than 500 works by Titian, Dürer, Rubens, Velázquez, Coello, Brueghel, Da Vinci, Tintoretto, and Ribera were lost when a fire believed to have started in the studio of court painter Jean Ranc spread to the rest of the palace WHAT PALACE?. Some 1,000 works were miraculously saved despite the INFORMATION MISSING Source: Jonathan Brown. Velázquez: Painter and Courtier, Second edition. (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006), 68-69.


the succeeding dreams and beautiful ideal of the *patria*, religion and glory ... an absolute loss of faith and power.\(^{70}\)

For those familiar with nineteenth-century Spanish histories and political discourse, this portion of Casado’s speech is evidence that the “Decline theory,” as it is now called, colored the narrative of the Spanish Academy. Discussed at greater length in chapter four, Decline Theory is simply the belief that foreign rulers, the Habsburgs and Bourbons in particular, sapped Spain of treasure and talent, causing Europe’s greatest empire of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to take a steep decline to one of Europe’s poorest nations. Casado’s borderline xenophobic language (e.g., “decadence,” “inert,” “bastardization”) is used by Spanish historians, such as Modesto Lafuente, to describe the corrupting influence of foreigners, whose presence was threatening to Spanish values.\(^{71}\) Thus, Casado’s remarks not only draw a circle around those within the permanent community, but creates a group who, despite their institutional and aesthetic influences, are excluded from it.

\(^{70}\) José Casado del Alisal. “Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando.” (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 10. Full quote: “... noches cuyas sombras nublan nuestro suelo en un largo periodo de decadencia; en el cual no sólo el arte, la patria entera yacía inerte: el bastardo de us instituciones, sus reveses, la emigración constante de sus hijos, que, por espacio de siglos, derramaron su sangre en descubrimientos y en conquistas, la habían enflaquecido y desangrado; sucediendo antiguos y hermosos ideales de patria,religión y gloria ... una absoluta falta de fe y de fuerza.”

\(^{71}\) See chapters four and five for more.
Casado ended his naming of the members of the permanent community.
with a discussion of Francisco de Goya y Lucientes, whose existence complicates a clean narrative of the Spanish Academy that Casado was constructing. He begins with admiration:

Goya, who reclaimed lost traditions; or, through the merits of the powerful intuition of his soul and surging fantasies — un-edited and fecund — broke the chains of routine. All by himself, he illuminated the last period of the century with a new and strange art that, the more it is criticized and studied, the more power it gives in its ascent to truth. For the qualities of his vigorous congeniality and for his inspiration, he reflects a fevered and intent soul, bursting with all the energies of his Aragonese race ...  

At the time of his remarks, Casado was painting a major altarpiece for the Basilica de San Francisco el Grande in Madrid. Another, by Goya (see figure 3), was in the adjoining room. With its conventional composition and treatment of figures and light, Goya’s altarpiece is far from the kind of work for which he is now known, but it was typical of his early oeuvre — a predictable result of his early training.

The son of a prosperous Basque gilder, Goya worked in various studios in the Aragonese capital, Zaragoza, before moving to Madrid. There he studied with the neo-classical court painter Anton Raphael Mengs, with whom he apparently had a very unhappy relationship, then applied and was rejected for admittance to the recently established Academia de San Fernando. Goya then left for Italy for a self-guided grand tour and successfully competed in an Italian art competition. He later returned to

---

72 José Casado del Alisal. Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 8. Full quote: “Goya, que la recogiendo las perdidas tradiciones, ó merced á la poderosa intuición de su alma, surge con fantasía y con fecundia inauditas, á romper las cadenas de la rutina; bastando, por sí solo, á ilustrar el último periodo de aquel siglo, con un arte nuevo y extraño, que, cuanto más se discute y más se estudia, con más fuerza se impone, por su acento de verdad, por los arranques de su genialidad vigorosa y por su inspiración, reflejo de un alma intencionada y férrea, dotada de todas la energías de su raza aragonesa ...”


74 While living in Rome, Goya participated in the 1770 contest held by the Reale Accademia delle tre belle Arti di Parma. Source: Joan Sureda. Goya & Italy. (Zaragoza: Exhibition catalogue: Museo de Zaragoza, 1 June-15 September 2008), 115.
Spain, where he was commissioned to a number of major frescoes and
tapestries, eventually becoming a court painter to Carlos IV.\textsuperscript{75} While his
royal portraits and collaborations with Francisco Bayeu y Subias
(1734-1795) for the \textit{Palacio del Pardo} were within the aesthetically
predictable range of his time, his other works — \textit{Los Caprichos}\textsuperscript{76} and
those now categorized as his “Black Paintings”\textsuperscript{77} — were polemical.\textsuperscript{78}

Before and after his death, Goya’s works became increasingly sought after
abroad, particularly in France. Joseph Bonaparte made Goya his official
painter during the French occupation.\textsuperscript{79} And in 1838, King Louis-Philippe
of France dedicated a section of the Louvre known as the \textit{Galerie
Espagnole} to Spanish paintings, and a number of Goya’s works were
prominently displayed.\textsuperscript{80} By Casado’s time, Goya, had been embraced by
many who were opposed to academic institutions, and who considered
Goya in particular as a compelling alternative (e.g., Théophile Gautier,\textsuperscript{81}
Paul Lefort\textsuperscript{82}). In his 1858 study of Goya, published in Paris, the critic
Laurent Matheron wrote: “Goya had no fixed aesthetic, and never married
himself to a type of ideal beauty: He searched out nature, and he found
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For the Spanish Academy, the adoption of Goya as a member of the permanent community was problematic. Several of his works, such as 3 de mayo de 1808 en Madrid: los fusilamientos de patriotas madrileños (1814), were considered patriotic triumphs; yet, by mid-century — principally due to the adoption of Goya by anti-academic painters — Goya often represented a rejection of academic theory.

The reality of Goya’s relationship with the Academy is much more complicated and merits a brief explanation as it relates to his lack of influence on nineteenth-century painters of Casado’s generation. In 1780, while working in the Royal Tapestry factory, Goya was voted a member of the Academia de San Fernando by fellow artists — many of whom had voted against his prix de rome application a few years earlier. By 1785, Goya was made vice-director of painting at the Academy and, then, director of painting in 1795. These roles made Goya an active participant in the Academy.

In 1792, Goya was a member of a newly formed committee tasked with the responsibility of reviewing the Academy’s teaching practices. The committee met multiple times from 1792 to 1799. While only fragments of the minutes from those meetings remain — some with what appear to be

83 Laurent Matheron. Goya. (Paris: Shulz et Thuillié, 1858), 20. Full text: “Goya n’eut point une esthétique à lui, et il n’épousa jamais un type idéal de la beauté: Il cherchait la nature, et il la trouvait. On le classerait aujourd’hui, ainsi que je crois l’avoir déjà dit, parmi les réalistes, s’il ne se fût pas proposé avant tout, d’animer des idées, d’exprimer quelque chose, et si, d’ailleurs, il n’avait pas mainte fois prouvé qu’il n’adorait pas de parti pris le hideux et le laid: il n’y voyait qu’un condiment de haut goût, un élément pittoresque, rien de plus. Il n’était donc réaliste qu’à demi. Il était d’ailleurs réservé à notre temps de voir des hommes de grand talent adonnés à la recherche exclusive de toutes les laideurs et les vulgarnités de ce monde.”


85 Ibid.
verbatim quotes from participants, rather than shorthand accounts — they demonstrate that Goya was intent on encouraging a particular kind of environment for artists in training:

Finally, Sir, I cannot find another, more effective method for advancing the Arts, neither do I believe it exists, than to award and protect ... the full liberty for genius to flow from those students of Art who want to learn [their instincts], without suppression, and without efforts to bend their inclination toward this or that style in Painting ...

What Goya appears to have been protesting was increased demands on students at the Academia de San Fernando to copy from classical statues as opposed to copying from life. The Academia de San Fernando followed a model shared by most eighteenth-century academies: New students started their education by copying old master prints and etchings in order to understand fundamental principles of composition. Later, students were allowed to work in the alas de Principios (The Rooms of [Basic] Principles), where they copied from fragments (e.g., heads, feet, hands) of classical Greco-Roman statues. After mastering these fundamentals, students were allowed to copy in the Sala del Yeso (Plaster Cast Room), which contained full-size models of statues. Finally, those students who had mastered the full statue were allowed to work with live models in the Sala del Natural (Natural Studies Room), where they were posed in the likeness of classical statuary.

Goya himself had undergone a similar artistic education, first formally in

---

86 Francisco de Goya y Lucientes. Discurso a la Real Academia de San Fernando acerca de la forma de enseñar las artes plásticas. (Madrid: Real Academia de San Fernando, 1792). Original text: “Por último, Señor, yo no encuentro otro medio más eficaz de adelantar las Artes, ni creo que le haya, sino el de premiar y proteger al que despunte en ellas; el de dar mucha estimación al Profesor que lo sea; y el de dejar en su plena libertad correr el genio de los Discípulos que quieren aprenderlas, sino primir lo, ni poner medios para torcer la inclinación que manifiestan á este, o aquel, estilo, en la Pintura ...”


Zaragoza and later during a self-imposed regime of copying from the antique and old masters in Italy. But, during the 1770s, a large bequest of classical statues and plaster casts to the Academia de San Fernando led to an increased fervor for the copy. The German-Bohemian painter Anton Raphael Mengs was among the most sought-after painters of the late eighteenth century, working for various royal patrons. Mengs was among the many foreign artists brought by King Carlos III to assist in the rebuilding of the Palacio Real in Madrid.⁸⁹ (He painted the ceiling of the palace’s banqueting hall.) Mengs’ studio was in Rome and had one of the world’s largest collections of original and plaster copies of Greco-Roman statues. In 1773, the Spanish royal family arranged to buy the entire collection from Mengs and donate it to the Real Academia de San Fernando in Madrid. Between 1778 and 1779, more than seventy-six crates of statues and molds arrived in Madrid.⁹⁰ Before this bequest, there were very few classical works in the Spanish royal collections, which were rich in fourteenth- to eighteenth-century masterpieces. The arrival of Mengs’ collection understandably led to an increased focus on the copy. It was this environment and the resulting de-emphasis on copying from life to which Goya was reacting.

According to comments from other artists and votes taken during that and other meetings, Goya was not a maverick in his attempts to loosen the canonical demands imposed on students. For example, on October 28, 1792, the minutes reflect Goya’s recommendation that, in place of drawing from casts and statues, students copy works by Annibale Carracci, Domenichino, Guido Reni, Correggio, and Raphael. His recommendations were voted on by the seven-member committee, with three voting in his favor.⁹¹ If anything, Goya appears to have been in favor of a broader skill

---


⁹⁰ Luis Alonso Fernández. *Formación del Buen Gusto.* (Madrid: Facultad de Bellas Artes, Universidad de Bellas Artes, 1996), 38

base for students and, therefore, allowing them greater capacity for expression.

In his essay, “Francisco Goya and the Crisis in Art around 1800,” Theodor Hetzer argues that Goya was part of a larger movement, also taking place in France, that rejected the prevailing rules and styles that dominated eighteenth-century European academies. But, whereas Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) sought to radically change the French Academy in the 1790s by implementing a particular and radical approach to art with neoclassical aesthetics, Hetzer believed that “Goya was not aiming at producing any new theory.” He suggested that “… Goya’s art remains decidedly revolutionary. The revolution, however, is that of an individual rather than of a theory.”

Almost 100 years earlier, in explaining why Goya was not a member of the permanent community, Casado had come to a similar conclusion:

Such a painter, so personal and impossible to copy, with his confident magnificence, with his strange and sublime eccentricities. He cannot have imitators, neither was he able to found a School. His genius was consummated with him ... Casado’s solution to the “problem of Goya” was diplomatic: Praise and isolate him.

To this point in his remarks, Casado had explained that his contemporaries

---


93 José Casado del Alisal. *Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 8. Full quote: “Goya, que ya recogiendo las pérdidas tradiciones, ó merced á la poderosa intuición de su alma, surge con fantasía y con fecundia inauditas, á romper las cadenas de la rutina; bastando, por si solo, á ilustra el último periodo de aquel siglo, con un arte nuevo y extraño, que, cuanto más se discute y más se estudia, con más fuerza se impone, por sus aciertos magníficos, por sus acentos de verdad, por los arranques de su genialidad vigorosa y por su inspiración, reflejo de un alma intencionada y férea, dotada de todas las energías de su raza aragonesa, que poco después dió al mundo en espectáculo en los gloriosos muros de la inmortal Zaragoza. Más, pintor tan personal y tan inimitable, en sus aciertos magníficos, como en sus extrañas y sublimes excentricidades, no podía tener imitadores, ni pudo fundar Escuela: su genio se consumió con él ...”
were experiencing a renaissance in harmony with the great masters of Spain’s past. For at least a century, as a result of foreign influence, Spanish artists lost their way. Goya “reclaimed” some of these lost traditions, but, ultimately, he was unable to teach others how to do the same. It is in this spirit that Casado explained that a solution arrived, which made the study and making of great art viable once again in Spain:

... the principles of a new art arrived among us; one that attempts to depart from old ways, replacing spent models with the study of Greek beauty and the robust inspirations of classical Rome, whose saving principles overcame the mannerist and sickly [art] enthroned in antiquated Europe from those times before the French Revolution. And after those masters ... who faithfully applied themselves to teaching and good taste in the study of painting, reinvigorating itself with simple methods and from ancient models ... From these artists planted the seeds of such a great and intelligent artistic education.94

This “new art” that “arrived” among Spaniards came from France and, without exaggeration, was the result of the careers of three painters: José de Madrazo (1781-1859), Juan Antonio de Ribera (1779-1860), and José Aparicio (1773-1838). The three were classmates at the Academia de San Fernando and graduated at an opportune moment. From the 1790s, France and Spain had been in a territorial dispute. With the Treaty of Basel (1795), promises were made between the two nations to remain friendly and, over the next several years, recompense those harmed by the dispute. This process was delayed by developments in the French Revolution (1789-1799). In order to establish friendly relations, in 1800 France invited a commission from Spain — diplomats, businessmen, engineers, and artists selected by King Carlos IV — to work closely with counterparts in France. The king chose Madrazo, Ribera, and Aparicio to

94 Ibid., 8-9. Full quote “... Pero llegaron entre nosotross los principios de un arte nuevo, que intentaba salir de las viejas corrientes, reemplazando sus gastados moldes con el estudio de la belleza griega y con las robustas inspiraciones de la clásica Roma; con cuyos principios salvadores se iba venciendo el arte amanerado y enfermizo, entrónizando en caduca Europa de aquellos tiempos precursores de la revolución francesa. Y en pos de aquellos maestros que ... aplicándose con fe á la enseñanza y á la propagación del buen gusto en el estudio de la pintura, valiéndose métodos sencillos y de modelos hasta entonces ... en la cual había de germinar las semillas de tan generosa é inteligente educación artística.”
travel with the newly appointed consul general from Spain to audition for a position in the studio of Jacques-Louis David.95

By 1800, David’s reputation as the foremost French painter was well established. Although he was often at odds with the French Academy, a series of successes by David and his early pupils (e.g., Girodet, Drouais, Isabey, Gérard) gave their neo-classical approach, both aesthetically and pedagogically, hegemony within France.96 It also drew the attention of the rising political leaders, particularly Napoleon, who began commissioning paintings by David in 1799.97 From 1797 to 1801, David’s studio had an average of sixty names on its rolls, with about forty in regular attendance.98 According to at least one of David’s French pupils, Étienne-Jean Delécluze (1781-1863), the kinds of artists found in the master’s personal studio, as compared to those of other professors at the Académie Française de Paris, were not of the highest standards:

> From the beginning of the Directoire period [1795-1799], David’s atelier ... had become a kind of refuge for those emigrants, noble or army breakaways, whose real or pretended ability to paint gave them access to the Master. It seemed that David had embraced his role as a protector of a class of men who, only a few years earlier, he had rigorously avoided.99

Madrazo, Ribera, and Aparicio are recorded as having passed David’s drawing test, the outcome of which was most likely aided by a letter of introduction from King Carlos IV of Spain.100 For the three young Spanish

---

artists, David’s neo-classicism and the post-revolutionary environment of France must have been at once foreign and invigorating. As previously mentioned, French art was by no means foreign in Spain, which was ruled a Bourbon king who had been raised in Versailles. But, Carlos IV’s coterie of artists (e.g., Michel-Ange Houasse, Louis-Michel Van Loo) were, by comparison to David’s generation, hopelessly outmoded. The young Spanish artists working in Paris were completely seduced by David, departing entirely from their previous work. For example, a comparison between two works by José Aparicio:

*Godoy Presenting Peace to Carlos IV* (1797), painted a few years before Aparicio moved to France, received a gold medal at the Academy’s annual competition (see Figure 4). The use of allegorical figures dressed in bulky, decorative clothing contrasts sharply with his post-Paris painting *Hunger in Madrid* (1818), with its dramatic gestures, austere setting, and figures in classical dress (see Figure 5). Aparicio depicts the French “liberators” — officers and mercenaries — as indifferent to sick and dying Spaniards; what the Spanish historian Fray Manuel Martínez described as “unprecedented cruelty” from the French after they entered “with words as sweet and gratifying as peace.”

---


Figure 4: José Aparicio (1773-1838) *Godoy presentando la paz a Carlos IV* (1797) Oil on canvas. DIMENSIONS? Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, Madrid.

Figure 5: José Aparicio (1733-1838) *El hambre en Madrid* (1818) Oil on canvas. 315 x 437 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.

[Click here for high-resolution image.]
After three years in Paris, Madrazo, Ribera, and Aparicio all went to Rome to continue their studies, with the full blessing and funding of the crown. It was there that Madrazo painted perhaps his most famous work, *The Death of Viriatus, Leader of the Lusitanians.*¹⁰⁴ (see figure 6). The choice of his subject is significant because it signals how Spanish artists, after adopting French aesthetics, made their works Spanish. This was done by negating its Frenchness altogether and, as Casado said in his remarks, using the French as an initial intermediary for the “study of Greek beauty and the robust inspirations of classical Rome.” Viriatus was an historical figure who heroically rallied Iberians against the Roman occupation between 147 and 139 BCE. The painting is both a reference to the overwhelming, inevitable invasion of French troops under Napoleon to every corner of Europe and a reference to Spain's proud classical history. Throughout the nineteenth century, Spanish historians and artists asserted that Spaniards had a more legitimate claim to Greek and Roman classical traditions than the French.

Spain was the birthplace of Emperors Hadrian and Trajan and the philosopher Seneca. It was also ruled by Julius Caesar for some time. And, as absurd as it sounds today, many Spaniards in the nineteenth century and earlier, including Queen Isabel la Católica, claimed to be descended from Hercules. Therefore, for Madrazo, Ribera, Aparicio, and Casado, the French provided a path back to a classicism that was familiar, even deeply embedded in their shared national heritage.

In any case, if Madrazo, Ribera, and Aparicio’s loyalties were in question during the French occupation of Spain (1808-1814), those doubts were quickly erased. The three artists, in Rome at the time of the occupation, were rounded up by French troops and placed in the Castello de Sant’Angelo for thirty-three days as punishment for not swearing loyalty to Joseph Bonaparte.

When the occupation ended, Madrazo, Ribera, and Aparicio returned to Madrid with Fernando VII (1813) and became remarkable and sustained influences within nearly every institution of the fine arts in Spain. All three served as court painters to Carlos IV, Fernando VII, and Isabel II. Madrazo and Ribera were at different times directors of the royal collection, responsible for the care and restoration of masterworks. Madrazo was the first director of the Museo del Prado, and was succeeded by Ribera. All three aided in the creation of the aforementioned Colección litográfica de cuadros del Rey de España el Señor Don Fernando VII. This lithography atelier, the Real Establecimiento Litográfico, became the basis for nineteenth-century fine-art printing in Spain, including several arts journals. Madrazo and Aparicio both served in various roles as teachers

---


José de Madrazo, in particular, became an agent of change within the Academia de San Fernando. In 1818, he was appointed the professor of color and, later, of composition. He immediately clashed with drawing professors at the Academy, who dismissed his claims that their drawing techniques were outdated and opposed introducing oil painting into the curriculum. When Madrazo was made the Academy’s director (1838), his radical changes were so controversial that he obtained a special royal order stating that he was “the active director and, in such, the only one to represent the teaching of painting in the School of Noble Arts.” In 1864, when the Academy in Madrid became the Central Academy, Madrazo’s reforms became standard for all regional academies.

When he spoke of “those artists who planted the seeds of such a great and intelligent artistic education,” Casado was referring to Madrazo, Aparicio, and Ribera, After these three, thirty-six Spaniards were accepted to the Paris Ecole des Beaux-Arts and given government scholarships; another forty-six studied independently in the Paris studios of professors at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. This influence was expanded upon by the next generation.

---


109 Ibid, 98.

110 Ibid., 82-85.


112 Francisco Estevey y Botey. La Escuela Central de Bellas Artes de San Fernando de Madrid: Apuntes de su historia y resumen de us plan de estudios y del reglamento de régimen interior. (Madrid: Blass, 1950), 1-10.

113 These artists and their relationships to French and Spanish artists have been meticulously documented by Reyero: Carlos Reyero. “Pintores españoles del siglo XIX en la Escuela de Bellas Artes de París: entre el aprendizaje cosmopolita y el mérito curricular.” Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, Number 72 (First Semester, 1991), 379-390.
José de Madrazo’s son, Federico de Madrazo y Kuntz (1815-1894), studied in Paris with Hippolyte “Paul” Delaroche (1797-1856) and later with Jean-Dominique Ingres (1780-1867) in Rome. Federico de Madrazo would himself become a court painter, professor of drawing and color & composition classes, director of the Academia de San Fernando, director of the Museo del Prado, president of the Exposición Nacional, president of the Scholarship Jury for fine-arts scholarships paid out by the central government, and director of the Academy in Rome. Maintaining and expanding relationships started by his father’s generation in Paris and Rome, he had close relationships with a number of influential figures, including Alexandre Dumas, père (1802-1870), Jean-Hippolyte Flandrin (1809-1864), Wilhelm von Kaulbach (1805-1874), Johann Friedrich Overbeck (1789-1869), Ary Scheffer (1795-1858), Horace Vernet (1789-1863), Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier (1815-1891), and Jean-Léon Gérôme (1824-1904).

An entire section of Casado’s remarks is dedicated to Federico de Madrazo, whom he calls “my beloved Master” and whose merits are witnessed by many artists who “yesterday were his disciples and today are the glory of art.” This is not simply hyperbolic flattery for the benefit of Federico de Madrazo, who stood on the dais behind Casado as he spoke. Madrazo was generous. He used his many foreign connections to secure positions for students in prominent studios in France, Rome, and Munich. He wrote letters of introduction whenever students traveled abroad and...

---


115 These are just a few of the artists with whom he regularly visited and corresponded, according to Madrazo’s personal records. Source: Various Editors. Federico de Madrazo Epistolario, Vols. I & II. (Madrid: Museo del Prado, 1994).

116 José Casado del Alisal. Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 10. Original text: “... mi querido maestro, recordando, para honra suya, los de tantos artistas insignes, que ayer fueron sus discípulos y hoy son gloria del arte.”
often allowed younger artists to accompany him. One prominent example includes the French painter Léon Bonnat who, as a teenager, moved to Madrid with his father, a bookseller. Bonnat was accepted to the Academia de San Fernando and invited to work in the private studio of Madrazo.\textsuperscript{117} The Spanish artist encouraged Bonnat to study in Paris. Bonnat became a very influential professor at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts de Paris and, in 1905, was named director of the Ecole. Many of his students eclipsed his own fame, including Thomas Eakins (1844-1916), John Singer Sargent (1856-1925), Henri de Toulouse Lautrec (1864-1901), and Edwin Lord Weeks (1841-1903).\textsuperscript{118}

Having established a clear historical narrative from the Golden Age of Spanish art in the seventeenth century to his time and naming key members of the shared permanent community from the past to the present, Casado transitioned his remarks to the challenges of “modern Spanish art”:

> It is certain that these modern times — so exuberant in material progress and so intent on the betterment of life and its conditions — offer little space, in their fevered activities, to think upon the sublime ideals that were the spiritual life of other times and other societies, to which the Parthenon, the Roman Forum, the Gothic Cathedral are eloquent testimonies.

The role of the artist in such times is to fulfill a “civilizing mission”:

> ... if the production of Spanish painters rises to touch the heights at which artistic work arrives when conceived in meditation, profundity, and the feeling of the Ideal: the incarnate idea and form, enchanted and transcendent force of a work of art ... To arrive at the expression of his soul and his internal life by way of the intuitive feelings that God put in the mind of the painter, without which the artist can never dominate or make the spectator fully aware of the


Casado’s remarks are peppered with the notion of the artist as an agent of the “idea,” a thought he expresses in different ways (e.g., “expression of his soul,” “sublime ideals”). This notion has lost much of its meaning to our twenty-first-century conception of art. However, to Casado’s audience, these would have been familiar doctrine, central to academic study.

In his remarkable study, *Idea: A Concept in Art Theory*, art historian Erwin Panofsky maps the “definition and conception of the term ‘idea,’ from Plato to the 17th century, when the modern definition emerged.” He begins with Plato (c. 428 BCE), who believed in a higher and greater reality — what he called the “idea” — for everything in existence that could not be understood through physical sensations. The aim of the liberal arts — those branches of knowledge that could be pursued by free men — was to seek out the idea:

When they finally commence the execution of their work [that is, after having carefully prepared the panel and sketched the principal lines], they let the eye, frequently alternating, dwell now on this, now on that side, once on that which is truly beautiful, just, rational, and otherwise pertinent in this context, and then again on that which merely passes for all this among men; and, by blending and mixing they produce from their materials that human image in the conception of which they let themselves be guided by what Homer

---

119 José Casado del Alisal. *Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 11. Full quote: “Cierto es que los modernos tiempos, tan exuberantes de progreso material y tan atentos á mejorar las condiciones de la vida, ofrecen poco espacio en su actividad febril para pensar en los ideales sublimes, que fueron la vida espiritual de otros tiempos y de otras sociedades, y de los cuales son testimonio elocuente el Parthenon, y el Foro romano y la Catedral gótica … Yo no hablaré del Arte español en general, pero diré, si que la producción de los pintores españoles suele carecer de la elevación que presta al trabajo artístico el concepto meditado y profundo y el sentimiento de lo ideal, encarnando idea y forma, principal encanto y fuerza de trascendencia de la obra de arte … para llegar á la expresión de su alma y de su vida interna por los medios intuitivos que Dios puso en la mente del pintor sin lo cual jamás llegará el artista á dominar al espectador, comprenetrendole de la idea …”

described as divine and godlike when met with among mankind.¹²¹

In order for this meeting of the “divine” and “mankind” to take place (i.e., what Casado calls “intuitive feelings that God put in the mind of the painter”), an artist must be looking toward the proper sources and be working in the appropriate genre or “the artist can never dominate or make the spectator fully aware of the idea …”

Not just any genre of art could achieve the highest expression of the idea. In seventeenth-century France, André Félibien (1619-1695) expressed what had already been the de facto hierarchical order of fine-art genres most likely to produce the “highest perfection” of the idea.¹²² This hierarchy, deeply embedded in the modus operandi of the French Academy, was reinforced by the neo-classical study of ideal beauty and the human form taught by Madrazo, Ribera, and Aparicio. Even before the nineteenth century, the curricula of the various regional academies emphasized figure painting, but each with its own distinct approach.¹²³ For example, Valencian artists, even in the eighteenth century, were well regarded for naturalism and bright colors, compared to artists working in


¹²² André Félibien. “Préface aux Conférences de l’Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture pendant.” Les Conférences de l’Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture au XVII siècle. Ed. Alain Mérot. (Paris: ENSB-A, 1996), 50. Original text: Celui qui fait parfaitement des paysages est au-dessus d’un autre qui ne fait que des fruits, des fleurs ou des coquilles. Celui qui peint des animaux vivants est plus estimable que ceux qui ne représentent que des choses mortes & sans mouvement; & comme la figure de l’homme est le plus parfait ouvrage de Dieu sur la Terre, il est certain aussi que celui qui se rend l’imitateur de Dieu en peignant des figures humaines, est beaucoup plus excellent que tous les autres ... un Peintre qui ne fait que des portraits, n’a pas encore cette haute perfection de l’Art, & ne peut prétendre à l’honneur que reçoivent les plus sçavans. Il faut pour cela passer d’une seule figure à la représentation de plusieurs ensemble; il faut traiter l’histoire & la fable; il faut représenter de grandes actions comme les historiens, ou des sujets agréables comme les Poëtes; & montant encore plus haut, il faut par des compositions allégoriques, sçavoir couvrir sous le voile de la fable les vertus des grands hommes, & les mystères les plus relevez.”

Seville, whose production tended to be more neutral in tone and compositionally ambitious.\textsuperscript{124} Arguably, the spread of the Central Academy’s brand of figurative work, combined with the success of the Exposición Nacional, led to greater conformity. In particular, large, multi-figural works featuring scenes from Spanish history received the greatest attention at the national contest from critics and juries. Some ninety percent of all awards at the first eighteen Exposiciones Nacionales were given to large, multi-figural Spanish history paintings.\textsuperscript{125} Each year, from 1856 to 1887, the number and size of history paintings submitted to the Exposición Nacional increased.\textsuperscript{126}

These enormous canvases — some as large at twenty feet in length\textsuperscript{127} — were not destined for a private market. Unlike in France, where there were frequent and public bidding wars between potential private buyers for pieces in the Paris Salon, the private market had little role in any part of Spain’s national art contests.\textsuperscript{128} The advent of the Exposición Nacional corresponded with a major building program by the central government.\textsuperscript{129} In effect, the Spanish government, through a program known as the Comision de Monumentos, became the principal patron for fine arts in Spain, both commissioning new monuments and renovating historic

\textsuperscript{124} Antonio de la Banda y Vargas. Estudios de arte Español. (Seville: Academia de Bellas Artes de Santa Isabel de Hungría, 1974), 20-30.

\textsuperscript{125} See Appendix II, Award-Winning Paintings of the Exposición Nacional. For additional analysis, see Bernardino de Pantorba. Historia y crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes celebradas en España. (Madrid: Jesus Ramon Garcia-Rama, 1980).

\textsuperscript{126} Bernardino de Pantorba. Historia y Crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes Celebradas en España. (Madrid: Jesus Ramon Garcia-Rama, 1980), 6

\textsuperscript{127} For example, Casto Plasencia y Maestre (1846-1890), Origen de la República Romana (1877), Oil on canvas, 468 x 690 cm, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.


\textsuperscript{129} The Plan de Castro, passed by the Spanish legislature in 1860, was a controlled urban expansion of Madrid, based on the work of Barón Georges-Eugène Haussman (1809-1891) in Paris. Several buildings in Madrid were created or renovated during the time, including the Museo del Prado, Cason del Buen Retiro, Teatro Real, Palacio del Senado, Palacio del Congreso, and Banco de España.
By the late 1880s, there were signs that the government’s role as the most significant patron of the Academy was beginning to wane. The predominant role of the Spanish government as the patron of the arts was eclipsed beginning with the Exposición Nacional of 1889, as evidenced by the smaller sizes of works in general and the focus on history paintings was replaced with an interest in works that required the same arsenal of skills used in history paintings, but applied to contemporary subjects. Then called “realist” works by Spanish critics, this genre is now often referred to as “social history paintings,” as most works involved socio-political commentary (see chapters seven and eight). The artists of these works were often patronized by a growing Spanish middle class. As a result, social history paintings were typically smaller in size and were meant to be hung in private homes, not large, public buildings. Artists like Raimundo de Madrazo y Garreta (1841-1920), the son of Federico de Madrazo; Mariano Fortuny y Marsal (1838-1874); and, later, Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923) found critical and commercial success in France. This prompted other Spanish painters to more abroad and imitate their work at home (see chapter eight). These developments seriously concerned Casado, who considered it a “fracturing” of the Spanish Academy.

Casado dedicated the final portion of his talk to describing three emerging “centers” of Spanish painting — Rome, Paris, and Madrid:

In any case, from this fractioning and from this separation are born the different tendencies observed in Spanish painting, according to the currents breathed by its authors, whether it be the dominant idea in Rome, in Paris, or in Madrid, the preferred centers of our

---

Casado did little to hide his true feelings about the motivations of the artists who worked in each city. He began with Paris:

Those who prefer Paris, either for study or work, seek out the noisy stimulation of an active and elegant life; the center of all refinements and ease. They are inspired by the feverish activity all about and that is stimulated by high prices and the great admiration with which art is received, solicited, and courted by lovers of art, picture dealers, and ostentatious capitalists ... it is an atmosphere that gives these [artists] a passion to produce and a passion to make money ... 132

Even if said with the most cheerful tone, it would be difficult to disguise the disdain that Casado had for those who, in so many words, had “sold out.”

Anti-French sentiment was nothing new in Spain. Throughout the nineteenth century, Second of May celebrations, held to remember Spanish resistance to the French occupation of 1808, became an annual occasion for francophobic speeches and demonstrations. 133 But, given the fundamental relationship of the Spanish Academy had French neo-classicists and romanticists, Casado’s sentiments seem particularly ironic. They were not unique in the fine arts. As will be discussed later (i.e., chapters seven and eight), those artists whose works were perceived as

---

131 José Casado del Alisal. *Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 12. Full quote: “En todo caso, de este fraccionamiento y de esta separación, nacen los caracteres diferentes y las encontradas tendencias que se observan en la pintura española, según que sus autores respiran las corrientes de la idea dominante en Roma, en París ó en Madrid, centros predilectores de nuestros pintores ...”

132 José Casado del Alisal. *Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 10-11. Full quote: “Dan su preferencia á París, los que para el estudio y el trabajo buscan el bullicioso estímulo de aquella vida activa y elegante, centro de todos los refinamientos y todas las facilidades; inspirándose en la fiebre de trabajo que los rodea, y que mantiene vivo su espíritu por el estímulo de altos precios y de la grande estimación que allí alcanza la producción artística, solicitada y cortejada por amantes del arte, por negociantes de obras pictóricas y por ostentosas capitalistas ... una atmósfera que mantiene activa en ellos la pasión de producir y la pasión de ganar ...”

being too French were subject to heavy criticism in popular journals.

Having just stepped down as director of the *Real Academia* in Rome, Casado witnessed an increased preference for Paris over Rome among his students. All artists working at the Academy in Rome were required to travel during the second year of their studies, and students were obliged to submit their travel plans to both the local director and to the Spanish Ministry of External Affairs for approval.\(^{134}\) In the first several years of the Academy (i.e., 1874-1879), the majority of Spaniards chose to stay within Italy, visiting Pisa, Venice, Florence, and Naples. However, in 1880, the number of students requesting to visit Paris eclipsed others.\(^{135}\) These travels were timed to correspond with the annual Paris *Salon* and several Universal Expositions.

This trend toward Paris troubled Casado, who believed the Eternal City was an antidote to the “fevered” environment of Paris:

> Rome is preferred by those who seek a center of tranquil life and austerity, where requisite calm reigns and favors meditation. In such ambience they can focus with greater intensity and transform into work the thousands of fantasies that fill the soul of an artist. Those who love art for art, who see in the Eternal City a perennial cloak of inspiration and of poetry ... the Patria of artists of all times.\(^{136}\)

Romanticism of Rome had been part of Spanish culture for hundreds of years. The relationship between the Habsburgs and the Pope during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries resulted in a corridor between Madrid

---

\(^{134}\) Alonso Sánchez, María Angeles. “El primer reglamento de pensionados de la academia de bellas artes en Roma.” *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología*, No. 3. (Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1976.), 96


\(^{136}\) José Casado del Alisal. *Discursos Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885). 11. Full quote: “A Roma dan la preferencia los que buscan un centro de vida tranquilo y severo, donde reina la calma necesaria y propicia á la meditación, y en cuyo ambiente pueden condensarse con mayor intensidad y traducirse en hechos, las mil fantasías que llenan el alma del artista; los que aman el arte por el arte, los que ven en la eterna ciudad un manantial perenne de inspiración y de poesía ... patria de los artistas de todos los tiempos.”
and Rome for many artists. In his manual for painters, *Arte de la Pintura*, Francisco Pacheco, whose students included Diego Velázquez and Alonso Cano, cites more than fifty works in Rome as essential to the understanding of art. \(^{137}\) It was only after Velázquez spent two years in Italy, principally in Rome, that he created his greatest works.\(^{138}\) By the eighteenth century, the *Academia de San Fernando* held a yearly scholarship competition — based on the French *Prix de Rome* — for artists to spend two to three years in Rome and fulfill a series of tasks. By the nineteenth century, this model had spread to nearly every regional academy. When the *Real Academia Española en Roma* was founded in 1874 — Spain’s first and only foreign school for artists, architects, and, eventually, musicians — it became the ultimate destination for aspiring academic painters.\(^{139}\) (This is discussed in greater length in chapters four and five.)

Despite all these long-held aspirations, mid-nineteenth-century Rome was a place of political chaos and poverty. “While you behold the perfection of beauty in the ruins of ancient Rome, you see the extreme of deformity in the buildings of the modern city,” wrote one visitor.\(^{140}\) Although a large community of Spaniards was working in Rome, the preponderance of these artists were there temporarily and were either dependent on family funds for their stays or on selling their work outside of Italy. Mariano Fortuny, perhaps the most commercially successful Spanish nineteenth-century artist in his lifetime, lived just outside of Rome. His studio was a regular gathering place for Spanish painters studying there, not only because of his expertise as a painter, but because of his commercial

---

\(^{137}\) Francisco Pacheco. *Arte de la pintura.* (Sevilla: Simon Faxardo, 1649).


\(^{139}\) “La Academia Española en Roma.” *Gaceta de Madrid.* (8 August 1873).

relationship with the art dealer and manufacturing printer and publisher Adolphe Goupil (1806-1893) in Paris. Fortuny became a talent scout for Goupil, perhaps superficially increasing the ranks of Spaniards working in Rome who were, in fact, deriving their incomes from Paris through Goupil.

Casado did not benefit from patrons in Paris or Rome. Nearly all his income came from Madrid. Having made his name at the Exposición Nacional of 1860, where his painting was at the center of a public firestorm, Casado was in perpetual favor of conservative politicians, who continued to send him government projects and commission portraits (see chapter four). Casado was born in Madrid, the son of a court functionary. He rose from a local drawing school to become the director of the Academy in Rome. It is perhaps not surprising, then, to learn he despised those who lacked a certain ambition and stayed in Madrid:

And, finally, those who fix themselves upon Spain, and with preference, Madrid, these painters passionately love art, and their patria and the warmth of their family even more, and the blue sky and the splendor of her sun, far from those who experience the fever of absence, the dark nostalgia that makes them long for this beloved patria. In all its convulsions and disgraces, with all the backwardness of its customs and with the lack of stimulation, rewards, and esteem for living artists. [Being in Spain] is for those with particular temperaments, who have an ardent necessity, as if

141 According to Mercè Doñate, Goupil considered Fortuny's works to be of considerable quality and, therefore, did not put the same demands on his output as he did on Jean-Léon Gérôme or William-Adolphe Bouguereau. Source: “Fortuny and Genre Painting.” Mercè Doñate Fortuny (1838-1874), Exh. Cat. (Barcelona: Museu Nacional d’Art Catalunya, 17 October 2003 to 18 January 2004), 504-505.

142 Ibid., 505.

Perhaps it is not so much his disdain for artists who chose “patria” and “family” over art, as Casado said. Here, Casado is stating disappointment in Spain. In his personal letters, Casado’s teacher, Federico de Madrazo, frequently complained about Spain’s backwardness. Following the Revolution of 1868, Madrazo, then serving as director of both the Academia de San Fernando and Museo del Prado, wrote his son, Raimundo, who was in Paris:

I am greatly contented to think that you and Mariano [Fortuny] are in Europe and not dependent on [government] employ and that you work for Europeans (even if they are from North America, I will call them Europeans). O that I were ten to fifteen years younger! I would not be in Madrid in these times! Nor would I think on what happens in this degraded and putrefied country! ...

Madrazo was writing at the height of chaos in Spain. Seventeen years later, at the time of Casado’s remarks, the monarchy had been restored, economic prosperity was becoming more widespread, and Spanish painters had received international acclaim at two consecutive Universal Expositions (see chapters five and six). Despite his worries about the fractioning of the Spanish Academy, Casado saw a bright future:

The lovers of art and foreign businessmen who today absorb nearly all the production of our painters come on pilgrimage to Toledo or Seville, worthy centers of our national School. Our national culture

144 José Casado del Alisal. Discurso Leídos ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 11-12. Full quote: “Y, por últimos, fijan sus reales en España, y con preferencia en Madrid, los pintores que, amando apasionadamente el arte, aman su patria aún más, y el calor de su familia, y el cielo azul, y el esplendor de su sol, lejos del cual siente la fiebre de la ausencia, la negra nostalgia que les hace suspirar por esta patria adorada, que con todas sus convulsiones, con todas sus desgracias, con todo el atraso de sus costumbres, y con toda la falta de estímulos, y de recompensas, y de estimación en que el artista vive, es para ciertos temperamentos una necesidad ardiente, como lo es el aire a la vida ...”

145 Federico de Madrazo. Letter to Raimundo de Madrazo, “20 December 1868.” Published in Epistolarios, Vol 2. (Madrid: Museo del Prado, 1994), 674. Original text: “... tengo una gran satisfacción cuando pienso que tú y Mariano estás en Europa y que no dependéis de un empleo, y que trabajáis para los Europeos (aunque sean de la America del Norte entra en la acepción de mi palabra Europeos) — ¡Ojalá que me encontrase yo con 10 o 15 años menos! — no estaría yo en Madrid en estas horas ¡y ni pensaría que existe este país degradado y podrido! ...”
will transform itself ... our artists will this regenerative work, which has been begun with all of us, with the splendor with which the arts gild the triumphal diadem of civilization, bringing to life once more the glorious times of the immortal *Florence of the Medicis*.\(^{146}\)

From the vantage of the twenty-first century, Casado’s optimism may seem misplaced. After all, the most well-known Spanish painters of the nineteenth century, Francisco de Goya and Pablo Picasso (1881-1973), were decidedly not members of the this permanent community, at least according to Casado’s standards of membership. They were bookends to a period that, although remarkably prolific, is only now being taken out of long-term storage. As these works are brought into greater public view with increased frequency, the nature of the Spanish Academy provides essential understanding of the works themselves: their aesthetics, iconology, high level of craftsmanship, destined audiences, and patrons.

---

\(^{146}\) José Casado del Alisal. *Discurso leído ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, el día de noviembre de 1885.* (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 25-26. Original text: “Los amantes del arte y los negociantes extranjeros, que hoy absorben casi toda la producción de nuestros pintores, vendrían en peregrinación á Toledo ó á Sevilla, centros dignos de nuestra Escuela nacional ... la cultura nacional se transformaría ... nuestras artistas coronarían la obra regeneradora, por todos iniciada, con el esplendor con que las artes doran la diadema triunfal de la civilización, resucitando para nuestra patria los gloriosos tiempos de la inmortal Florencia de los Médicis.”
CHAPTER FOUR

Exposición, Ejecución, y Revolución
It is necessary that the wholesome and enlivening reforms of the revolution permeate all spheres of public administration…. It is impossible for the arts to remain apart from these great changes.

— Gregorio Cruzada

In 1868, Queen Isabel II of Spain (1830-1904 | Rule, 1833-1868) was dethroned. Three exiled generals had incited a rebellion among Spanish armed forces, overthrown the government, and ushered in a period known to supporters as the Revolución Gloriosa (Glorious Revolution) or, to monarchists, as simply the Sexenio Revolucionario (Six-Year Revolution). The years leading to and during the revolution dramatically affected the Spanish Academy, at times thrusting the fine arts into political territory. In 1860, only four years after the first Exposición Nacional, a history painting by the young and upcoming artist Antonio Gisbert (1834-1901) unexpectedly became the center of a polemical national debate. His painting El Suplicio de los Comuneros (1860) was overtly political and anti-monarchical. Steel-plate etchings of the work were widely distributed through a nascent yet active liberal political press. When Gisbert’s painting was not given top prize by the court-appointed jury of the Exposición, liberal politicians made it a symbol of their fight for constitutional reform of the Spanish throne. The fight over Los Comuneros galvanized a group of like-minded progressives who would overthrow the government eight years later. These would-be revolutionaries handsomely rewarded Antonio Gisbert for his anti-establishment œuvre. This chapter will briefly set the political context for the Exposición Nacional of 1860, map contemporary understandings onto Gisbert’s controversial painting, describe the debate surrounding the work’s public reception, and list some of the most

147 Gregorio Cruzada. La Ilustración Española y Americana. (Madrid, 15 May 1869), 225. Original text: “Preciso es que las saludables y vivicadoras reformas de la revolución lleguen a todas las esferas de la administración pública... No es posible que las artes puedan permanecer extrañas a estas grandes revoluciones.”

148 It seems likely that this name is in reference to the English “Glorious Revolution” of 1688, which Spanish revolutionaries saw as sharing many parallels with their own goals.
significant consequences experienced by the Academy as a result of its politicization.

Dominique Dufour de Pradt (1759-1837) was the personal secretary to Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821 | Reign, 1804-1814, 1815) during the French occupation of Spain (1808-1814). In 1816, Dufour wrote a history of the eight-year “Spanish Revolution,” as he termed it, concluding that the Spanish were fundamentally unable to adopt French law and Enlightenment principles as a result of their primitiveness: “fait commencer l’Afrique aux Pyrénées” (“Africa begins at the Pyrenes”). While Dufour’s characterization of Spain was surely influenced by his own sense of bitter loss of the Napoleonic Empire, including Iberia, it was also a reflection of how far Spain had fallen as a world power.

Three hundred years earlier, a unified Spain had led Europe against the Turks, brought a seemingly endless supply of wealth from New World silver mines, and enjoyed a kind of hegemonic influence in European diplomacy and culture. Yet, by the mid-nineteenth century, the Iberian peninsula was behind “modern” Europe in nearly every measurable way, including life expectancy, mortality rates, agricultural production, transportation infrastructure, and literacy. “From the year 1580 till now, everything that has happened in Spain has been decline and disintegration,” wrote the historian and philosopher José Ortega y Mémories historiques sur la révolution d’Espagne. (Paris, 1816), 66-67. Original text: “C’est une erreur de la géographie que d’avoir attribué l’Espagne à l’Europe; elle appartient à l’Afrique; sang, mœurs, langage, manière de vivre et de combattre; en Espagne tout est africain. Les deux nations ont été mêlées trop longtemps, les Carthaginois venus d’Afrique en Espagne, les Vandales passés d’Espagne en Afrique, les Maures séjournant eu Espagne pendant 700 ans, pour qu’une aussi longue cohabitation, pour que ces transfusions de peuples et de coutumes n’aient pas confondu ensemble les races et les mœurs des deux contrées. Si l’Espagnol était Mahométan, il serait un Africain complet; c’est la religion qui l’a conservé à l’Europe.” The first Spanish rail between Madrid and Barcelona — the country’s dual economic centers — was not operable until 1864. In 1803, the first public railway in England was put into use. In 1837, the railway opened in France. Source: David Ringrose. Spain, Europe and the “Spanish Miracle,” 1700-1900. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 280-288. In 1860, the literacy rate in Spain was 27 percent, compared to 69 and 63 percent in England and France, respectively. Source: Gabriel Totella. The Development of Modern Spain. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 13, 50-72.
Nineteenth-century Spanish intellectuals dedicated countless books and tracts to what is now referred to as the “Decline” (“Disentigración” or “Degeneración” in Spanish). Decline theorists dedicated themselves to explaining the causes and cures for centuries of political, economic, and moral deodorization. Spaniards tended to agree that the apex of their civilization was reached during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs Isabel I (1451-1504 | Reign, 1474-1504) and Ferdinand (1452-1516 | Reign, 1474-1516), who unified Spanish territory, ejected Islamic and Jewish occupants of Iberia, and sponsored the discovery and colonization of the Americas:

Sixteenth-century Spain, full of religious idealism, a nation alive, a vibrant community united by a common ideal, eager to do great things, conscious of the transcendence of its actions, created with its science and its art the highest type of culture that Christian civilization had produced in all its history.

But, whereas historians and politicians could agree on the greatness of Spain before the long deterioration, theories on the point of departure and causes for decline were hotly contested and heavily influenced by contemporary political philosophy.

By the mid-nineteenth century, two opposing decline theories emerged, one from the moderate ancien regime and the other from the progressive left. Moderate historians tended to blame foreign influence for the downfall

---

151 José Ortega y Gasset. España invertebrada. (Madrid: Calpe, 1921), 47. Original text: “Entonces veríamos que 1580 hasta el día cuanto en España acontece es decadencia y desintegración.”

152 A number of recent economic studies have shown that, despite being the greatest source of Europe’s wealth during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Spain was, in fact, not the region’s wealthiest. The well-known Spanish currency, silver pieces of eight, were rarer within Spain than in France or England. However, this reality was not understood by the nineteenth-century Spaniard, who believed, almost to a person, that Spain had been the richest nation, only to lose its wealth later. See Henry Kamen. Imagining Spain: Historical Myth & National Identity. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 15-30.

153 Pedro Saínz Rodríguez. La evolución de las ideas sobre la decadencia española. (Madrid: Editorial Atlántida, 1925), 18.
of Spain, while progressives blamed the Spanish monarchy and church for abusing power and squandering resources. Looking back over nearly a century of decline literature, the historian and politician Juan Valera y Alcalá-Galiano (1824-1905) wrote in 1887:

It was a most lamentable situation. In order to explain our decline, we had either to image that there really had existed a monstrous deviation or aberration in the progress of our civilization and that is was necessary to renounce the past and condemn it by taking the principles of civilization from outside, or we had to understand our past better, rehabilitate what was good in it, purify it of any corrupting elements and pursue our upward movement ... For our political history, [Modesto] Lafuente, [Antonio] Cánovas, and [Juan] Ferrer del Ríos; for the history of our laws and institutions [Manuel] Colmeiro, [Pedro José] Pidal, and [Antonio] Cárdenas; for the history of our civilization in general [José Ángel] Tapia and [Fermin] Gonzalo Morón; and for the history of our letters, sciences and arts [José] Amador de los Ríos, Valmar, [Pascual de] Gayangos, both the Guerras, [José] Canalejas, [Manuel] Milà i Fontanals, [Carlos] Aribau, [Marcelino] Menéndez y Pelayo, and many others who have written studies and published books, by virtue of which we can now say that it is not only amiable foreigners who come to teach us what we are and what we have been.\textsuperscript{154}

Outside of historical studies, decline theory became polemical in the management of the Spanish government. Put in the simplest of terms, traditionalists believed that Spain's decline was due to corrupting foreign influences and could be solved through a strong monarchy and church. Liberals, on the other hand, pushed for a constitutional monarchy and strong central-government-led programs (e.g., land reform, banking systems, educational programs) that had been successful in other countries, especially France.\textsuperscript{155}

Spain had already been in economic decline when King Ferdinand VII (1784-1833 | Reign, 1808, 1813-1833) died. Breaking with historical precedent, Ferdinand VII named his daughter, Isabel II, as his successor instead of allowing his brother Carlos to take the throne. Factions — both political and regional — lined up to support one or the other.


\textsuperscript{155} Ibid.
Conservatives, regional separatists (e.g., Basque and Catalanian), and Catholic fundamentalists supported Carlos, while the majority of business leaders and progressive and moderate politicians in the central government sided with Isabel II. The result was a prolonged civil conflict known as the Carlist Wars, which waxed and waned from 1833 to 1876 and drained already scant resources of the Spanish government.\textsuperscript{156}

The central government was split two into political parties representing opposing ideologies. Moderates supported Queen Isabel II; progressives sought constitutional reforms that would diminish royal control over traditional legislative and judicial powers and introduce a number of new rights for Spaniards, including property rights, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly.\textsuperscript{157} Unable to alienate any political allies during a prolonged civil war, the queen expressed public support for a constitution while effectively sabotaging its implementation through a revolving door of prime ministers and senators who opposed reforms. The decades of political battles between 1833 and 1860 amounted to what one historian compared to slow, self-administered poison by the crown.\textsuperscript{158} Isabel II’s political ineptitude was compounded by a series of embarrassing personal failings. The result was government deadlock, national bankruptcy, and widespread discontent with the government as a whole, and especially with the queen.\textsuperscript{159}

The communication of this discontent was severely limited. In 1824,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See Appendix IV, Nineteenth-Century Spanish Constitutional Reforms.
\item The novelist and history professor Francis Gribble compiled first-hand accounts of British and American foreign officers who personally knew the queen: “Isabella is not only the Queen of Spain, but, before she was enciente, the Queen of fun and pleasure, dancing being her delight and perpetual amusement…. She had no sooner entered into her kingdom, in short, than she began to dance it away; and, of course, there are plenty of historians who enumerate her [lovers].” Source: Francis Henry Gribble. \textit{The Tragedy of Isabella II.} (Boston: Gorham Press, 1913), 179-180.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Ferdinand VI issued a royal decree banning the publication of all periodicals, with the exception of two government-published weekly newspapers (La Gaceta and El Diario de Madrid); he also allowed the publication of print works exclusively dedicated to “Commerce, Agriculture, and Art.” The Printing Law of 1837 loosened censorship by allowing periodicals, including those dedicated to political commentary; but all content was subject to government review before publication. Under this system, public criticism of the queen was severely limited; even former war heroes were regularly exiled for opposing policies of the queen.

Within this context, the historical decline theories that heavily influenced Spanish politics found a safe place for expression in non-political literature and art. In other words, historical art and literature became proxies for otherwise illegal political discourse. Interpretations of events that happened hundreds of years earlier — the discovery of the Americas, ties to ancient Rome, the reconquest of Spain — were subjects of daily conversation and cause for heated political debates. History societies, often fronts for illegal political organizations, sprung up throughout Spain, and interpretation of historical facts was often motivated more by nineteenth-century political ideology than accuracy.

History painting, in particular, became susceptible to political historical interpretation. Based on the French academic model, the curriculum of the Spanish Academy of Fine Arts was calibrated primarily to create large-scale history painting. Because the government was nearly the sole patron for the arts, the Spanish painting scene was largely under the thumb of the monarchy. 

---

160 “Real Orden Expedida por el Ministerio de la Guerra.” Gaceta de Madrid, No. 11. (Madrid: 24 January 1824), 45-46.
of the arts (see chapter 3), institutional stability and career opportunity required the good will of those in power, whether they were elected or not.\textsuperscript{165}

By historical coincidence or design, over the course of the nineteenth century, Spanish painting was elevated to a new level of international prestige abroad, and then at home. During his brief reign as king of Spain (1808-1813), Joseph Napoleon actively sought out Spanish works of art to be taken to France and put on display. His aide, Alexandre de Laborde (1773-1842), led efforts to locate works of art and would later publish his findings:

The reign of Philip II and the countless geniuses of the time ... such as Velazquez, Murillo, Cano, Coello, Zurburán. This is the period to be studied if one is to know the real Spanish school, which has a particular quality that the other schools do not; it occupies a middle ground between the Italian and Flemish schools: closer to nature than the former, it is nobler than the latter, while partaking of the beauties of both ...\textsuperscript{166}

From 1838 to 1853, an exhibition of Spanish masterworks — many of dubious authenticity — was held in the Louvre.\textsuperscript{167} (The collection subsequently was sold at auction in London.\textsuperscript{168}) For French and, later, British artists, the collection provided an alternative vein of classicism and

\textsuperscript{165} "Furthermore, auction houses and artists’ stock companies (with the exception of a few patronage societies) were nonexistent in Spain, unlike in France and England, for the same period of 1830-1870 ... these emerge after 1874 and the restoration of the monarchy, the nationalization of the bank and the creation of new stock markets." Source: Oscar E. Vázquez. \textit{Inventing the Art Collection: Patrons, Markets, and the State in Nineteenth-Century Spain}. (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 8.


\textsuperscript{167} "It was the Galerie Espagnole that forced French aesthetic discourse to address the notion of a Spanish school of painting. Delécluze, who defined a school as ‘a succession of artists who shared fixed principles of composition and execution,’ ... found, as did many French critics, that Spanish old master painting shared a pronounced naturalism and strong color ..." Source: Alisa Luxenberg. \textit{The Galerie Espagnole and the Museo Nacional 1835-1953: Saving Spanish Art, or the Politics of Patrimony}. (Hampshire: Ahsgate Publishing, 2008), 24.

\textsuperscript{168} Nigel Glendinning and Hilary Macartney, eds. \textit{Spanish Art in Britain and Ireland, 1750-1920}. (London: Tamesis Books, 2010), 82.
would contribute to new movements throughout Europe, including realism and naturalism. During the subsequent decades, many French artists (e.g., Courbet, Manet, Carolus-Duran, Gérôme) and British artists were inspired to travel to Spain to study these artists' works in situ. Interest in Spain was further heightened by the marriage of Napoleon III to the Spanish Grandee Eugénie de Montijo (1826-1920) in 1853. Far from the hegemonic status it once enjoyed, this interest was a limited acknowledgment of Spain’s past accomplishment, not its current contributions. It was no accident, then, that in 1854, a year following the closure of the Galerie Espagnole and despite national fiscal insolvency, warring political parties galvanized in support of the creation of a Paris Salon-style contest, named the Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes, featuring Spain’s best native talent.

However small, the window of opportunity to establish a more positive national identity at home and abroad was seized upon by Spanish politicians who, in addition to funding the national arts contest, also set aside enormous resources to send contemporary Spanish paintings to a series of Universal Expositions (see chapters 5 and 6). Following the Vienna Universal Exposition of 1873, the politician Francisco María Tubino (1833-1888) wrote:

A permanent exhibition of the Fine Arts, organized by the individual initiative of a good citizen — where illustration, genius, and diligence combine for our benefit, for true and modest patriotism, not trivialities or by accident — can demonstrate, with no more eloquent works, to what extent the complaints that depict Spain dragged toward a deadly and shameful decline are unfounded. Nothing is so common than finding in periodicals, by their own and exclusive accord — declared by the disinterested and honest maintenance of those eternal foundations of the social order — articles and loose paragraphs that describe our nation at the least of the civilized nations ... Also, touching on the disdain with which foreigners regard us, the recent Universal [Exhibition] on the shores of the Danube has been an opportunity to demonstrate the opposite, to do the justice of placing Spain among the most well-

regarded and favored nations. Unfortunately, foreign critics are correct in saying they do not know of a people with such beautiful and enviable faculties, yet with such a bad government; something we ourselves affirm.\textsuperscript{170}

In other words, Tubino saw the Spanish Academy as another front for combating the decline both in reversing the poor opinions held by foreigners and in developing the “citizen” — a word that reflects of his liberal political ideology — at home. Unfortunately, this interpretation of the useful role of the fine arts meant that the Academy — its institutions and production — could become subject to the politically minded.

In 1856, by royal order, Spain’s first national arts contest, \textit{La Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes}, was created.\textsuperscript{171} The competition was the joint responsibility of the \textit{Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando} in

\textsuperscript{170} Francisco María Tubino. \textit{Revista Europea}. Year 1, Vol. 1, No. 14. (Madrid: 31 May 1874), 417-419. Original text: “La Exposición permanente de Bellas Artes, organizada por la iniciativa individual de un buen ciudadano, donde la ilustración, el genio y la diligencia se asocian, para dicha nuestra, al patriotismo verdadero y modesto, no garullo y de circunstancias, puede demostrar, con otros hechos no menos elocuentes, en qué medida son infundadas las quejas de los que pintan á España arrastrándose al término inevitable de una mortal y vergonzosa decadencia. Nada tan frecuente como encontrar en los periódicos que, por propio y exclusivo acuerdo, se han declarado mantenedores desinteresados ó ingenuos de lo que llaman fundamentos eternos del orden social, artículos ó párrafos sueltos pintando á nuestra patria como el último de los países civilizados. También en lo tocante al desden conque los extranjeros nos miran, el reciente certamen universal en las orillas del Danubio, ha sido ocasión, demostrándose lo contrario, para que se nos haga justicia hasta colocarse á España entre las naciones más consideradas y favorecidas. En lo que desgraciadamente tienen razón los críticos extranjeros, es en decir que no conocen pueblo con facultades más hermosas y envidiables, pero con peor gobierno, y esto mismo lo afirmamos nosotros.”

\textsuperscript{171} That it would be held in Madrid was an important, if not surprising, statement. Many of the country’s most internationally recognized painters (e.g., Mariano Fortuny) were from or based in Barcelona, which had long been the political and economic rival of Madrid. The east-coast city was considered closer to the rest of Europe, especially France, and had a much larger private market for paintings than the capital. The nineteenth-century artistic rivalry between the two cities has yet to be explored and deserves more attention than can be afforded here.
Madrid and the powerful *Ministerio del Fomento* (Ministry of Development). Before 1856, there were few ways for Spanish artists to gain national attention. Most well-known native artists were either painters to the court or lived abroad, where their success in Paris *Salons* made them international celebrities (e.g., Mariano Fortuny, Raimundo de Madrazo, and Joaquín Sorolla). The *Exposición Nacional* superceded the many exhibitions held in the country’s seventeen academies of art and provided a new platform for regional artists, potential financial rewards, and recognition on a national level.

The advent of the *Exposición Nacional* coincided with the rise of Spain’s first independent national press. As the only national public art contest, the *Exposición Nacional*, in particular, spawned a previously absent school of Spanish art criticism, but few of the self-appointed art critics had formal experience in the fine arts. Many were either employed directly by political parties or were politicians themselves. Similarly, awards for the *Exposición Nacional* were affected by politics. Juries were directly or indirectly appointed by the queen, and funding for the contest’s prizes was apportioned by the *Congreso de Diputados*, the lower house of Spain’s bicameral legislature. Unlike the Spanish Senate, the lower house was elected by regional governments and dominated by progressive politicians.

---

172 In 1857, the Spanish government passed the country’s first law governing public education. The sweeping reform, called the Ley Moyano (Moyano Law) after the liberal political reformer Claudio Moyano y Samaniego, centralized education curriculum and funding. All schools, including fine arts academies, were required to offer a core of basic courses (i.e., language, history, arithmetic). Art academies — including hiring and curriculum — came under the control of the *Academia de San Fernando* in Madrid. Source: Juan C. Araño Gisbert. “La enseñanza de las Bellas Artes como forma de ideología cultural.” *Arte, Individuo y Sociedad*, No. 2. (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1989), 14-16.

173 *Catálogo de las Obras de Pintura, Escultura, Arquitectura, Grabado y Litografía.* (Madrid: Imprenta Nacional, 1856).


who opposed royal policy.\textsuperscript{177}

With the contest being judged by supporters of the queen and the payment of prize money controlled by the progressive Congress, politicization of the \textit{Exposición Nacional} was, perhaps, unavoidable. It was in 1860 that a perfect storm of public interest, artistic merit, and political crisis — or opportunity, depending on the political persuasion — came together and made the \textit{Exposición Nacional}, and one painting in particular — \textit{El Suplicio de Los Comuneros} (1860) — by Antonio Gisbert, a \textit{cause célèbre} for progressives.

Gisbert's work was one of two highly anticipated paintings sent to the \textit{Exposición Nacional} in 1860. The other was \textit{Los últimos momentos de Felipe IV el Emplezado} (1860) by José Casado del Alisal (see figure 1). Both paintings were sent from Rome, where Gisbert and Casado studied as government-sponsored scholarship holders. The unusual circumstances of their scholarship contributed to the polemical events of 1860.

On 7 March 1855, the Ministry of Development announced a three-year, government-sponsored scholarship to study in Rome.\textsuperscript{178} It was the Spanish Academy's equivalent of the French \textit{Prix de Rôme}, supervised by the \textit{Real Academia de San Fernando} in Madrid with yearly tasks reviewed by a panel of Academy judges.\textsuperscript{179} Technically, only one scholarship for painting was available. Fifteen painters applied that year, all recent graduates of Madrid's \textit{Real Academia de San Fernando}. In the words of José de Madrazo, the jury's president and the Academy's elder

\textsuperscript{177} Arturo Domínguez Fernández. \textit{Leyes electorales españoles de diputados a cortes en el siglo xix: Estudio histórico y jurídico-político.} (Madrid: Civitas, 1992), 150-165.

\textsuperscript{178} Marcial Antonio López. “Real Decreto.” \textit{Diario de Madrid}. (Madrid: 11 June 1855).

\textsuperscript{179} The first year required copying an old master or Greco-Roman work unavailable in Spain. The second year, scholarship holders were required to create a full-body, life-size nude figure. The final year's task was a large-scale, multi-figural history painting or sculpture.
The present competition is one of the most brilliant to take place since the beginning of the Academy, as can be seen by these works in which the principal qualities that make up the art of painting meet in [Gisbert and Casado], whose work is elevated to a level above their youth.\footnote{Archivo Biblioteca Academia San Fernando, A. 1, L. 40. Original text: “... la presente oposición es una de las más brillantes que han tenido lugar hasta ahora desde la instalación de la Academia, como se puede ver por las obras que en el existen, porque las de los actuales opositores reúnen las más principales cualidades que constituyen el arte de la pintura, elevadas a un grado inesperado en unos jóvenes de su edad...”}

Unable to choose, the jury sent both Gisbert and Casado. Thus, two Spanish \textit{Prix-de-Rôme} winners would submit a major work to the \textit{Exposición Nacional} of 1860, forcing the jury to choose between works by two rising stars in the Academy.

\footnote{José de Madrazo (1781-1859) was court painter to Carlos III, Carlos IV, Ferdinand VII, and Isabel II. He studied under Jacques-Louis David in Paris and was a personal, lifelong friend to both Jean Auguste Dominique Ingres and Francisco de Goya.}
Figure 1: José Casado del Alisal (1832-1886) Los últimos momentos de Fernando IV, El Emplezado (1860) Oil on canvas. 385 x 218 cm. Palacio del Senado, Madrid.
Casado’s submission was titled *Los Últimos Momentos de Fernando IV, el Emplezado* (*The Final Moments of Ferdinand IV, The Summoned*, Figure 1). The medieval king of Castile was the subject of a major two-volume biography published in Madrid in 1850 that compared his rule to that of Isabel II. Like the nineteenth-century queen, Fernando IV’s (1285-1312 | Rule, 1295-1312) claim to the throne was compromised by another pretender to the throne and subsequent dynastic civil war. The eventual peace settlement was considered by Spanish historians as a model and precursor for modern Spain.

... to overcome the feudal system, removing the buttresses of the Lords and, some time later, privileges in general by converting them into common law; conquering and preserving civil liberties and political liberties. Such can the events of Ferdinand IV’s reign be characterized ... which can be considered the first step for modern societies in the road toward the social progress that existed in Castile ...

After establishing order in Castile, Ferdinand IV took Gibraltar from Islamic forces for the first time in 500 years. The victorious monarch gave the Carvajal brothers, two military leaders, management of the new territory. Years later and under false testimony, the brothers were accused of attempting to assassinate the king. Without the required trial by jury, Ferdinand IV had them summarily executed for treason. On the scaffold of execution, the Carvajal brothers publicly summoned the king to appear

---


183 When Ferdinand VII named his daughter, Isabel II, to be his successor, it was a major breach in Spanish Royal protocol. Under laws established in the sixteenth century, Ferdinand VII’s younger brother, Carlos, was to inherit the throne. The change began the Carlist wars, which continued until the 1870s.

184 Benavides. *Memorias de D. Fernando IV.* Original text: “... dominar el sistema feudal, echando de sus fortalezas á los señores, y algún tiempo después, generalizando el privilegio hasta convertirlo en ley común, conquistando con sus perseverancia la libertad civil y la libertad político. Tal es el carácter que presentan los acontecimientos del reinado de D. Fernando IV ... que puede considerarse como el primer paso dado por las sociedades modernas en el camino del progreso social [que] existió en Castilla....”
before the judgment seat of God within thirty days. Less than thirty days later, Ferdinand IV was found dead in his bedchamber:

A strange noise was heard coming from the king’s bed. Immediately the servants came and found him dead. What could have happened? God knows. The king was alone. Could it be that the Carvajal brothers, with bloody shadows, came to take him before the tribunal of God to complete the period of their charge? Only God knows.185

The question of Ferdinand’s guilt was not the subject of the painting — his red nightgown and the white robes of the brothers Carvajal were indications of forgone conclusions. Rather, the subject was the proper execution of justice against an abusive king. Fundamentally, Casado’s painting emphasized a traditional relationship between ruler, God, and people.

It was the distillation of a contemporary moderate argument for addressing — or, rather, failing to address — Spain’s political crisis. For those supporting limitations on royalty, or even more extreme solutions such as popular revolt, moderates had a message: Judgment and punishment of royalty was not the work of people, but of God. God was at Spain’s helm — good monarch or bad monarch — and glory was somehow predestined as long as the Spanish people stayed true to traditional values. After all, it was Ferdinand IV’s great-granddaughter and Queen Isabel II’s namesake, Isabel I (1451-1504 | Reign, 1474-1504), who led Spain to its greatest glory. Had the people revolted against Ferdinand IV for his unjust execution of the Carvajal brothers, Spain’s history would have been different and, perhaps, less glorious. As it turned out, the people did not need to revolt, because God removed the wicked king in His own time.

---

The lack of controversy stirred by Casado’s painting is evidenced by the absence of commentary on its content. Of the few critics who reviewed the painting in popular journals, treatment was limited to formal elements of the work.\textsuperscript{186} The progressive writer and art critic Juan de Dios Mora praised Casado’s ability to integrate lessons from “great masters”:

Of course, looking on this composition, full of grand poetry and executed with great firmness, one can recognize the careful study of Nature and masterpieces carried out by its author, in whose paintings a pleasant and surprising harmony are evident. For all the genius one may have, such qualities cannot be attained without such work and methodical and sustained observation. \textsuperscript{187}

To Casado these formal elements were critical for professional advancement. Before the painting was ever placed on public view at the \textit{Exposición Nacional}, it needed the approval of the academic scholarship jury. A single sentence set down the jury’s criterion for both Casado’s and Gisbert’s works: “In the final year, [scholarship holders] will execute a work with a composition of no less than three figures of natural size ...” \textsuperscript{188}

This simple language took for granted the four-pronged curriculum of the Spanish Academy: drawing, composition, coloring, and expression. Years of study in the \textit{Real Academia de San Fernando} left little doubt to what Spain’s \textit{Prix de Rôme} recipients should create for their last academic work: a large-scale, multi-figural painting.

\textsuperscript{186} \textit{La España}, No. 4351. (Madrid: 12 October 1860), 1.

\textsuperscript{187} José de Dios Mora. “Exposición de Bellas Artes, IV.” \textit{La Discusión}. (Madrid: 1 November 1860). Original text: “Desde luego, al contemplar esta composición, llena de terrible poesía y ejecutada con gran firmeza, puede reconocerse el atento estudio del natural y de las obras maestros que ha hecho el autor, en cuyos cuadros se advierte esa grata y sorprendente armonía, que por más genio que se tenga, nunca se adquiere sin el trabajo y la observación metódica y sostenida.”

Figure 2: Raffaello Sanzio da Urbino (1483-1520) *School of Athens*, detail (c. 1509)
Fresco. Apostolic Palace, Vatican City.
Casado’s painting is full of quotations and techniques were intended to please the scholarship jury. Taking into account his educational background (i.e., his mentors and curriculum) and the works to which he had access in Rome makes the iconographic forensics less mysterious.

The upward, summoning gesture of the far-left Carvajal brother and the barreled shape of the canvas references *School of Athens* by Rafael (c. 1509), a work studied by Casado during his first year in Rome. Casado also quotes from *The Death of Socrates* (1787, Figure 2) by Jacques-Louis David (French, 1748-1824, Figure 3), whose work was fundamental to teaching practices at the Central Academy in Madrid (see chapter 3). Comparisons to Socrates’ unjust death for the betterment of the state would have been intuited, at least by members of the Academy. The king’s sword remains sheathed in acknowledgement of God’s pending judgement. In Casado’s work, the upward gesture of the philosopher is instead given to an innocent Carvajal brother.

There are many traditional compositional conventions for communicating
supernatural figures. Here, the ghostly presence of the Carvajal brothers shares a strong resemblance to Ary Sheffer’s *The Ghosts of Paolo and Francesca Appear to Dante and Virgil* (1835 and 1855, Figure 4), who are similarly wrapped in white, then by darkness, and are without any discernible anchor. The 1835 version of Scheffer’s painting was awarded a medal at the Paris *Salon* and was well known to the scholarship jury’s president, Federico de Madrazo y Kuntz, who studied in Paris during the mid-1830s. Reproductions of the painting were also used at the *Real Academia de San Fernando* for classroom study of drapery.¹⁸⁹

The pose of King Fernando IV is taken directly from the Greek statue *Sleeping Ariadne* (c. 200 BCE), of which there are several versions, including one at the Vatican (Figure 5) and another at the Prado Museum (Figure 6). Casado would have had access to both. A plaster caste of the Prado version was regularly used for instruction at the *Academia de San Fernando* from the late eighteenth century.

Casado’s work bears significant compositional similarities to Jean-Dominique Ingres’s works *Odalisque and Slave* (1839, Figure 7), which also uses the figure of the *Sleeping Ariadne*. Ingres’s works may have been introduced by Casado’s mentor, Federico de Madrazo, who did his own study of the painting.¹⁹⁰ Casado’s *Ferdinand IV* more closely resembles Madrazo’s version, which accentuates the female figure even more than Ingres did. Placing the king in such a feminizing position — in contrast to the strong gestures and masculine physiques of the Carvajal brothers — could even be considered another commentary on Ferdinand IV’s compromised character (i.e., the king had become womanly and, therefore, weak).


Casado’s quotations from the French school of art were not lost on contemporaries. Years later, when discussing the careers of Casado and Gisbert, a Spanish art historian repeated a common distinction made between the two:

The biographies of Casado and Gisbert show that both artists maintained that which in sporting terms or bullfighting is called a “rivalry,” a raucous rivalry, in which each had his supporters and stalwarts. Politics also complicated the matter. Casado, a disciple of Madrazo, pensioned in Rome and concerned with the collections of Spanish masters and a pure palette, staked his career on history paintings. On the other side, a temperate, realist, and eclectic man — as he confessed himself — Gisbert became the painter of the Left, not for any other reason than for having chosen liberty as the subject of his canvases. Among these, as much *Los Comuneros* (1860) and, later, *The Puritans* (1862) and, later, the *The Execution of Torrijos and His Companions [on the Shores of Málaga]* (1880). The critics of “the Left” (e.g., [Gregorio] Cruzada Villaamil), extolled
The same commentators who consistently described Casado as a “disciple of Federico de Madrazo” (i.e., a text-book classicist) were equally consistent in describing Antonio Gisbert as a “progressive” painter.

---

191 Enrique Lafuente Ferrari. Breve historia de la pintura española, Vol. II. (Madrid: Ediciones AKAL, 1987), 483-484. Original text: “Las biografías de Casado y Gisbert muestran que ambos artistas mantuvieron eso que en términos deportivos o taurinos se llama ‘una competencia,’ una rivalidad ruidosa, en la que cada uno tenía sus apoyos y sus partidarios incondicionales, la política llegó también a complicarse en el asunto. Casado, discípulo de Madrazo, pensionado en Roma y preocupado por las colecciones de los maestros españoles y por una paleta castiza, jalona su carrera de cuadros históricos. Frente a él, hombre templado, realista y ecléctico, como él mismo confesaba, Gisbert vino a ser el pintor de las izquierdas, no por otra cosa sino porque los asuntos que eligió para sus lienzo libertad; se presentaron a ello, tanto Los Comuneros, como luego los puritanos, y mas tarde el fusilamiento de Torrijos y sus compañeros. Los críticos ‘de izquierda’ (Cruzada Villaamil, por ejemplo) ensalzaban a Gisbert de realista, robusta.”
Figure 5: Unknown artist. *Ariadne Sleeping* (c. 160 CE) Roman copy of second-century BCE Greek work Marble. Vatican Museums, Vatican City.

Figure 6: Unknown artist. *Ariadna dormida* (Ariadne sleeping) (c. 175 BCE) Roman copy of second-century BCE Greek statue Marble. 99 by 238 x 95 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid.
Gisbert’s submission to the Exposición Nacional, Los Comuneros (Figure 8), was so politically charged that the controversy surrounding the subject of his work overshadowed its artistic merit. As one serious contemporary critic stated:

[Los Comuneros] is the first flowing of a genius, one that would honor [Paul] Delaroche. It is impossible to create a more arrogant and magisterial figure than this Padilla, crossing his arms, contemplative, with a sublime, Christian resignation, and the complete martyrdom of a holy cause, next to his beheaded friend, whose fate he will follow. The economy and confident disposition of this solemn and terrible scene is made without being repugnant. The good placement of figures — each according to his role — the significant action of each that unfolds in such a way as to clarify the tremendous drama: expressive heads, well-modeled forms, natural foreshortening, gradated perspective, well-placed accessories,
abundant light; herein lie the qualities of this canvas.192

Villaamil’s analysis of Los Comuneros correctly identifies markers of Gisbert’s education. The composition is classical: a central triangle with carefully overlapping figures that, together, provide a narrative that can be read from right to left and, also, left to right. The central figure is in the brightest light and highest position. In other words, Gisbert’s painting was in every aesthetic sense a conventional Spanish academic painting. The same values of drawing, composition, coloring, and expression that informed Casado drove Gisbert.

Figure 8: Antonio Gisbert (1834-1901) El Suplicio de los Comuneros (1860) Oil on canvas. 255 x 365 cm. Congreso de los Diputados, Madrid.

192 Nemesio Fernandez Cuesta. “Cuadro del Señor Gisbert,” Museo Universal, Year VIII, No. 23. (Madrid: 5 June 1864), 178. Original text: “Con ser flor primeriza de un ingenio, honraría a Delaroche. Imposible es crear figura más arragonte y majestuosa que la de ese Padilla, cruzado de brazos, contemplando, con la sublime resignación del cristiano y la entereza de mártir de una santa causa, a su amigo descabezado, junto al pilón que le aguarda para recibir igual muerte. La economía y acertada disposición de la escena solemne y terrible, sin ser repugnante; la buena colocación de los personajes, según el papel desempeñan; la acción significativa de todos ellos, que deslinda de una manera clara las peripecias del tremendo drama; cabezas expresivas, formas bien modeladas, escorzos naturales, perspectiva con gradación, accesorios oportunos, abundancia de luz, he aquí la cualidades de ese lienzo.”
By quoting from Delaroche’s execution painting, Gisbert may have been appealing to Federico de Madrazo, chair of the scholarship jury. Madrazo had studied in the Paris studio of Delaroche four years after *Lady Jane Grey* (1833, Figure 9) caused a sensation in the Paris Salon. Reference to the execution of *Jane Grey* could have also brought to mind Spanish views on the troubled relationship between progressive, humanist values and the *ancien régime* (i.e., crown and church). Jane Grey was a devout Protestant with a humanist education. Her execution by Queen Mary I, a devout Catholic and wife of the Habsburg king of Spain, Felipe II, was considered by many nineteenth-century Catholics to be religious.

193 Carlos González López and Montserrat Martí Ayxelà. *El Mundo de los Madrazo.* (Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid, 2001), 318-319. The work was purchased by Anatoly Demidov, a Russian prince, who installed *Lady Jane Grey* in his private museum near Florence. Madrazo would have had ample opportunity to see either reproductions or the original when he passed through Florence in 1841.
martyrdom.\textsuperscript{194} For progressive Spaniards, the cozy relationship between the Spanish crown and Catholic church had been a central roadblock in the adoption of a new constitution.\textsuperscript{195} Thus, it would have been plausible for Gisbert to exploit a comparison with Lady Jane Grey’s execution and help many Spaniards to map their own frustrations onto Delaroche’s work through \textit{Los Comuneros}.

An comparative aesthetic analysis of the two works shows a divergence in Spanish history painting from its recent roots in French neo-classicism and romanticism toward a more realist and violent art. The relationship between violence and its depiction in the fine arts goes back to ancient times. Plato believed any action — violent or not — that caused an emotional response would distract from true understanding. Euripides, as found in the final scenes of \textit{Medea}, argued that violence, if used sparingly and at appropriate times, would effectively combine both emotional and rational understanding. In \textit{Poetics}, Aristotle held a middle ground between Plato and Euripides, believing an ideal work should not depict the moment of violence itself, but the moments leading to violence.

In \textit{The Execution of Lady Jane Grey}, the calm pose of the executioner, Jane Grey’s hand gently led to find the executioner’s block, white dress, and blood-absorbent hay all stand in terrific contrast to the inevitable bloody execution about to take place. Thus, Delaroche’s work becomes terrifying because of what it forces the viewer to imagine. This was in line with the traditional indirect depiction of violence that had dominated French art of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially those artists most closely associated with neo-classicism and romanticism, such as Delaroche.


There had been long, even ancient, precedents in the depiction of violence. Plato argued that any work (e.g., statue, play, poem, painting) that evoked strong emotional reactions, such as the depiction of violent acts, would distract from an audience’s ability to think clearly about the fundamental truths posed by a work. Defending the bloody, onstage massacre of children at the end of his play *Medea*, Euripides wrote that such graphic scenes reinforced the audience’s experience and understanding of tragedy. In *Poetics*, Aristotle undertook a lengthy treatise on tragedy, which took the middle ground between Plato’s moratorium on depicting violence and the shocking voyeurism of Euripides. Aristotle argued that audiences, in order to understand the causes and consequences, be shown the moment before or after the violence occurs. This became a standard trope for much of the next 500 years, with notable exceptions (e.g., William Shakespeare.) Arguably, the French neoclassicism and romanticism of many French masters who had directly influenced the Spanish Academy (i.e., David, Ingres, Delaroche) also eschewed the direct depiction of violence in favor of moments before and after. For example, in *The Lictors Bring to Brutus the Bodies of His Sons* (1789, Figure 10), Jacques-Louis David avoids direct representation of the story’s most harrowing details, instead relying on subtle symbols (e.g., in place of actual decapitations, a ball of yarn falls out of a basket onto a crimson tablecloth).

In this light, Gisbert’s *Comuneros* may have seemed extremely violent. One figure has already been decapitated and, while sparing the viewer the sight of a gory neckline, the executioner holds the severed head aloft to both the viewer and the gathered crowd. This willingness to be more direct and sensational than his contemporaries and immediate predecessors, may indicate that Gisbert had more in common with the pre-French era of Spanish art; with artists like Francisco de Goya and José de Ribera.
Figure 10: Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) *The Lictors Bring to Brutus the Bodies of his Sons* (1789) Oil on canvas. 323 by 422 cm. *Musée du Louvre*, Paris.

Figure 11: Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828) *Tres de mayo de 1808 en Madrid: los fusilamientos en la montaña del Príncipe Pío* (1814) Oil on canvas. 268 by 347 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid.
In theme and directness of imagery, *Los Comuneros* could be compared to Francisco de Goya’s *Tres de Mayo* (1814, Figure 11). Both paintings depict the execution of failed rebels. Although it did not appear in newspaper commentary, it is likely that Goya’s painting, which hung in the *Museo del Prado* from the 1830s, would have come to the minds of contemporaries while looking at Gisbert’s work.

When *El Suplicio de los Comuneros* was submitted to the *Exposición Nacional*, it was accompanied by a text from Modesto Lafuente’s politically charged, multi-volume *Historia de España* (1850-1867):

At the appointed hour, the three condemned appeared on the path leading to the place of execution, which was on the base of the square’s platform. They wore cowlis of black, the robes of mourning priests. As they approached, the town crier shouted: “This is the justice commanded by His Majesty and our Lord Governors and in their name, these gentlemen...”

“You lie, and so does he who commands you!” exclaimed Juan Bravo with a loud and fiery voice. “Traitors, no. But, guardians of the public good and defenders of the kingdom’s liberty.” To which, with noble tenderness, Padilla answered: “My lord Juan Bravo, yesterday was our time to fight like gentlemen. Today it is to die like Christians.” The Segovian captain [Bravo] fell silent as they arrived at the plaza. “Kill me first,” he said to the executioner, “because I do not wish to see the death of the greatest man left in Castile.” Then, the blade fell on his throat. Padilla came to the scaffold ... Seeing Juan Bravo’s cadaver, he exclaimed: “There you are, my good Sir!” He lifted his eye to heaven and pronounced: “*Domine, non secundum peccata nostra facias nobis*” (“Oh Lord, do not deal with us according to our sins”). And instantly, his words and life were cut off as his head was separated from his neck. After the same manner, Francisco Maldonado was executed. The three heads were placed on meat hooks and lifted high for public view. Thus ended the three most brave guardians of the communities. Their
The execution of Bravo, Padilla, and Maldonado concluded a brief revolt of the Comuneros (1520-1521), which threatened Carlos V’s new rule over the kingdom of Spain. The kingdom, encompassing much of modern Spain, was created by Isabel I of Castile and Ferdinand II of Aragon. The monarchs dramatically increased their original territories by expelling the non-Christian inhabitants of Iberia and making alliances — through diplomacy or the threat of military superiority — with autonomous kingdoms in Iberia, including Valencia, Galicia, Mallorca, Sevilla, Cordoba, Murcia, Jaen, the Algarves, Gibraltar, Barcelona, Molina, and the Basque territories. Isabel and Ferdinand essentially became the queen and king of several semi-autonomous communities, called comuneros, each with their own kings and queens. Each of these communities had negotiated fueros (“perpetual covenants”) with the kingdoms of Castille and Aragon. This meant that Iberia was a kind of confederacy of territories, overseen by nobles with long-standing rights, under Isabel and Ferdinand, with each

---

196 Modesto Lafuente. Historia General de España, Vol. 8. (Barcelona, Montaner y Simón, 1850), 155-116. Original text: “Llegada la hora salieron los tres sentenciados camino del lugar donde había de ejecutarse el suplicio, que era al pie del rollo de la villa. Iban en mulas cubiertas de negro y auxiliados de sacerdotes. Como en la carrera fuese gritando el pregonero: ‘Esta es la justicia que manda hacer S. M. y los gobernadores en su nombre á estos caballeros. Mándalos degollar por traídos ...’ Mientes tú, y aun quien te lo mandó decir, exclamó altiva y fieramente Juan Bravo: traídos no, mas celosos del bien público y defensores de la libertad del reino. A lo cual le contestó con noble entereza Padilla. ‘Señor Juan Bravo, ayer fué día de pelear como caballeros, hoy lo es morir como cristianos. El capitán segoviano guardó silencio, y así llegaron á la plaza. Degüéllame á mi primero, le dijo al verdugo por que no vea la muerte del mejor caballero que queda en Castilla. Y la cuchilla segó su garganta. llegóse al cadalso Padilla, y quitándose unas reliquias que llevaba al cuello las entregó á don Enrique Sandoval y Rojas, primogénito del marqués Denia, que se hallaba á su lado, para que las trajese mientras durase la guerra, suplicándole las enviase después á doña María Pacheco, su esposa. Vió cadáver de Juan Bravo y exclamó: ‘¡Ahí estás vos, buen caballero!’ Levantó los ojos al cielo pronunció el: ‘Domine, non secundum peccata nostra facias nobis,’ é instantáneamente le fué cortada el habla y la vida separándole la cabeza del cuello. Lo propio se ejecutó con Franscisco Maldonado, y las tres cabezas fueron clavade en escarpías y puestas á la expectación pública en lo aldo del rollo. Así acabaros los tres más bravos caudillos de las comunidades. Su suplicio fué también la muerte de las libertades de Castilla.”

maintaining semi-autonomous rule.\textsuperscript{198}

At the death of Ferdinand, the Catholic monarchs’ daughter, Juana “The Mad,” began fifty years of rule, first on her own and then in cooperation with her son, Carlos V. Management of the kingdom — which included new territories in America — was stabilized by Iberian states assuming a greater autonomy, sometimes overstepping powers granted in the \textit{fueros} negotiated by Juana’s predecessors.\textsuperscript{199}

Juana’s son, Carlos V, was crowned in 1517 at the age of 16. He had been raised in the Spanish territory of Flanders and spoke little Castilian. When Carlos V arrived in Spain, he brought a large coterie of Flemish functionaries to replace native Castilians in key government positions. Compared to that of his “mad” mother, Carlos’s rule was assertive. He immediately went about reestablishing weakened royal authority, demanding a return to established \textit{fueros}.\textsuperscript{200} This led to widespread tensions that were further inflamed by Carlos’s election as Holy Roman Emperor in 1519. With the major religious crisis that eventually stabilized as “The Reformation,” Carlos V left a Dutch cardinal, Adrian of Utrech, to rule the kingdom of Castile in order to manage his new responsibilities. Under Cardinal Adrian, taxes were raised and great sums were sent abroad to fuel the emperor’s continental (i.e., foreign) wars.\textsuperscript{201}

In 1520, the semi-autonomous kingdoms of Castile, the \textit{Comuneros}, banned together to oppose royal encroachment on their powers. Generals Juan de Padilla, Juan Bravo, and Francisco Maldonado led a hopeless

\textsuperscript{198} Ana Isabel Carrasco Manchado. \textit{Isabel I de Castilla y la sombra de la ilegitimidad: propoganda y representación en el conflicto sucesorio (1474-1482).} (Madrid: Silex Ediciones, 2006), 266.


campaign against Carlos V’s army. Within a year, the Comuneros were crushed at the Battle of Villalar (1521). Padilla, Bravo, and Moldonado were summarily tried and executed the day after that defeat.

The title of Gisbert’s painting appears in the catalogue as El Suplicio de Los Comuneros. Inexplicably, the words El Suplicio are removed from subsequent public presentations and official documents, and the painting is known today as Execución de los Comuneros (Execution of the Comuneros). While generally translated as “torture” or “execution,” the word suplicio is derived from the verb suplir, meaning “to make up for, atone,” and was used often to describe Christ’s sacrifice on the cross. The crucifixion of Christ is regularly translated to “el suplicio de la cruz.” By placing the severed head next to the crucifix on the altar, Gisbert is making the Comuneros vicarious saviors for Spain.

The absence of the king’s person in Gisbert’s picture, and that of any representative of the crown court, could lead to two conclusions: first, absence was a commentary on the foreign-ness of the king, who was busy dealing with non-Spanish interests. Second, it is possible that by the mid-nineteenth century, it was more acceptable to openly criticize the church than the crown. If true, Gisbert self-censored and, in the process, perhaps called more attention to the crown by its absence than would have been possible through its presence.

While much of its content could have been outrageously progressive, perhaps even considered seditious by some, simply hanging Los Comuneros in the Exposición Nacional was not enough of a cause célèbre to garner national attention. It was the decision to not award Gisbert’s painting the medal of honor that galvanized progressive journals and politicians and made the painting synonymous with freedom-fighting.

Of nearly 2,000 submissions to the Exposición Nacional of 1860, 333
works by 134 artists and architects were accepted.\textsuperscript{202} According to Article 3 of the contest's rules:

For each Exposición a special jury will be formed in order to qualify submitted works. This jury will be composed of members of the Royal Academy of San Fernando, selected by general election and secret ballot [of members of the Academia de Bellas Artes]. To these, the government may add more, if deemed convenient, up to six, directly appointed members from within or without the [central Spanish] government. The jury will be divided into three sections, corresponding to painting, sculpture, and architecture.\textsuperscript{203}

Twenty-two medals were awarded and fifty-nine honorable mentions. The jury met a few days before the opening of the Exposición on October 1. This was the third Exposición Nacional; for each of the previous contests, the jury had awarded a medal of honor to the exposition’s best painting. The medal of honor not only came with prestige and attention, but guaranteed the work would be purchased by the state and hung in the Museo Real del Prado.

According to newspaper accounts of the jury’s deliberations, only El Suplicio de Los Comuneros and Los Últimos Momentos de Fernando IV, el Emplezado were seriously considered for the medal of honor. The final tally — twelve in favor of Los Comuneros and seven for Fernando IV — was two votes short of the required fourteen required for Gisbert to win. For the first time in the Exposición’s short history, the medal of honor was declared “vacant.” This could be seen as evidence of serious disagreements within the jury, whose makeup was more political than professional.

\textsuperscript{202} Specifically, there were 283 paintings, twenty-two prints, twenty-two sculptures, and six architectural works. Nearly seventy-five percent of all paintings were rejected. Source: Bernardo de Pantorba. Historia de la Exposiciones de Bellas Artes. (Madrid: J. Ramón García-Rama, 1980), 75-76.

\textsuperscript{203} Agustín Estéban Collantes. “Real Decreto.” Gaceta de Madrid. (12 January 1854), 3. Original text: “Artículo 3: En cada exposicion se formará un Jurado especial para calificar las obras presentadas. Este Jurado se compondrá de individuos de la Real Academia de San Fernando, elegidos por ellas en junta general y votación secreta, á los cuales podrá agregar el Gobierno, si lo juzga conveniente, hasta otros seis nombrados directamente por el mismo de dentro ó fuera de la corporación. El Jurado se dividirá en tres secciones, correspondientes cada una á la pintura, la escultura y la arquitectura. [sic.]”
academic (see chart 1).

The nineteen-member jury in 1860 was larger than those from the *Exposiciones* of 1856 and 1858, with thirteen and fifteen members, respectively. Besides a small core of academics, it was a celebrity jury, composed of Madrid’s political, literary, and social *crème de la crème*. Of the nineteen, thirteen were members of the scholarly institutions within the larger Spanish Academy.²⁰⁴ Six were government officials and honored guests of the queen. Unlike the members of the scholarship jury, thirteen members of the *Exposición* jury were not artists — they were politicians, writers, scholars, or historians.

---

²⁰⁴ For most of this thesis, the term “Spanish Academy” has referred almost exclusively to the Academy of Fine Arts. But, as in other European nations, Spain had various academies, including an Academy of History, Academy of Literature, Academy of Sciences. Jury members for the *Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes* were often drawn from members of these other academies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURY MEMBER</th>
<th>AFFILIATION (Members of Academy in <em>Italics</em>)</th>
<th>VOTE FOR COMUNEROS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federico de Madrazo</td>
<td>Director, Real Academia de San Fernando; Director, Prado Museum; Court Painter to Isabel II</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Luis de Ribera</td>
<td>Professor, Academia de San Fernando; Student of Delaroche; Court Painter to Isabel II</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis López Piquer</td>
<td>Court Painter to Isabel II</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aníbal Álvarez Bouquel</td>
<td>Professor of Architecture, Real Academia de San Fernando</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentín Cardera</td>
<td>Court Painter to Isabel II</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Caveda y Nava</td>
<td>Conservative politician and novelist; opponent of constitutional reform</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás de Corral y Oña</td>
<td>Marqués de San Gregorio; personal physician to Isabel II</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Gil de Zárate</td>
<td>Progressive author; director, Department of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Álvarez de Toledo y Silva</td>
<td>Spanish Grandee, Marqués de Molina; son of exiled progressive general</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José de Castro y Orozco</td>
<td>Marquis of Gerona; Moderate historian; friend of Isabel II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Oliván</td>
<td>Government sub-secretary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch</td>
<td>Playwright; director, National Library</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos de Haes</td>
<td>Professor, Real Academia de San Fernando; Belgian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Amador de los Ríos</td>
<td>Progressive historian; public supporter of constitutional reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aureliano Fernández-Guerra</td>
<td>Progressive historian, poet, and playwright; public supporter of constitutional reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Godoy Alcántara</td>
<td>Progressive author and historian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel de Asas Castillo</td>
<td>Member, Real Academia de Historia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolás Suárez Canton</td>
<td>Progressive politician</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Cámara</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who voted for *Los Comuneros* were among the most active in progressive causes. Most jurors were open supporters of progressive causes and constitutional reforms. On the other hand, those who voted “Fernando” were older than most, only one was not directly employed by Queen Isabel II, and they were among the committee’s least politically involved.

Gisbert’s painting was unquestionably political. Many in the Academy, such as Federico de Madrazo, believed politics and the Academy should remain separate. In 1854, he wrote an angry letter to his brother, Luis, a fellow painter and academician, about his fear that political involvement interfered with and discredited the Academy:

> The decree for the Academy’s *Exposiciones* has effectively been made public. But it is not what the Academy had proposed; and, what is “rumored at the Academy of San Fernando” is intrigue and lies made up by Don Pepito (you know what I mean), who gives greater credit to that heard in the cafe than to what comes from us.\(^{205}\) Nothing is said in this decree regarding prizes for engravers. It says that foreign painters are not allowed to exhibit their works unless they are executed in Spain. (Oh great Don Pepito!!!) Likewise, the jury will consist — in addition to those named by the Academy — of six individuals named by the government ... Another move by Don Pepito!!! Don’t trust anyone!!! In this country nothing is respected, no one knows anything, and they are aided by that same government(!) to look at the only competent institution in this field with distrust and a suspicious eye ... such is everything! And so [the Academy] becomes more unpopular, just as Galofré\(^{206}\)

---

\(^{205}\) In Madrazo’s letter, “Don Pepito” refers to the painter José Galofre y Coma, a fellow member of the Academia de San Fernando, who was a constant source of opposition and criticism of the Madrazo family.

\(^{206}\) José Galofré y Coma (1819-1867) was a painter from Barcelona who had gained some renown in Rome, Paris, and Madrid and was influenced by the Nazarenes, with whom he associated. Galofré was an outspoken critic of the Academy, believing that formal teaching stifled true creativity and retarded the arts in general.
wishes ...207

When the jury’s decision became public, Madrazo’s frustration was played out in dramatic form. It forced the Academy into an ongoing debate about constitutionalism. In progressive newspapers and Congress, which funded museums and schools of art, the Academy was pitted against “the people” and “liberty.”

The consequences of politicization brought unwanted attention, but, in the short term, these did not affect the Academy in any substantive structural or philosophical way. However, eight years later, during the Glorious Revolution, those within the Academy who sided against Los Comuneros reaped the consequences: Federico de Madrazo, his administration, and fellow court painters were dismissed, and Antonio Gisbert was appointed director of the Prado Museum and official painter to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Spain.208

In 1860, the jury’s decision dominated newspapers for two weeks. Coverage was asymmetrically distributed between the progressive and moderate press. In three weeks, more than 100 articles and commentaries appeared in five progressive newspapers in Madrid alone. During the same period, only five articles appeared in conservative and moderate newspapers nationwide. The jury — even more than the painting — became the focus of progressive ire. “It appears that the jury has resolved

207 SOURCE?? Original text: “Salió efectivamente el decreto para las Exposiciones de la Academia, pero no es lo que la Academia ha propuesto, y eso que se dice “oída la Academia de San Fernando,” es un amasijo, un embrollo, elaborado por Don Pepito (ya me entiendes) que siempre se deja llevar más por lo que oye en el café que por lo que nos oye a nosotros. Nada se dice en ese decreto de premios para los grabadores. Se dice que los pintores extranjeros no podrán exponer sus obras si no están ejecutadas en España (¡¡¡oh Don Pepito!!!). Item, el jurado se compondría, además de los nombrados por la Academia, de 6 individuos nombrados por el Gobierno ... ¡¡¡otro Don Pepito!!! ¡¡¡desconfiar siempre de todos!!! En este país donde no se respeta nada, donde nada se sabe, se ayuda ¡por el mismo Gobierno! a mirar con desconfianza, de mal ojo, la única corporación competente en esta materia ... ¡¡¡así va todo!!!, así se la hace impopular, qué mas quiere Galofre y comparsa ... [sic.]”

to not adjudicate a medal of honor, because in their high judgments none of the paintings merits so great a reward."\textsuperscript{209}

The previously unknown members of the Academy and the Byzantine rules that governed the \textit{Exposición Nacional} were discussed exhaustively, and made to appear out of touch.

\textit{Los Comuneros} lacks, then, two votes. The public vote, the opinion of all of the people of Madrid with the exception of the jury, had already awarded the author of \textit{Los Comuneros} a crown for his talent. Therefore, console yourself, Mr. Gisbert, if only an insignificant minority of the jury fails to award you a medal.\textsuperscript{210}

Never subject to public scrutiny before, the Academy was criticized for not being sufficiently democratic.

Our Academies find themselves in a lamentable state of discredit, for their lack of usefulness, the indolence of their members, the cliquishness that can be observed in the admission of a friend (the greater part of which are negative), for the arrogance they have of putting their own opinions above that of the public, which constitution the Great National Jury or, in other words, the \textit{Academia Suprema} of all branches of knowledge.\textsuperscript{211}

Meanwhile, moderate journals such as the self-proclaimed “monarchy newspaper” \textit{La Esperanza} made almost no mention of the controversy and

\textsuperscript{209} \textit{La Correspondencia de España}. Year XIII, No. 790. (Madrid: 7 November 1860), 7. Original text: “Parece que el jurado ha resuelto no adjudicar la medalla de honor, porque en sus altos juicios ninguno de los cuadros presentados merece tan grande recompense [sic]."

\textsuperscript{210} \textit{La Correspondencia de España}. Year XIII, No. 791. (Madrid: 9 November 1860), 4. Original text: “Le han faltado, pues, dos votos. El voto público, la opinión de todo el pueblo de Madrid à excepción de los diez jurados, han adjudicado ya al autor de \textit{Los Comuneros} la corona del talento. Consuelos por lo tanto el señor Gisbert si una mayoría insignificante del jurado no lo adjudica una medalla [sic].”

\textsuperscript{211} \textit{La Iberia}. (Madrid: 7 November 1860), 4. Original text: “Nuestras Academias se hallan en un periodo lastimoso de descrédito, ya por la inutilidad de sus trabajos, ya por la indolencia de sus miembros, ya por el pandillaje que se observa en la admisión de socio (la mayor parte de méritos negativos), y también por el alarde que hacen de ponerse en puxa con la opinión pública que constituye el gran jurado nacional, ó sea la academia suprema de todos los ramos del saber.”
limited contest coverage to a simple listing of prize winners. The two non-political arts papers — *Museo Universal* and *El Mundo Pintoresco* — avoided political discussion, instead focusing on aesthetic considerations. In other words, it appears there was no political gain for moderates to elaborate on the situation.

On the other hand, progressives smelled blood in the water. The court-appointed jury’s decision could be exploited. Two rival progressive papers, *La América* and *La Iberia*, joined forces to rally subscribers:

> From today a [public] subscription will be opened to give a crown of gold to the distinguished Spanish artist Mr. Gisbert ... that will replace the *Medal of Honor* denied him by the *Exposición*’s Tribunal ... The idea is to make a national subscription, through the combined efforts of some newspapers, in order to buy with these funds the painting *Los Comuneros* and give it to the [Prado] Museum.

In effect, the subscription was the formation of a new “*academia suprema*,” a small demonstration of the existence of national progressive sympathies.

---

212 *La Esperanza*. (Madrid: 1 December 1860), 3.


214 *La Iberia*. (Madrid: 8 November 1860), 3.

215 *La América*. (Madrid: 8 November 1860), 4. Original text: “... *se abre desde hoy una subscripción para reglar una corona de oro al distinguido artista español ... que reemplace á la medalla de honor que le ha negado el Tribunal de la Exposición ... La idea de abrir una subscripción nacional, de que se ocupan algunos periódicos, para comprar con sus producto el cuadro de Los Comuneros, y regalarlos al Museo.*”
The subscription was aided by a nationwide distribution of a wood engraving of *Los Comuneros* (Figure 12) in *El Museo Universal*. Within days of the public announcement of the jury’s decision, Gisbert collaborated with the engraver Tomás Carlos Capuz (Valencia, 1834-Madrid, 1899). (Strangely, Casado’s painting was not reproduced for several more weeks, perhaps indicating the journal’s reaction to public interest or, even, Gisbert’s own initiative.) The engraving was paid for by the *Museo Universal*, which made no political comments in its own publication. Nationwide distribution dramatically increased interest outside of Madrid, leading to a second wave of reaction in more than eighty regional newspapers. Publications such as *La Opinión de Valencia*, a progressive paper published in a traditionally rebellious region, joined Madrileño periodicals in raising funds to purchase *Los Comuneros* for the Prado Museum:

Now we have the venerable Academy ... A general feeling of
reproach has been raised, and this respectable body must know, at this late time, that illustrating the nineteenth century is not a light fancy and that public opinion today is overruling and omnipotent. For many others, the Prado Museum was not the proper setting for Gisbert’s work. The city of Toledo, birthplace of Padilla — the painting’s central figure — announced it would like to buy Los Comuneros in order to “conserve it as a monument that will perpetuate the memories of those Martyrs of Liberty.” Not to be outdone, the city of Alcoy, Gisbert’s hometown, announced it would offer to buy the painting for twice the amount offered by Toledo.

Perhaps sensing a critical mass of public discontent or a political opportunity, on November 21, Salustiano Olózaga (1805-1873), leader of the majority Progressive Party in the Spanish Congreso de Diputados, gave a fiery speech criticizing the jury for not awarding Gisbert’s “clearly superior work” the medal of honor. He accused the jurors of “political cowardice” and “being out of touch with common opinion.”

Olózaga had been at the forefront of progressive causes since the 1830s and would be a key participant in the revolution of 1868. Simply attributing his involvement to political opportunism would be unfair. Seven years earlier, the progressive politician was elected a member of the Royal Academy of History for his extensive scholarship on the fifteenth-to-sixteenth-century Iberian unification. Olózaga made the historical figures

216 La América. (Madrid, 24 November 1860), 12. Original text: “Ya es la venerable Academia de la lengua española que obra con desgraciado tinto al tratar de ornar la lira del mejor cantor de la guerra de África. Un sentimiento general de reprobación se levanta, y aquella respetable corporación tiene que conocer, aunque ya tarde, que la ilustración del siglo XIX no es una vana quimera, que la opinión pública de hoy es soberana y omnipotente.”

217 Ibid., 12.


219 Salustiano Olózaga. Discurso leído en la sesión public ante la Real Academia de la Historia. (Madrid: Real Academia de Historia, 1852).
who of Los Comuneros the subject of his 1852 induction speech, saying that, as a result of their deaths, “all of Spain consequently lost its liberty and has even allowed itself to forget its loss.” Olózaga simultaneously pledged 200 pesetas — a large sum of money — to the subscription being held by a confederation of left-leaning periodicals and called for the jury to meet again.

Now under pressure from a key leader in the Spanish Congress, which funded the Exposición Nacional, the jury agreed to meet a second time and revote. In a public announcement, the jury attempted to reframe the controversy in a way that would save face and make its members appear less deaf to popular concerns:

> With simultaneous sympathy and pleasure, we observe the events surrounding the adjudication of public prizes. With sympathy because, regardless of the cause, we wish to see justice and impartiality without regard to other motivations or reasons; as we must see beyond this moment. With pleasure, because these events have imprinted upon us the reality of a universal conscience, called public opinion, that fortunately in our country is not silent as some pretend; and, that can easily resolve any terrible accident effected upon those great works placed in the care of the scientific and intellectual stewardship of the nation.

The revote was fruitless. No jury member was willing to change his vote, resulting in even more progressive opposition. The reaction of the liberal newspaper La Época was typical of others:

> Con sentimiento y con placer al mismo tiempo, observamos lo que recientemente viene sucediendo en punto á la adjudicación de premios en los certámenes públicos. Con sentimiento, porque á cualquiera lo causará, ver la justicia y la imparcialidad postergada á otros méritoles ó razones que debemos abstenernos de calificar en este momento; con placer, porque los hechos que mamos á mencionar han patentizado la realidad de esa conciencia universal, llamada opinión pública que, por fortuna, en nuestra patria no yace tan dormida como ningunos pretendan, y cuyo temible fallo deber ser de hoy mas un correctivo al proceder de las grandes ilustracions, principalmente de las encargadas de la dirección científica e intelectual del país.”

---

220 Enrique Berzal de la Roas. Los Comuneros: de La Realidad al Mito. (Madrid: Silex Ediciones, 2008), 229. Original text “... roda España perdió sucesivamente su libertad y se ha procurado también que se perdiera la memoria de ella.”

221 Salustiano Olózaga. “Exposición de Bellas artes.” La América: Crónica Hispano-Americana, Year IV, No. 18 (Madrid: 24 Nov. 1860), 11. Original text: “Con sentimiento y con placer al mismo tiempo, observamos lo que recientemente viene sucediendo en punto á la adjudicación de premios en los certámenes públicos. Con sentimiento, porque á cualquiera lo causará, ver la justicia y la imparcialidad postergada á otros méritoles ó razones que debemos abstenernos de calificar en este momento; con placer, porque los hechos que mamos á mencionar han patentizado la realidad de esa conciencia universal, llamada opinión pública que, por fortuna, en nuestra patria no yace tan dormida como ningunos pretendan, y cuyo temible fallo deber ser de hoy mas un correctivo al proceder de las grandes ilustracions, principalmente de las encargadas de la dirección científica e intelectual del país.”
It appears that the jury of the *Exposición* of Fine Arts, clearly seeing and not doubting of clamor raised by not having conceded to Mr. Gisbert, author of the painting *Los Comuneros*, the medal of honor, has reconvened to reconsider the issue. We know that five judges have entered their votes against the painting a second time.\footnote{Editorial. *La Época*, No. 3831 (Madrid: 8 Nov. 1860), 2-3. Original text: “Parece que el Jurado de la exposición de Bellas Artes, en vista, sin duda, del clamoreo levantado por no haberse concedido al Sr. Gisbert, autor del cuadro de los Comuneros, la medalla de honor, ha vuelto a ocuparse de este punto, diciendo que se le conceda. Sabemos que cinco señores jueces han consignado su voto contrario á este segundo acuerdo.”}

In an editorial letter, Olózaga framed the jury’s decision:

> At this moment, I recall with pleasure how the people of Madrid voiced their objections as they contemplated this magnificent painting that represents the expression of those noble men who showed great dignity and valor in their final moments. I congratulate the work’s young author and eminent artist, who I believe will be pleased that such a favorable opinion of his work has been formed, not only by those people who understand art but by those who do not, if only for sentimental reasons. These serve as compensation in place of the medal of honor that he has been denied by a small minority now.\footnote{La América. (Madrid: 24 November 1860), 13. Original text: “Yo recuerdo en este momento con placer cómo acude el pueblo de Madrid á contemplar ese cuadro magnífico que representa la expresión de aquellos nobles caballeros que tanta dignidad y valor mostraron en su postrer momento. Ya que digo esto, felicito á su jóven autor y eminente artista, quien creo se complacerá de que forman un juicio tan favorable de su obra, tanto las personas entendidas en el arte como las que no lo son, pues para esto basta el sentimiento, y le servirá de compensación de la medalla de honor que una pequeña minoría le haya negado hasta ahora.”}

Olózaga then flexed his political authority to combine government funds with those gathered by the nationwide progressive newspaper subscription and buy the painting for a record 80,000 *reales* (about £300,000 in today’s currency\footnote{Reyero, Carlos. “El valor del precio. Tasación y compraventa de pinturas en el Madrid Isabelino (1850-1868)” *e-Art Documents: Revista sobre col-lecciones & col-leccionistes*, No. 1 (Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 2001), 1-33.} — ten times the amount given to a medal of honor winner —
Throughout all this, Gisbert stayed out of the public eye and returned to Rome. However, the combined weight of money and congressional authority carried more finality than any other offer the artist had received or could hope for. Gisbert accepted Olózaga’s offer. It is worth quoting at length the official letter sent to Gisbert by the politician on behalf of those buying the painting.

Our Dear Sir:

This commission, by way of the general cooperation of numerous subscriptions, has been gathered to give you a public testimony of the admiration and enthusiasm that the people of Madrid have for the painting El Suplicio de los Comuneros; and thus the honor to present you with a crown that, with colors emblematic of the painting, anticipates the coming triumphs of the painter who has become the most popular Spanish painter of the present century.

... We have neither the authority nor any competence to judge the work’s artistic merit; yet, by the same token, we must acknowledge the general feeling of approval, which is the great test to which all works of fine art are subject and without which no work can be considered whole.

But it is not for us to make notice of or dwell on the canvas’s perfections. It is for us to congratulate you for having given new life to the noble figures of those distinguished citizens who gloriously gave their all defending the liberties of Castile. Three centuries of oppression have not erased all memory of the great struggles and lamentable luck of the illustrious chiefs of the communities. But that which was for many a vague tradition is now for all the Spanish people a magnificent reality that will continue, together with your name, to the most remote generations, as a knowledge of those who merit rewards for having greatly sacrificed their lives for the

---

225 The purchase price was more than ten times the amount given for the medal of honor. By comparison, the annual salary for the director of the Academia de San Fernando was 20,000 reales and a self-portrait of Goya, now in the Museo Nacional del Prado, was purchased in 1863 for 4,000 reales. Source: Carlos Reyero. “El Valor del Precio: Tasación y Compraventa de Pinturas en el Madrid Isabelino, 1850-1868. Also See: Comerç, Exportació, Falsificació d‘objectes d‘art, No. 1. (Barcelona: 2009). Only 10,429 reales came from popular subscriptions. Source: Adrián Espí Valdés. “Suplicio de los Comuneros de Castilla: Un cuadro de Polêmica.” Arte Español, XXIV. (Madrid: 1962), 67.
The message was clear: The more liberal Congreso, unlike the court-appointed jury, had heard the people and done their will. The jury was not a worthy steward of the painting. The painting was a vicarious symbol for the people and the jury for the Spanish monarchy.

We are very happy and congratulate the commission as an act of honor, more than any artistic consideration, more than politics. The canvas immortalizes one of the most glorious chapters of the Spanish people; and, as such, the Congress pays a just tribute to the defenders of the fueros and liberties of Castile.

A week later, the Senate purchased Casado’s Los últimos momentos de Fernando IV, el empleado. Casado was paid 45,000 reales — much less than Gisbert received, but still a record price. The acquisition received no attention other than an announcement in the official government paper and one in the weekly general-interest, illustrated newspaper, Museo

---

226 Salustiano de Olózaga. “Letter to Antonio Gisbert.” 16 May 1861. Original quote: “Muy Sr. nuestro: La Comisión nombrada en la Junta General de los numerosos suscriptores que se reunieron para dar a V. un público testimonio de la admiración y el entusiasmo con que ha visto el pueblo de Madrid el cuadro del “Suplicio de los Comuneros,” tiene la honra de presentar a V. una corona que, con emblema de los colores de la pintura, recuerde a los tiempos venideros el triunfo más popular que un artista español ha alcanzado en el presente siglo ...” ... No tenemos ni autoridad ni competencia siquera para juzgar artísticamente de su mérito; pero por lo mismo acaso se nos ha creído más apropiado para representar el sentimiento general de aprobación que es la gran prueba a que se sujetan todas las obras de las bellas artes y sin la cual ninguna puede considerarse perfecta. “Pero que no nos sea dado señalar ni encarecer las perfecciones del cuadro de los Comuneros, nos será permitido felicitar a V. por haber dado nueva vida a las nobles figuras de aquellos distinguidos ciudadanos que sucumbieron gloriosamente defendiendo las libertades de Castilla. No bastaron tres siglos de opresión a borrar del todo la memoria de las grandes luchas y de la suerte lamentable de los ilustres jefes de las comunidades; pero lo que sólo era para muchos una tradición confusa, es ahora para todo el pueblo español una magnífica realidad, que pasará con el nombre de V. a la más remotas generaciones, recibiendo de todas ellas el culto que merecen los que sacrifican notablemente su vida por la libertad de su patria. Por eso el Congreso de los Diputados, en cuyo salón están inscritos los nombres de Padilla, Bravo y maldonado ha adquirido y conserva con la debida veneración el cuadro que inmortaliza su memoria.”

227 Clamór público, No. 94. (1 December 1860), 1-2. Original text: “Mucho nos alegramos de ello, y felicitamos a la comisión por un acuerdo que tanto la honra, ya sea bajo el aspecto artístico, ya bajo el político. El cuadro referido inmortaliza una de las páginas mas gloriosas para el pueblo español, y el Congreso paga así un justo tributo a los defensores de los fueros y las libertades de Castilla.”
The upper house of the Spanish legislature was entirely different than the elected Congreso. Made up of nobles, royal appointees, and clergy, the Senate was staunchly opposed to constitutional reforms. The purchase of Casado’s painting appears to be a counter-statement to the Congress’s purchase of Los Comuneros; the public debate over the painting and jury’s decisions had caused supporters of the queen to dig in their heels, rather than make concessions.

In terms of financial rewards, both Gisbert and Casado had been well compensated, more than any other nineteenth-century Spanish artists had been for a single work. But these large sums were not the result of a heightened esteem for artistic merit. They were the byproduct of political disputes that would boil over and bring even greater consequences to Gisbert, Casado, and the Academy at large.

In 1868, three exiled military generals — Francisco Serrano, Juan Bautista Topete, and Juan Prim Serrano, led Spanish armed forces in a coup to dethrone Isabel II. All but one battalion defected to the rebels. Defeat was inevitable. The queen fled to France, where she remained until her death in 1904. The three generals became the three presidents of the new Provisional Revolutionary Government. They quickly established a constitutional council and search committee for a new constitutionally bound monarch. Those who had been loyal to constitutional reform, such

---


229 With the death of Ferdinand VII (1833) and the splintering of political loyalties that came with the Carlist Wars, María Cristina de Borbón, wife of Ferdinand VII and Regent until Isabel II came of age, issued the Royal Statue of 1834 to reorganize the government. The statue established a bicameral legislature. The lower house (i.e., Congreso de Diputados) was elected by political party leaders; and, the upper house (i.e., Senado) was appointed by the queen. Although the statue gave these two houses responsibility for passing laws, in reality most laws during the period were issued and enforced by military fiat (i.e., pronunciamiento). Source: Alejandro Nieto. Historia política de las Cortes constituyentes de 1836-37. (Madrid: Editorial Ariel, 2011), 23-48.
as Salustiano Olózaga, were handsomely rewarded.

Gisbert’s biographer, Adrian Espí Valdés, asserts that shortly after the Exposición Nacional of 1860, Juan Prim contacted the artist and initiated a warm friendship. Espí Valdés also believes that the three generals and Gisbert met in Paris in 1867.\(^{230}\) (All four were in Paris at the same time, but the claim cannot by verified by other sources.) Whether they were collaborators or simply acquaintances, it is clear that the new government gave Gisbert special treatment.

Within a year of the establishment of the Revolutionary Government, “all royal ownership of artistic treasures” was declared void and put in the “hands of the people.”\(^{231}\) The Royal Prado Museum was renamed the Museo Nacional del Prado.\(^{232}\) Within a few days, Federico de Madrazo, who had served as the museum’s director, director of the Academia de San Fernando, and court painter to Isabel II, was dismissed from all his positions within days.\(^{233}\) An official letter from the president of the Provisional Revolutionary Council gave Gisbert, who had never held an administrative position in any institution, his mentor’s responsibilities:

Don Antonio Gisbert,  
By agreement of the council and under unanimous vote, you have been named Director of the Museum of Painting & Sculpture belonging to the national trust that was the crown’s ...\(^{234}\)

---


\(^{231}\) “Anuncio del Tesoro Público.” Gaceta de Madrid. (22 February 1870), 2.

\(^{232}\) Joaquín Gil Berges and Emilio Castelar. “ Decree “Reestructuración de las actividades del Museo Nacional de Pintura y Escultura” (Madrid: Ministro de Fomento, 18 Jan. 1870)


Gisbert took the helm of the Prado Museum and began an ambitious program to reorganize the collection. He was also put to work as the government’s preferred portraitist, essentially filling the roles of the recently dismissed court painters who had voted against him during the Exposición of 1860. During their first year in power, Gisbert painted the three presidents and Salustiano Olózaga.

Figure 13: Antonio Gisbert (1834-1901) Amadeo I, Rey de España (1872) Oil on canvas. 136 x 89 cm. Facultad de Bellas Artes de la Universidad de Complutense, Madrid
Gisbert's influence went beyond the arts. In 1869, he was sent by the Provisional Government to Egypt on a dual mission: first, to collect Egyptian antiquities for the museum; and, more importantly, to represent Spain at the opening of the Suez Canal. Gisbert was a member of the government's search committee for a new monarch. While in Egypt, he met Amadeo Ferdinando Maria di Savoia, duke of Aosta and second son of Victor Emmanuel II, the first king of a united Italy. Soon after, Amadeo became Amadeo I of Spain, and the king's first official portrait was painted by Gisbert (Figure 13).

The six-year period known as the Glorious Revolution was unquestionably good for Gisbert, but it was short lived. In 1873, with less than two years on the throne, Amadeo I abdicated. Revolutionary leaders were forced to reconcile with moderates in order to form a stable government. Isabel II's son, Alfonso XII, was invited to take the throne under a new consensus constitution. In 1874, Federico de Madrazo was reinstated as director of the Prado. Madrazo later wrote to his son in frustration: “That devil Gisbert! He should be held responsible for abandoning his post as director of the museum. (Gisbert went his way, saying: ‘Leave it as it is!’)”

Gisbert had left for France without saying goodbye to his staff or meeting with Madrazo. In the years after the 1860 Exposición Nacional, Gisbert had become increasingly alienated from the Academy and his former mentor. Madrazo only mentions Gisbert three times in his personal letters: twice after the revolution and once before. In an 1866 letter, Madrazo seems to indicate that the lack of goodwill began with Gisbert:

> I don't know if [Gisbert] is in Madrid yet. He has never come to see me. He hasn’t even sent a card after Mother’s death! He should well remember how much she and Father always loved him! ... But there is nothing but ingratitude in this world and in this country more

---

than any other.  

When the Glorious Revolution ended, so did Gisbert’s Spanish career. Madrazo was once again in control of nearly all important fine arts institutions (i.e., director of the Prado Museum, director of the Academia de San Fernando, president of the jury of the Exposición Nacional, and court painter to Alfonso XII). In France, lacking Spanish audiences and government patronage, Gisbert’s style changed dramatically. He spent the next several years painting Louis-XV period works, the kind that Raimundo de Madrazo (1841-1920) — son of Federico — had been successfully showing at the Paris Salon for years. The painting, Love Song (Figure 14), is typical of this period in Gisbert’s oeuvre. Being smaller, lacking political themes, registering a much brighter pallet than the works that made him famous in Spain, Gisbert had joined the numerous ranks of artists selling to a commercial market in France.


Back in Spain, José Casado del Alisal was ascendant. In 1874 he was made the first director of the Spanish Royal Academy in Rome and inducted into the Real Academia. With a Bourbon monarch back on the throne and Madrazo at the helm of the Academy, it would appear that the revolution left the Academy relatively unscathed. But, beginning with the Exposición Nacional of 1860, the Academy had changed or, perhaps, evolved. The creation of the country’s first national art contest and increased freedom of the press gave artists a national market for the first time. Painting for a popular Spanish audience led to a new emphasis on native Spanish subjects and styles that differed from the French style and on less popular subjects that had dominated academic painting before 1858.
The Prado Museum had changed, too. Although brief, Gisbert’s directorship dramatically shifted the makeup and priorities of the museum. Gisbert was perhaps the first to realize the potential benefits of looking beyond the Academy for rewards and going directly to the masses. Future participants in the *Exposición Nacional* would follow his example by choosing widely recognizable subjects, courting political controversy, and immediately collaborating to have their works widely distributed in popular journals.

---

238 Gisbert’s directorship of the museum deserves serious scholarly review. It was under his tenure that the Spanish collections (i.e., Velázquez, Zurbarán, Coello) were given priority display and the Italian and French collections were relegated to secondary roles. It seems that Gisbert deliberately went about demoting works by non-Spanish artists that were representative of the “foreign” Habsburg and Bourbon courts. Today, works by Titian, which would be prominently featured in other museums, remain in the wings of the Prado Museum, where Gisbert placed them.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Greatest Spanish History Painting
Only a few years younger than José Casado del Alisal and Antonio Gisbert, Eduardo Rosales (1836-1873) rose from obscurity and quickly eclipsed their fame. He never held an administrative position or taught, but Rosales’s *Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* (1864, Figure 1) became the most influential work for Spanish history painters, imitated and quoted in countless other works. The painting was initially dismissed by many critics, who considered *Testamento* the product of an inexperienced, yet promising artist. But when a French jury awarded it a top prize at the *Exposition Universelle* of 1867, Spanish critics reassessed earlier opinions of the work and Rosales became a national hero. When Rosales died of tuberculosis at age thirty-six, he left behind rich documentation of his process of creating what became known to many as the greatest Spanish history painting. Through notes, sketches, and personal letters, this chapter will first explore Rosales’s own record of creating the work, his aspirations, and influences. Next, the chapter will follow the initial negative reception of *Testamento* by Spanish critics, and the remarkable reversal of opinion after the work was admired by French audiences. Finally, this study of *Testamento* will briefly demonstrate its remarkable influence on the Spanish Academy at large and Rosales’s own attempts to move away from its aesthetic into one he considered more authentically Spanish.

---

Rosales was born in Madrid. The son of a minor government official, he studied at the Instituto de San Isidro, Madrid’s oldest school, before being accepted to the Academia de San Fernando at age fifteen. His humble beginnings and relative poverty were unusual. Later, a biographer would note the difference between Rosales and many of his fellow painters:

Poor Rosales, a pure Madrileño and with no resources, he was more like a plebeian than an aristocratic client of Don Federico Madrazo ... So poor that before 1867 even the colors he used of his

---

celebrated painting were borrowed ...241

At school, Rosales distinguished himself as a remarkable anatomist. His early drawings were used by successive professors at the Academia as examples for students well into the mid-twentieth century242 (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) Nude Man Standing and from Behind (1857) Graphite on paper. DIMENSIONS??. Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, Madrid.

Upon graduating, Rosales was encouraged by Federico de Madrazo (1815-1894) to compete for a government scholarship to study in Rome. Successful, he was pensioned in Rome along with classmates Vicente Palmaroli (1834-1896) and Alejo Vera (1834-1923). Rosales was not


considered the finest applicant. According to the scholarship committee, he barely qualified and, as a result, was awarded lesser funding for his monthly allotment. In retrospect, the painter Martín Rico (1833-1908) noted with some irony that money and resources were misplaced:

It is curious to note that the two pensioners who were in Rome with less funding [than other scholarship holders] were those who gave the most glory to the Patria: Rosales and [Mariano] Fortuny.\textsuperscript{243}

Mariano Fortuny (1838-1874) had been pensioned by the \textit{Escola L'Llotja} in Barcelona, which had a separate process for Catalan artists and far fewer funds than the central government.\textsuperscript{244} According to Rico, the lack of money became so serious that Rosales’s friends petitioned the Spanish Embassy on his behalf for additional funds.

At the time of the petition, Rosales had submitted a work to that year’s \textit{Exposición Nacional}, to only moderate success.\textsuperscript{245} Even before knowing how well his painting was received at the contest, Rosales believed he needed more time for a “great work.” In 1862 he wrote his cousin, Martínez Pedroza:

If they grant me an extension, I will go to work painting a work from our history: I do not know which it will be, but I have considered making it Isabel La Católica redacting her last codicil on November 25 — I believe that’s correct — three days before her death.

\textsuperscript{243} Luis Rubio Gil. \textit{Eduardo Rosales}. (Madrid: Ediciones Aguazul, 2002), 81. Full text: “Es curioso notar que los dos pensionados que había en Roma con menos sueldo eran los que habían de dar más gloria a la patria: Rosales y Fortuny. Cuando fueron pensionados a Roma Plamaroli y Alejo Vera, Rosales, que era muy amigo suyo, se decidió a ir con ellos; pero como no tenía bienes de fortuna, muy pronto se encontró en la mayor estrechez, y sus dos amigos, ayudados de otros, hicieron una petición a la Embajada, y el Gobierno por este medio le dio cien liras al mes; aún cuando en aquéllos tiempos era esa cantidad más que ahora, de todas maneras era muy insuficiente, y sin embargo, pintó el cuadro del Testamento de Isabel la Católica. Mucho influyeron en el cambio que hizo Rosales la amistad con Carolus Durán, Palmaroli y Vera, que querían que siguiera haciendo la pintura religiosa del 1400, al ver el cambio que hizo no les gustó mucho; pero el tiempo deo la razón a Rosales, y también a ellos les convenció.”


\textsuperscript{245} Luis Rubio Gil. \textit{Eduardo Rosales}. (Madrid: Ediciones Aguazul, 2002), 82.
Because in it can be seen the immense love that she had for her people and it is, at the time, interesting for our history in regard to the clauses it bequeathed to us ..."  

Within a few weeks, the Ministry of Development agreed to give Rosales 150 pesetas more each month — significantly less than had been requested, but enough to rent a small studio near the Spanish Steps with room for a bed and space to paint. Located near the Académie de France à Rome (also known as Villa Medici), the area around the Spanish Steps was, for nineteenth-century artists, the hub of Rome’s fine-arts community. Artists supply stores, models, painting classes, and social events could be found in abundance.  

For Rosales, like Casado and Gisbert before, Rome was the launching ground for a career in Spain. The pressure to produce a significant work for the upcoming 1864 Exposición Nacional consumed all of his time. Letters and sketches made from his arrival in 1861 show Rosales composing one grand Spanish subject after another in his sketchbook. Of the nearly fifty sketches from the period that are in public collections, all dealt either directly with Isabel and Ferdinand or with their children and grandchildren (see Figures 3, 4, 5, 6). Ultimately, Rosales focused on a subject of serious discussion in a number of contemporaneous biographies of Isabel: the moment the queen changed her will.  

Having established her will and not having made serious adjustments for

---

246 Luis Rubio Gil. *Eduardo Rosales*. (Madrid: Ediciones Aguazul, 2002), 77. Original text: “Si me conocen la prórroga, me pondré a pintar un cuadro de nuestra Historia: no sé cual será, todavía, pero tengo pensado hacer Isabel la Católica redactando su último codicilo en 25 de noviembre (me parece), tres días antes de su muerte: este momento de la gran Reina es de lo más hermoso de su gloriosa vida, porque se ve en él el inmenso amor que tenía a su pueblo y es, al mismo tiempo, interesante para nuestra Historia por las cláusulas que en él dejó consignadas ...”


248 In 1882, Carlota Rosales Martinez donated eighty-two drawings by Rosales. More than fifty of them were dated by her father and were accompanied by careful annotations compiled by Carlota.
almost two years, Isabel made significant changes to the document only
days before her death. These modifications revealed Isabel’s own
concerns about her legacy. In turn, the preoccupation with these changes
in mid-nineteenth century Spain reveals Spanish anxieties about national
identity, decline, and trajectory.

In January of 1863, Rosales had made extensive notes from Prescott and
Lafuente and resolved to paint the moment Isabel added the codicil. In a
letter to his cousin, Rosales writes a lengthy justification:

In relation to the national, [writing of Isabel’s will] seems to be great
to me. If it were some Austrian or Bourbon, that is, a royal who
came after the Catholic [monarchs], I would understand, for I greatly
believe Isabel is one of the great national glories and [the writing of
her will] I find to be the greatest among all of the admirable
moments of her life. If you have read it (the will) I believe that you
will find it to be so and that the public will not look with indifference
at a re-creation of that moment, when the best of our rulers,
motivated by a just pride for Spain, concerns herself with the
happiness of her people with the love of a mother, charging herself
and her successors not to impose new taxes. To the contrary, they
will see that those which she established, whether or not just, put
an end to the excesses of the Crown. I think that such an example
deserves to be put before before their eyes, for all it is, because I
know that they will study the subject over months and months,
because they are truly nationalistic issues. The era of the
Comuneros, or the war against the Moors, or the Italian wars during
the time of Carlos V; none of whom are truly nationalists or, to me,
merit such great feeling. If I cannot find a compelling reason to do
otherwise, I am resolved to work on Isabel. In the case that you
encounter reasons even more powerful against the subject than I
find for it, tell me. Just let me know whether you find it extremely
national, and I assure you that I will read [your thoughts] earnestly,
esteeming them greatly. You will be doing me a great service, if you
The letter reveals one of Rosales’s principal motivations for choosing the subject of Isabel’s testament: The resulting painting should be sufficiently “national.” This is further evidence of the _Exposición Nacional_’s influence on works produced by Spanish artists. Rosales’s choice was intended for several audiences. First, creating a large, multi-figural painting was the third-year requirement for scholarship holders. Previous to 1856, scholarship holders from the _Academia de San Fernando_ had produced works for their third year that varied from Spanish historical scenes to religious themes. These were submitted to scholarship juries, composed of professors from the Academy, court painters and, after 1856, leaders from the Ministry of Development. The juries largely judged the works by how they represented the development and quality of the scholarship holder’s painterly arsenal, such as the mastery of light, color, tone, composition, anatomical accuracy, and communication of the narrative of the work. The narrative itself was secondary to the demonstration of these skills.

Beginning with the first _Exposición Nacional_ of 1856, there was another

249 Luis Rubio Gil. _Eduardo Rosales_. (Madrid: Ediciones Aguazul, 2002), 78. Original text: “... en cuanto a lo de nacional me parece que los es mucho; si se trata de algún austriaco o borbón, es decir, de algún rey posterior a los Católicos, lo comprendería, pero precisamente creo que una de las mayores glorias nacionales sea Isabel y en aquel momento la encuentro superior a ninguno de los muchos admirables rasgos de su vida: si lo has leído (el testamento) creo que te parecerá lo mismo y que el pueblo no vería con indiferencia reproducirlo el momento en que la mejor de las reinas, motivo de justísimo orgullo para España, se ocupa de la felicidad de su pueblo con el amor de una madre, encargando a sus sus sucesores no le agravien con nuevos impuestos y, al contrario, vean si los que ya había establecidos eran o no justos, poniendo coto de este modo en los desmanes de la Corona. Me parece que un tal ejemplo bien merece ponerse ante los ojos, por todo esto y porque sé que poniéndose a buscar un asunto se pasan meses y meses y porque los que hay verdaderamente nacionales son o de la época de los Comuneros o de la guerra contra los moros o de las guerras de Italia en tiempos de Carlos V, ninguna de cuyas épocas me merece simpatías, es posible que si ya no encuentro razón muy poderosa en contrario, me resuelva a hacer el de Isabel; si acaso tú encontraras razones más poderosas en contra de las que yo encuentro en pro de él, dimelo, pues sólo me indicas que lo quieras más nacional, asegurándote que las leeré con gusto y las tendré en mucho, y puede que fueran tales de hacerme abandonar mi empresa, en lo que me harías un favor si son tales de hacérmea ver verdaderamente peligrosa de mal éxito.”

audience for scholarship holders. That year, second- and third-place medals for the contest went to Eduardo Cano (1823-1897), Isidoro Lozano (1826-1880), and Benito Soriano Murillo (1827-1891) — all scholarship holders in Rome who sent their third-year paintings first to the scholarship jury and, then, to the jury of the Exposición Nacional. Some jurors served on both the scholarship and contest juries (e.g., José de Madrazo, Federico de Madrazo), but the jury for the Exposición Nacional, from its inception, included non-artists as well as royal and political appointees who were perhaps less swayed by artistic qualities than by showmanship. Arguably, for the first two Exposiciones Nacionales, the audience for painters and their works was mostly limited to the two juries and a small group of devotees of art in Madrid. But this all changed with the political furor surrounding Antonio Gisbert’s painting, Los Comuneros, during the third Exposición Nacional in 1860 (see chapter four). From that point forward, the Exposición Nacional had truly become nationalized, with regional newspapers throughout Spain either sending their own correspondents to report on each contest — especially when hometown painters were competing — or, at least, reprinting coverage from other papers. Therefore, in the ten years between the Los Comuneros and Testamento, the audience had become less academic and more national.

Before settling on Testamento, Rosales was experimenting with another work: Doña Blanca de Navarra (1871). Blanca de Navarra (1424-1464) served as queen of the kingdom of Navarre — later made a province of Spain — and the consort to two kingdoms of Sicily. Blanca’s strong female


leadership, a few decades before Isabel’s birth, made the Catholic queen’s reign palatable to many unused to the idea of female rulers.254 While making preliminary sketches for Doña Blanca, Rosales to his brother-in-law about how his painting could potentially affectIOUS to Eduardo Rosales, the final painting of any student in Rome had gone from being subject to the judgment of a small group of academics, to a work that would potentially discussed nationally, what he termed the “national spirit”:

In treating such particular historical moments of each province [of Spain], artists should never weaken the national spirit or revive old and disgraceful rivalries. For the provinces will create their museums and help the Government come into being. I am fixated on this idea: that such moments from the life of Doña Blanca will generate interest and have great success.255

As the Madrid-born son of a government official, Rosales was a natural-born nationalist. The idea of a unified and single Spanish identity would have been, for him, taken for granted. For those outside of the capital, this notion of a “national spirit” then, as now, is difficult to define and fraught with controversy. For most of the nineteenth-century, there were forty-nine provinces and fifteen regions in Spain, each with a distinct identity and history.256

From around the year 1500, these distinct identities became increasingly subsumed into a shared Spanish identity. The unification of several kingdoms under Queen Isabel and King Ferdinand, followed quickly with


255 Eduardo Rosales. “Letter from Rome 24 January 1863.” Reproduced in Luis Rubio Gil. Eduardo Rosales. (Madrid: Ediciones Aguazul, 2002), 86. Original text: “... los artistas deberán tratar otros asuntos de la historia particular de cada provincia, siempre que no tiendan a enflaquecer el espíritu de nacionalidad o a renovar antiguas y desgraciadas rivalidades y, en este caso, las provincias formarían también sus museos y ayudarían a llevar la carga al Gobierno: fijo en esta idea me ha parecido que algún asunto de la vida de doña Blanca tendría interés y obtendría buen éxito.”

the discovery of the Americas and a series of successful military
campaigns against the Islamic caliphate, were seen as shared
accomplishments. From this “Golden Age” of Spain, the outside world
regularly referred to Iberians, with the exception of Portugal, collectively as
“Spaniards.” Within Spain, most experienced a dual identity. For example,
someone from Barcelona would consider themselves ethnically and
culturally “Catalan,” while being “Spanish” meant subjecting oneself to the
laws of the king or queen of Castile (e.g., paying tariffs, serving in the royal
armed forces).

This dual identity (i.e., being a regional native and a royal subject)
remained largely the case for Spaniards until the beginning of the
nineteenth century, when the idea of a “nation” emerged.

From 1808, we can speak of Spanish nationalism: an ethnic
patriotism that became fully national, at least among the elites. It
was the undisputed work of liberals. Elite modernizers took
advantage of the opportunity to try and impose systematic social
and political change. And, the method was the launch revolutionary
idea of a nation as the holder of sovereignty. The national myth
mobilized [Spaniards] against the foreign army and against Joseph
Bonaparte’s collaborators ... Liberal Spaniards identified
themselves between patriotism and defense of liberty. As Austin
Argüelles, the Spanish deputy, said upon presenting the
Constitution of 1812: “Spaniards now have a homeland.”

257 José Álvarez Junco. “La identidad Española en el mundo de las naciones.” Crítica,
No. 961. (May-June 2009), 32.

258 Xosé Núñez Seixas. “La construcción del Estado-nación español en el siglo XIX
¿Éxito incompleto o fracaso relativo.” L’Estat-Nació i el conflicte regional: Joan Mañé i
Flaquer, un cas paradigmàtic, 1823-1901. (Barcelona: Publicacions de L’Abadia de
Montserrat, 2004), 7-31.

259 José Álvarez Junco. Mater dolorosa: La idea de España en el siglo xix. (Madrid:
Taurus, 2005), 157. Original text: “A partir de 1808 puede hablarse en España de
nacionalismo: el patriotismo étnico pasó a ser plenamente nacional, al menos entre las
élites. Y ello fue obra indiscutible de los liberales. Las élites modernizadoras
aprovecharon la ocasión para intentar imponer un programa de cambios sociales y
políticos; y el método fue lanzar la idea revolucionaria de la nación como titular de la
soberanía. El mito nacional resultó movilizador contra un ejército extranjero y contra los
colaboradores de José Bonaparte, en tanto que no españoles (afrancesados). Los
liberales españoles recurrieron a la identificación entre patriotismo y defensa de la
libertad: como declaró el diputado asturiano Agustín Argüelles al presentar la
Constitución de 1812, ‘españoles, ya tenéis patria.’”
The Constitution of 1812 — although never adopted and containing a significant role for the monarch — created what José Álvarez Junco called “two versions” of the Spanish nation: one put forward by “modernizing elite Spaniards” who sought to create a constitutional republic with a strong central government; and another that “faced with a [liberal] republic, mobilized and adopted a common defense of the traditions and religious beliefs.” From the beginning of the nineteenth-century to the early twentieth century, these two camps (i.e., liberal and conservative or modern and traditional) went about defining their respective versions of the Spanish nation. Their different versions were manifested in nearly every arena of Spanish culture: politics, literature, plays, music, history, philosophy, architecture, and fine art. All these were used, as noted by Álvarez Junco, to “reinforce” a particular “Spanish identity.”

As discussed in chapter three, nineteenth-century Spanish historians actively sought to a form and describe a “permanent community” for the Spanish nation. This meant writing a collective history, beginning with founding fathers and establishing the chief heroes and villains throughout the nation’s history. There were two very different versions — one liberal and one traditional — of the Spanish nation and its history. Antonio Gisbert’s controversial painting, *El suplicio de los Comuneros de Castilla* (1860), was an overt work of liberal national mythology (see chapter three). By saying he would not pursue his first subject, *Doña Blanca de Navarra*, because of its potential to awaken “rivalries,” Rosales was clearly not aiming for the kind of raucous, partisan attention given to Comuneros. Instead, he began experimenting with figures who were revered members of both liberal and traditional permanent communities: Isabel and

---


Ferdinand.

We know from letters and sketchbooks that, after dismissing the subject of Doña Blanca, Rosales began experimenting with a number of scenes from the lives of Isabel and Ferdinand. These almost all centered around the discovery of the Americas and the *Reconquista* (the retaking of “Christian” territory from “Islamic occupiers” in Iberia). He sketched several versions of the meeting between Isabel, Ferdinand, and Columbus. Some of the sketches emphasize Isabel over Ferdinand; others leave him out completely. Rosales also attempted various key battles between Isabel and Ferdinand’s forces against the Kingdom of Granada. Although Ferdinand was among the most respected military leaders of his time, Rosales’s compositions favor the military leadership of Isabel. This is in step with nineteenth-century Spanish historical views, which tended to see Isabel as above reproach and Ferdinand as inept and power hungry.

The following passage accompanied Rosales’s work in the catalog of the *Exposición Nacional*:

Isabel died in *Medina del Campo* on the 26 of November of 1504. On October 12 of the same year, in the same villa, she executed her celebrated testament that reflects so clearly the peculiar qualities of her mind and character and the most complete test of her constancy that, at the moment of her death, she would continue faithful to the principles that had directed her conduct throughout

---


264 Even while noting his military and administrative accomplishments, Modesto Lafuente wrote about Ferdinand’s character flaws — for example, being “jealous” of Isabel and “naturally suspicious” of others. These were often stated in contrast to the good character of Isabel. After her death, Lafuente observes that Spain became subject to the errors of the king, which had before been kept in check by Isabel. Source: Modesto Lafuente. *Historia de España: Vol II*, 1883 ed. (Madrid: Montaner y Simon, 1883), 128-129.
her life.265

The passage was, purportedly, a direct quote from The History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic by William H. Prescott (1796-1859).267 But it would be more accurate to say that it is a paraphrase of Prescott’s work with additions by Rosales himself.268 Specifically, the phrase “... the most complete test ...” was a significant addition by the painter, revealing his intent to add greater import to the event. Prescott’s work was one of two contemporary histories with extensive discussion of Isabel’s testament and codicil. The other was Historia de España by Modesto La Fuente (1806-1866), who borrowed heavily from Prescott’s work. Both writers believed Isabel’s testament and codicil established, for better or worse, the future of Spain.

The use of Prescott’s text is telling. An American who had never been to Spain and did not speak Spanish, Prescott was a lawyer and scholar of medieval Italian poetry.269 Prescott’s first writings on Iberia resulted from helping his mentor and Harvard professor, George Ticknor (1791-1871), prepare for a series of world-history lectures.270 Prescott expanded the

265 Catálogo de la Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1864). Original text: La Reina Doña Isabel murió en Medinal del Campo en 26 de Noviembre de 1504. En 12 de Octubre del mismo año, y en la mismavilla, otorgó su selébre testamento, que es el mejor testimonio en que resplandecen con tanto brillo las ilustres prendas de su espíritu y de su carácter, y la pureba mas completa de la constancia con que á la hora de su muerte segía fiel á los principios que habian dirigido su conducta durante toda su vida.”


268 The following is the same passage, with Rosales’s additions to Prescott’s text italicized: Isabel died in Media del Campo on the 26 of November of 1504. On October 12 of the same year, in the same villa, she executed her celebrated testament which reflects so clearly the peculiar qualities of her mind and character and the most complete test of her constancy with which at the moment of her death she would continue faithful to the principles that had directed her conduct throughout her life. SOURCE NEEDED


270 Ibid.
lectures with materials provided a by rare book collector in Spain and a series of Spanish-speaking translators of varying skill levels. He published the History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic in 1838. The first Spanish edition of Prescott’s work, Historia del reinado de Fernando e Isabel, Los Reyes Católicos, was published in Madrid in 1855. An instant bestseller, it was the first original book-length study of Isabel published in Spanish since the seventeenth century. Consensus among Spaniards was that it was a masterwork that communicated the “values and majesty” of Isabel, despite Prescott’s interpretation being “protestant,” “liberal,” and “anti-catholic.”

Although Prescott’s book named Ferdinand before Isabel, in her lifetime Isabel was clearly the senior partner and sole heir to the much larger and more powerful Kingdom of Castile. As a woman and inexperienced ruler, Isabel was an unlikely successor to the crown. She persuaded skeptical nobles to combine resources and oppose the Portuguese claim to Castille. Her marriage to Ferdinand was less than satisfactory to many, who believed uniting with Aragon was less than strategic. As the first female leader of a Spanish kingdom for hundreds of years, Isabel defied categorization. She was able to balance statesmanship — stateswomanship — with motherhood, appearing on horseback on the front lines of a military campaign even while she was pregnant with one of her seven children. After securing herself the crown, Isabel surpassed her contemporaries’ wildest expectations by expanding Castilian territory through military victories against Islamic and Portuguese forces, creating new alliances with Spanish and foreign kingdoms and sponsoring the discovery and settlement of the New World. As stated by a contemporary scholar:

---


And now, who cannot see that, although the title of Empire is in Germany, it in reality lies in the power of the Spanish monarchs who, masters of a large part of Italy and the isles of the Mediterranean Sea, carry the war to Africa and send out their fleet, following the course of the stars, to the isles of the Indies and the New World, linking the Orient to the western boundary of Spain and Africa.274

After the sudden deaths of two of her children and two grandchildren, Isabel's health quickly declined.275 She retreated to Campo de Medina, home of her faithful friends, the Marques and Marquess de Moya.276 By 1504 she was bedridden. Isabel had her room hung with carefully selected tapestries, including themes from the *Apocalypse of Saint John*, the *Triumph of Love*, and *Pope Gregory I in the presence of Christ*. 277 On October 12, she signed her final will and testament, in which she hoped to imitate the model of “good King Hezekiah,” in preparing her casa.278

According to Prescott and contemporary court functionaries to Isabel, many of the gross abuses of the indigenous Americans had been successfully kept from the queen until after the will had been made.279 When knowledge of the mistreatment came to her attention, Isabel was deeply troubled.280 Suffering from a heavy fever, the queen called her


276 Ibid., 289.

277 Ibid., 391.


personal council together to witness the addition of a codicil on 5
November 1504, three weeks before her death.\textsuperscript{281}

The codicil addressed her concerns and imposed obligations for redress.
Re-emphasizing the responsibility, given to her by the pope, of caring for
the indigenous peoples of America, she commanded that her successors:

\ldots not consent to nor allow the Indians, neighbors and inhabitants
of the Indies and Mainland, won and to be won, to receive any
injury to their persons or possessions, rather to the contrary, that
they should be well and fairly treated, and if they have received any
injury that it should be remedied and provided for so that in nothing
does it go beyond what was ordered and established in the
apostolic letters of the said concession.\textsuperscript{282}

The queen also commanded that the resources typically spent to mourn
the passing of a monarch instead be distributed to the poor.\textsuperscript{283}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{281} Peggy Liss. \textit{Isabel the Queen}. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004),
391.

\textsuperscript{282} Isabel la Católica, Reina de Castilla. \textit{Testamento y codicilo de la reina Isabel la
Católica: 12 de octubre y 23 de noviembre de 1504}. (Madrid: Dirección general de
archivos y bibliotecas, 1969), Codicil, Section 11. Original text: \textit{``Que así lo hagan y
cumplan, y que esto sea su principal fin y en ello ponga mucha diligencia, y que no
consientan ni den lugar a que los indios, vecinos y moradores de las Indias y Tierra
Firme, ganadas y por ganar, reciban agravio alguno en sus personas ni bienes, antes al
contrario que sean bien y justamente tratados, y si han recibido algún agravio que lo
remedien y provean para que no se sobrepase en cosa alguna lo que en las cartas
apostólicas de dicha concesión se mandaba y establecía.''}

\textsuperscript{283} Isabel instructed Fernando and Juana to treat the people of the Indies well: \textit{``If they
were receiving any harm, to remedy it, so that it did not exceed the apostolic letter of
concession,''} wherein the papacy had granted her the right to convert the people there.
That last issue was \textit{``part of her great concern to die with a clear conscience and so a
requisite salvation was also an admission, in as circuitous and least self-incriminating
fashion possible, of having transgressed moral and legal bounds in regard to the people
of the Indies. Interpreted within context, of prime consideration to her was not so much
the welfare of the natives as that she might have jeopardized her soul in overstepping the
papal concession, and endangered Castile’s holding of the Indies as well.''} Source: John
\end{flushleft}
In life, Isabel had been famed for her faith as much as her leadership. After her death, a campaign for Isabel's sainthood was quickly taken up by her supporters, and that campaign continues to this day. But while her unification of Spain and international campaign to take back European territory from Islamic populations was very popular, Spanish treatment of native populations in America blackened her legacy.

Despite her clear intentions to remedy the mistreatment of indigenous peoples, Isabel's successors were too preoccupied with pressing Iberian and European conflicts to take active roles in the Americas. Her immediate heirs, Joanna “The Mad” of Castile (1479-1555 | Reign, 1504-1555) and Ferdinand, spent decades fighting over control of Castille (see chapter six.) Carlos V (1500-1558 | Reign, 1519-1556), Isabel's grandson, was famously appointed as holy Roman emperor to combat the incursion of Ottoman Turks into European territory. By the time of Carlos V's successors (i.e., the Habsburgs), practical management of the Americas had been wrested from distant Iberian leadership by local conquistadors and royally appointed governors. Under this local rule, indigenous populations had been irreversibly reduced to slavery and second-class citizenship. For a nearly a century, Spain benefited from treasure ships from the New World, but by the nineteenth century the shipments had dissipated and the local populations were in revolt. Bankrupt and preoccupied with its own civil war, the government of Isabel II (1830-1904 |

---

284 “If Isabel's princely qualities inspired acclaim and emulation by her immediate Hapsburg successors and other Europeans, yet as time when on that image faded and gave way to another, that of the devout and pious queen, on her knees humbly praying, a view of her culminating in the current attempt to have her canonized as a saint.” Source: Peggy Liss. *Isabel the Queen.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 410.


148
Reign, 1843-1868) was unable to maintain leadership of the American colonies.\textsuperscript{288}

While the text accompanying his work was from Prescott, Rosales took extensive notes from \textit{La Historia General de España} by Modesto Lafuente,\textsuperscript{289} who neatly synthesized this narrative of a trajectory and decline of Spain’s greatness from Isabel I to Isabel II.\textsuperscript{290} Speaking of Rosales’s painting, the critic José García wrote:

\begin{quote}
...the era of the Catholic Kings, the time when the nation was created and formed, civilized and instructed, extended and prosperous. That era, during which a mighty treasure created and accumulated, a treasure of genius and courage, statesmen and soldiers; blood and wealth, which was later spent by Austrian monarchs without restraint. Seeking fame and glory, in a short time, they plunged their people into shameful prostration and ruin.\textsuperscript{291}
\end{quote}

In this way, Garcia, Lafuente, and other like-minded individuals interpreted that the addition of a codicil was a prophetic warning that had come true. Having veered away from the instructions of Isabel, Spain had descended into a long decline.

While his choice of subject was motivated by an optimistic nationalism, Rosales’s depiction of the scene demanded historical accuracy. Academic critical reactions to works displayed in the \textit{Exposición Nacional} were often more concerned with the portrayal of period costume, geography, and


\textsuperscript{289} These notes have been preserved by the Rafel Gil Archive in Madrid.

\textsuperscript{290} Peggy Liss. \textit{Isabel the Queen}. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 393.

\textsuperscript{291} José García. “La Exposición de Bellas Artes: Cartas familiares a un ansente.” \textit{La Época}. (23 December 1864). Original text: “…la época de los Reyes Católicos, aquella época en que la nación se constituye y forma, se civiliza é instruye, se estiende y prospera, aquella época en que se crea y acumula el caudaloso tesoro de genio y de valor, de políticos y de soldados, de sangre y de riqueza que luego han de gastar sin freno los monarcas austriacos, sciándose de fama y de gloria en breve tiempo para precipitarse con su pueblo en vergonzosa postración y ruina aquella época se lleva lo mas vivo y ardiente en mi afecto.”
even furniture than other considerations. In his manual for aspiring Spanish history painters, Francisco de Mendoza — a professor at the Academia de San Fernando — instructed:

The author should be inspired by the period and study well the place and scene — if it be outdoors, the climate and topography of the site, and verify it — having in mind the customs of the people and assiduously looking for the exact clothing of the epoch. And, in the case that the monuments or books cannot be found [about the particular individuals], he should procure an understanding of the nations from where these customs, laws, arms, furniture, and architecture were derived. Or, at the very least, the remote and nearby nations from whom they received their forms ... thereby exuding the spirit, arriving at a convincing illusion that it was truly such, as if being present.292

Rosales revealed his own concerns with historical accuracy when working on Doña Blanca de Navarra (1871). The painting re-created a scene from a popular novel by the same title that had been widely read in Spain.293 In another letter, Rosales reveals the variety of sources he would consult:

I would be grateful if you would get to know [Francisco Navarro] Villoslada, or someone who does, and get him to tell you what sources he used for his novel Doña Blanca; if they were from little-known manuscripts and a summary of her final days; that is to say, from the time she was given to Mosén Pieres de Peralta until her death. And find out if her burial included any curious circumstances. I have read the Annals of [the Crown of Aragón] by [Jerónimo] Zurita [1512 - 1580], [Ramón] Alesón [1781-1846] and [Antonio de] Nebrija [1441-1522] but they say little. I would like to know more

292 Francisco de Mendoza. Manual del Pintor de Historia, ó sea recopilación deas las principales reglas, maximas y preceptos para los que se dedican á esta profesión. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1870), 32-33. Original text: “Debe el autor inspirarse en la época y estudiar bien el lugar y la escena; y si es en el campo, hasta el clima y la topografía del sitio en que se verificó el hecho; teniendo muy presentes las costumbres de las personas, y buscando con asiduidad los trajes propios de la época, y en caso no se puedan hallar monumentos ó libros que lo digan, debe procurarse conocer las naciones de quines recibieron sus costumbres, sus leyes, sus armas, sus muebles y su arquitectura, ó á lo méno las naciones remotas ó cercanas de quines tomaron las modas ... é impresionando su espiritu, de modo que llegue á forjarse la ilusion de que realmente fué así y que pasa á su presencia. [sic.]”

293 Francisco Navarro Villoslada. La mujer de Navarra. (Madrid: Gaspar y Roig, 1849).
historical particulars not cited by those authors ... 294

In Doña Blanca, Rosales had benefited from working with a scene in a novel that, although based in historical fact, was lavishly retold in great detail. Painting the last days of Isabel was significantly different, as he was looking directly at historical texts and not historical fiction.

Finding Spanish historical documents was only one serious complication of painting in Rome. Another was finding Spanish-looking models:

... right now I am closing in on the Catholic King, but the lack of models has me desperate. It seems incredible to paint a painting outside of the country whose history is being represented. Adequate models cannot be found, I am desperately looking all about. I have spent two months looking for one that resembles the traditional type of the Catholic King, and I still haven’t found one. In Spain, I would find one hundred thousand. It is a huge inconvenience and one that takes precious time. 295

Although Rosales had taken a large personal library to Rome, being abroad required that he rely on a large cast of assistants, including the painters Luis Ferrant Llausas (1806-1868), Vicente Palmaroli y González (1834-1896), and his cousin, the writer and journalist Fernando Martínez Pedrosa (1830-1892) to gather, sketch, and describe historical people and objects.

---


295 Eduardo Rosales. “Letter to Fernando Martínez Pedrosa, Rome, 25 December 1863.” Cited in: Enrique Pardo Canalís “Textos. Rosales.” Revista de Ideas Estéticas. (Madrid, 1973), 75-90. Original text: “... Ahora estoy enredado con el Católico Rey, pero la falta de modelos me desespera: parece increíble lo que es hacer un cuadro fuera del del país cuya historia se representa, no se encuentran modelos que puedan servir a lo que uno desea; yo estoy desesperado buscando por todas partes hace dos meses uno que tenga alguna semejanza con el tipo tradicional del Rey Católico y todavía no he hallado: en España encontraría cien mil; éste es un inconveniente bastante grande y que hace perder un tiempo precioso.”
I received your letter, including carbon copies of Cisneros’s letters. While you are in Paris, I would appreciate if you could make some notes, even very short ones, of furniture from 1500 or earlier; a bed, a chair, if there be any, one with arms and those that are most Spanish in style from that era ... You well know that those here in the Vatican do not resemble [Spanish] taste much. That being the case, would you do me the great favor of making some notes? 296

Rosales took careful notes in his sketchbook, citing physical descriptions of Isabel and her court from Eugenio de Robles’s (fifteenth and sixteenth centuries) *Compendio de la vida y hazañas del cardenal don fray Francisco Ximenez de Cisneros y del Oficio y Missa Muzarabe* (1604).297

The painter Luis Ferrant (1843-1917) sent Rosales an oil copy of a portrait of Queen Isabel made in her lifetime by Juan de Flandes (1460-1519, see Figure 3). Flandes had been appointed court painter by 1498, and his principal duties were marriage portraits of Isabel’s eligible daughters. His portrait of the queen was painted when she was between 48 and 53 years old.298 In his *Diario*, Rosales made several annotations of the work (see Figure 4).

---

296 Eduardo Rosales. “Letter to Vicente Palmaroli, 12 April 1863.” Cited in: Enrique Pardo Canalís “Textos. Rosales.” Revista de Ideas Estéticas. (Madrid, 1973), 75-90. Original text: “... recibi tu carta con los calcos de Cisneros, quisiera que en París me hicieras algún apunte, aunque muy ligero, de algunos muebles del 1500 o anteriores, alguna cama, sillón si los hay, con brazos y los que más se aproximen al gusto español de aquella época; bien sabes que aquí los que hay es lo del Vaticano y no se parece mucho a nuestro gusto de entonces, me harías un gran favor si lo pudieras hacer.


298 Ibid.
Figure 3: Juan de Flandes (c. 1460-1519) *Isabel la Católica* (c. 1496-1503) Oil on panel. *Palacio de El Pardo*, Madrid.

Figure 4: Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) *Notes on Juan de Flandes portrait of Isabel La Católica* (1863) Ink on paper. *Museo Nacional de Cataluña*, Barcelona.
Figure 5: Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) *Isabel la Católica, preparatory sketch* (1863) Oil on canvas. Private collection.
It is clear from both Rosales’s oil sketch (see Figure 5) and the final work that, rather than portray the queen at age 53, heidealized Isabel. In *Testamento*, she appears much younger, with a symmetry informed by classical statuary. The queen’s hair is covered — typical for married Christian woman in the fifteenth century — but Rosales made the surrounding headdress and linens white, as if to indicate holiness or purity.

Both in circumstance and in the treatment of the subject, it is difficult to not compare Rosales’s Isabel to several depictions of the “Dormition of the Virgin.” According to Catholic tradition, three days before the Virgin Mary’s death, the Archangel Gabriel appeared to her. She immediately became ill and was confined to bed in the home of John the Beloved. The apostles were miraculously brought to her bedside from their various foreign locations. According to tradition, within moments of their arrival, the Virgin was miraculously assumed into heaven.\(^{299}\)

Rosales believed that, just as the Virgin had called people to her bed three days before dying, Isabel had called her advisers to add the codicil three days before her death. (It actually took place three weeks before she passed away.) As well, the portrayal of the Virgin wearing a white headdress and surrounded by white linens had been a customary depiction of the subject since Byzantium.\(^ {300}\) During his studies at the Academia de San Fernando, Rosales would have been able to see various Dormitions that could have served as inspiration for *Testamento*, including *La Muerte de la Virgen y la Asunción* (c. 1550) by Michiel Coxie (1499-1592), *El Tránsito de la Virgen* (c. 1462) by Andrea Mantegna (1430/1-1506), and *El Tránsito de la Virgen* (c. 1550) by Juan Correa de Vivar (1510-1566), to name a few (see Figures 10, 11, and 12, respectively). For those familiar with Dormition scenes, it is as though


Rosales had painted Isabel moments before she too was assumed into heaven.

In comparison to Isabel, the other figures in the painting appear dark, especially Ferdinand of Aragon. For his depiction of Ferdinand, Rosales depended on Lucio Marineo Sículo (1460-1533), a linguist and historian appointed to the court by Fernando. Marineo described Ferdinand as:

… of medium stature, of good color, and brilliant and animated eyes. He had a small nose and mouth, well-formed and white teeth; a wide face and serene and long and solid chestnut hair. His mannerisms were correct and only rarely did his visage register sadness and grave melancholy. He was grave in his speaking, and in his movement he had a truly dignified presence, the total sum of his content a great King (see Figure 6).\(^{301}\)

\(^{301}\) Lucio Marineo Sículo. *Sumario de la vida de los Reyes Católicos, don Fernando y doña Isabel*, Vol. 21. (Madrid: 1587), 801. Original text: “Era el Rey Don Fernando de mediana estatura. Tenia todos sus miembros muy bien proporcionados. En el color era blaco [sic.] con muy gracioso lustre. Lenia el gesto alegre y respladesciente; los cabellos llanos y de color sasi sastaño claro: la fente serena pero casua casta la media cabesa, las cejas de la misma color de los cabellos y apartadas una de otra. Los ojos claros y casi risueños; la nariz pequña y mien facada y conforme a las otra fationes del sesto. Las mejillas de color de rojas coloradas, la boca pequeña y agaciada; los labios colorados y semejante al cozá; los dientes blandos, ralos y pequeños ... el verdadero Rey.”
Figure 6: Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) Portrait of King Ferdinand, the Catholic from the artist’s Diario (1863) Ink on paper. Museo Nacional de Arte de Cataluña, Barcelona.
Later, in a letter to his cousin:

... the figure that gives me the most trouble is the Catholic King. I want to portray him morally and I don’t know if I will achieve my goal, because I think he is the least moved of all of them and I want to show that he felt it more in his head than in his heart. I have done a better job realizing [Cardinal] Cisneros. In the end, we’ll see how it turns out. I hope he doesn’t look like a ridiculous scarecrow ...

Nineteenth-century historians had uncharitable feelings toward Ferdinand. According to Lafuente, the Catholic king spent his lifetime aspiring to wrest control of Castile from his wife and, after her death, the King of Aragon conspired with Habsburgs to put Spain under foreign rule. Perhaps reflecting this uncomplimentary view, in Rosales’s painting Isabel looks like a saint and Ferdinand is in darkness. To nineteenth-century Spaniards this was a nonpartisan judgment. It was historical fact.


Unable to find Spanish source books for period interiors and costume, Rosales sketched from *Costumes français civil depuis les Gaulois jusqu'à 1834* and *Le Moyen age et le Renaissance* published in Paris in 1848 (see Figures 7 and 8). Rosales clearly relied on a number of sources to understand his subject, but these were little help in developing the formal elements (e.g., composition, tone, color, etc.) that would result in *Testamento*. From reading his *Diario*, it is possible to map encounters the painter had with other works that would eventually inform *Testamento*, but were seen years before it was conceived. Upon receiving his scholarship, Rosales traveled from Madrid to Rome with his fellow scholarship holders, Vicente Palmaroli and Alejo Vera. It was the first time any of the three had been out of the country and, for Rosales, outside of Madrid. They took the opportunity to make a slow, circuitous route, stopping at monuments and exhibitions in Barcelona, southern France, Venice, Florence, and Pisa. All along, Rosales took meticulous notes:

> In Biarritz [France] I saw the ocean for the first time. Standing in front of *The Daughter of Tintoretto* [sic.] by Léon Cogniet, I formally promise to do such a work, even if I die of hunger.

He admired the painting for its “synthesis of love, beauty, and death” — themes that could likewise be applied to the *Testamento de Isabel la Católica* (see Figure 9).

---


The French painter Léon Cogniet (1794-1880) was a friend of Federico de Madrazo, Rosales's mentor at the Academia de San Fernando.\textsuperscript{308} (A close relationship between Madrazo and Cogniet resulted in the latter teaching more Spanish students than any other professor at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts de Paris.\textsuperscript{309}) It is possible that Rosales deliberately sought out Le Tintoret peignant sa fille morte (1843) on Madrazo’s suggestion.

Cogniet’s work had been very well received at the Paris Salon of 1843 and, later, at the 1855 Exposition Universelle in Paris. Shortly before Rosales’s visit to Biarritz, Le Tintoret peignant sa fille morte had been

\textsuperscript{308} Federico de Madrazo. “París, 27 de julio de 1853” and “París, 5 de agosto de 1853” in José Luis Díez, ed. Epistolario de Federico de Madrazo y Kuntz, Vol. 1. (Madrid: Museo del Prado, 1994), 438-444.

\textsuperscript{309} Carlos Reyero. “Pintores españoles del siglo XIX en la Escuela de Bellas Artes de París: entre el aprendizaje cosmopolita y el mérito curricular.” Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, No. 72. (1991), 377-395.
purchased by the Société des amis des arts de Bordeaux and was the center of an exhibition held in its honor. The work directly inspired Paul Delaroche’s (1797-1856) memorial of his dying wife (See figure 10). Carlos Reyero has suggested that Rosales was the torch bearer of Delaroche to a new generation of Spanish painters.

After leaving Biarritz for Nimes, Rosales noted seeing Delaroche’s “beautiful painting,” Cromwell Examining the Cadaver of Charles I

---


Unlike many of his other works, Delaroche’s depiction of Cromwell is made in loose brushstrokes and natural coloring, as opposed to hidden strokes and a porcelain-like varnish. Setting aside the Delaroche’s historical embellishments, his treatment of the figures and space is completely natural, free of extraneous gesture or posing. Whether or not this is what caused Rosales to take note of the work, this lack of affectation — what Rosales referred to regularly in his journals as “naturalness” — was something to which he aspired.

Rosales noted naturalness in works from very different periods. After touring southern France, he continued with Palmaroli and Vera to Florence, where they rendezvoused with the French painter Carolus-Duran (1837-1917). According to Martín Rico (1833-1908), all except Rosales were interested in religious art from the 1400s.

Rosales greatly influenced and rendered a change on those with whom he shared friendship, Carolus-Durán, Palmaroli, and Vera, who wanted to continue making religious paintings from 1400 — to see that he would paint otherwise displeased them; but with time Rosales was justified and they too were convinced...

“Religious works from 1400” was Rico’s way of describing art that came from the period predating the adoption of linear perspective. These works, epitomized by artists like Giotto di Bondone (1266/67-1337), Andrea Mantegna (1431-1506), Fra Angelico (c. 1308-1368), and Domenico Ghirlandaio (1449-1494), were often misunderstood or ignored by nineteenth-century academic curricula. But in Rome, interest in the period led to a variety of movements, such as the Nazarenes and Purismo

---


313 Martín Rico y Ortega. “Recuerdos de mi vida.” Cultura Hispánica. (Madrid: Ibérica, 1906), 84. Original text: “Mucho influyó en el cambio que hizo Rosales la amistad con Carolus Durán. Palmaroli y Vera, que querían que siguiera haciendo la pintura religiosa del 1400, al ver el cambio que hizo no les gustó mucho; pero el tiempo dio la razón a Rosales, y también a ellos les convenció.”
theorists; artists broke with academic practice and made substantial arguments for the study and emulation of early religious art for its compositional structure, vibrant color, and rich symbolism.314

Perhaps at the behest of his traveling companions, Rosales spent an afternoon in the Chiesa di Santa Trinita, a destination for many artists sympathetic with the Nazarenes.315 There he was deeply impressed by a series of frescos by Ghirlandaio, in particular the Death of San Francis di Asisi (see Ffigure 11):

The treatment of his death is very admirable, with truthful expressions and very energetic, divinely composed, but without pretension nor ostentation of art. To the contrary, a simplicity and naturalism that astonish. All of the heads have the reality of life. I do not recall having seen such spirit or more energy in Pisa, in the frescoes of [Andrea di Cicone di Arcangelo (1308-1368)], the difference being that those were raised to High Art. [Domenico Ghirlandaio’s] are exquisitely drawn. In the foreground, a few frail people, kneeling and crying at the Saint’s death. They kiss his feet and hands. I have never seen such a work.316

But while Rosales would be deeply influenced by Ghirlandaio’s composition — first in a study for Visita de Carlos V a Francisco en la


316 Eduardo Rosales. “29 September 1857.” Diario. See also: Florencia de Santa-Ana y Álvarez Ossorio. “Rosales y el arte italiano del Renacimiento.” Bellas Artes, No. 32. (1973), 23. Original text: “En la chiesa de S. Trinitá, una capilla con frescos de Ghirlandaio representando asuntos de la historia de S. Francisco. El de la derecha, asunto de su muerte, admirabílisimo; expresión verdadera y muy enérgica, divinamente compuesta, pero sin pretensión ni alarde de Arte; al contrario una sencillez y naturalidad que pasman. Todas las cabezas con un sello de vida, que no recuerdo haber visto tanto espíritu ni tanta energía más que en Pisa, en los frescos de Orcagna; con la diferencia de que en aquéllos el Arte está llevado a gran altura; están bellísimamente dibujados. En frente, unos frailes que, arrodillados y llorando por la muerte del santo, le besan los pies y las manos; no he visto cosa como ella.”
Torre de los Lujanes and later in Testamento — he was “astonished” by the fifteenth-century artist’s “naturalism.”

Rosales, himself, would eventually be credited for infusing Spanish history painting with naturalism. The term naturalism was coined in the 1630s to describe “actions based on natural instincts.” By the mid-eighteenth century, naturalism was a distinct philosophical school, concerned with the relationship between humanity and nature. But it was not until the mid-nineteenth century that the specific term was applied to the fine arts.

---

317 Pedro de Madrazo. España Artística y Monumental: El arte moderno español. (Madrid: Viuda de Rodríguez, 1889), 340. Original text: “El Naturalismo de Rosales, mantenido en su justa medida en el Testamento de la reina Católica, puede servir de norma para la moderna pintura de historia; porque el proscribirlo totalmente de los estudios de nuestros pintores y de los salones de nuestros aficionados nos parece un funesto consejo, sugerido por ciertos críticos exagerados e intolerantes que impacientes de ver los convencional y falso lanzado fuera del dominio de las artes plásticas, reducen el campo de la acción de ésta al mezquino círculo de la vida actual y común, o sea de la fotografía.”


This did not mean that what was called “naturalism” by nineteenth-century artists did not exist by many other terms and in many other periods of art.\(^{320}\)

To Rosales and his contemporaries, naturalism meant something specific, not only in and of itself, but in contrast to other movements specific to the period. Perhaps the clearest definition of the term, as understood by nineteenth-century artists, was by Jules-Antoine Castagnary (1830-1888) in his review of the 1863 Paris Salon, titled, *Three Contemporary Schools: the Classical School, Romantic School, and Naturalist School*:

... all three are in agreement about the point of departure: Nature is the foundation of art. The classical school states that nature must be corrected under the guidance of antiquity or the masterpieces of the Renaissance ... The romantic school states that art is free; that nature must be interpreted freely by the liberated artist. It is not afraid of reality, but escapes reality by subordinating it as the whims of imagination dictate ... The naturalist school states that art is the expression of life in all its forms and all its degrees, and that its only goal is to reproduce nature by bringing nature to its maximum power and intensity: Here, truth and skill are in equilibrium.\(^{321}\)

Castagnary went on to explain that, in France, the classical and romantic schools had reached maturity, but that naturalism was only beginning to take shape. He attributed this to the influence of Golden-Age Spanish painting upon a new generation of French artists.\(^{322}\)

From 1835 to 1853 some 400 Spanish seventeenth-to-eighteenth-century

\(^{320}\) In *Idea*, Erwin Panofsky makes a convincing argument for roughly the same distinction and point of departure as Castagnary. (Rather than classicism, romanticism, and naturalism, he uses the terms idealism, mannerism, and naturalism.) But Panofsky convincingly demonstrates that these often warring approaches have been dominant at different times at least since antiquity. Source: Erwin Panofsky. *Idea: A Concept in Art Theory; A Study of the Changes in the Definition & Conception of the Term "Idea," from Plato to the 17th Century, When the Modern Definition Emerged.* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968), 104-112.


\(^{322}\) *Ibid.*
paintings — aggressively collected by King Louis-Philippe (1773-1850, Reign, 1830-1848) in a few short years — were put on display at the Louvre. Called the Galerie Espagnole, works by Velázquez, Zurbarán, Ribera, Murillo, and El Greco had rarely been seen outside of the Iberian Peninsula. These works inspired a generation of artists (e.g., Gustave Courbet, Jean François Millet, Eduoard Manet, John Singer Sargent, Thomas Eakins). “May posterity,” Castagnary wrote, “in a few hundred years, consider [French artists working today] the equal of Spanish painting ...” A great deal has been written about the influence of the Galerie Espagnole on the development of naturalism and realism in French art and, in turn, on the rest of the world through the hegemonic influence of French art on other schools. It is, then, strange that Rosales would be credited with bringing naturalism to Spain.

Arguably, from the eighteenth-century Spanish artists were looking away from their own aesthetic roots and toward the French (see chapter three). From the Bourbon Monarchy of Carlos III, who was raised in Versailles and strengthened a cultural exchange with the French Academy, a kind of delayed French aesthetic dominated official taste and training in Spain. Through José de Madrazo and Federico de Madrazo, neo-classicism, then romanticism became the predominant aesthetics of Spanish academic painters. Even as the French avant garde was discovering Spanish old masters at the Galerie Espagnole, artists in Spain, such as Gisbert and Casado, were looking to Ingres and Delaroche. For some contemporaries, this dynamic was clear and came to an end with Rosales: “For many Spaniards, Rosales is the link between the past and the present. He

323 Alisa Luxenberg perhaps made the best summary: “Using the most neutral terms possible, one can describe the Galerie Espagnole as an art collection commissioned by a constitutional monarch, who used more than one million francs of government funds to send undercover agents to obtain and export more than 400 paintings from Spain, which, in the majority of the cases, was a crime under Spanish law." Source: Alisa Luxenberg, The Galerie Espagnole and the Museo Nacional 1835-1853: Saving Spanish Art, or the Politics of Patrimony. (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 5.

crossed from romantic and classicism to ... a more pure authenticity.”  

According to today’s preeminent scholar on Rosales, José Luis Diez, Rosales introduced naturalism to Spanish history painting for the first time with Testamento. But there are a number of indications that even the most Frenchified Spanish painters had assiduously studied Spanish old masters in order to incorporate their lessons, including naturalism — although they often used other words.

Regional artists in Spain had always had access to local examples of Spanish sixteenth- and seventeenth-century works — the kind that had inspired the French avant garde. This access was limited (e.g., artists at the Academia de San Carlos in Valencia had access to a number of works by native José de Ribera, but only two small works by Diego Velázquez). Spanish access to Spanish old masters expanded dramatically during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. As a court painter, the neo-classical advocate José de Madrazo undertook the major project of creating steel-plate engravings of several sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish paintings from the royal collection. Culminating in the Museo Universal, the work was distributed to every major Spanish academy of the time, where it was incorporated into classroom curriculum. The Real Museo del Prado, with more than 1,500 works from the royal collection, was opened to the public in 1819. It immediately became a study collection for Spanish artists, who were allowed to copy from works by Italian, Flemish, and Spanish works gathered by the royal family over 400 years. Upon arrival, each artist was required to sign the Registro de copiantes, listing his name

---

325 Gregorio Prieto. Eduardo Rosales. (Madrid: 1950), 10. Original text: “Contituye el lazo entre el pasado y el presente. Cruce de lo Romántico y lo clásico; el Romanticismo lo bebe en su patria, a donde las brisas románticas llegan con su más pura autenticidad tardíamente...”


327 Catálogo de los cuadros que existen colocados en el Real Museo del Prado. (Imprenta Nacional, 1821), 1-40.
and the work he intended to copy that day. Kept each year from 1819 to today, even a cursory examination of the books leading to Rosales’s time shows that paintings by Velázquez were by far the most copied. This begs the question: What lessons did Spanish artists, who were trained in French technique, gain from the study of Velázquez?

José de Madrazo encouraged his son, Federico, to admire Velázquez for his compositional mastery. Later, in his personal letters, Federico de Madrazo, in great demand for his portraits, discussed Velázquez as the “greatest portrait painter.” During his studies in Paris and Rome, Federico regularly used the words “rich” and “pure” to describe Velázquez’s approach in contrast to other old masters and even his teacher, Ingres. But in 1866, in his personal correspondence with his son Raimundo (1841-1920) — who was in Paris with Rosales at the time

---


329 Ibid.

330 A wonderful example that illustrates this perspective can be found in a letter from Thomas Eakins to his father. Eakins was an American studying in Paris in the studio of Carolus-Duran, a friend of Rosales and a long-time admirer of the Spanish school. On Duran’s advice, Eakins traveled to Madrid and, after visiting the Museo del Prado, wrote: “Since I am now here in Madrid I do not regret at all my coming. I have seen big painting here. When I had looked at all the paintings by all the masters I had known I could not help saying to myself all the time, it is very pretty but its not all yet. [sic.] It ought to be better, but now I have seen what I always thought ought to have been done and what did not seem to me impossible. O what a satisfaction it gave me to see the good Spanish work so good, so strong, so reasonable, so free from every affectation. It stands out like nature itself.” In his letter, Eakins also contrasted Velázquez with Peter Paul Rubens. He described Rubens as “The nastiest most vulgar noisy painter who ever lived.” Source: Thomas Eakins to Benjamin Eakins. “Madrid, 2 December 1869.” Charles Bregler. Thomas Eakins Collection, Quotes in Foster and Leibold, Writing about Eakins, 211.

At the time of his letter, Federico de Madrazo was studying with Ingres in Rome. He wrote to his father that: “I greatly envy being able to see Velázquez’s portraits ... there is no doubt that Velázquez is the greatest to have understood portraits.” Source: Federico de Madrazo to José de Madrazo. “Rome, 3 September 1840.” Epistolario, Vol. 1, No. 124. (Madrid), p. 323. Original text: “Mucho le envidio el poder ver todos los día los cuadro de Velázquez ... No hay duda que Velázquez es el que mejor ha entendido los retratos.” Also see Federico de Madrazo to José de Madrazo. “Rome, 36 August 1841.” Epistolario, Vol. 1, No. 136. (Madrid), 359.

— Federico writes several letters mentioning Velázquez in very different terms than before:

You will also note ... when you return [to Madrid] and see Velázquez, that he is the true painter of naturalism *sin sistema.*

The phrase *sin sistema* is literary translated as “without a system.” Within context, it perhaps best translates as “without imposing anything on nature.” However, despite these insights and ready access to the same artists who inspired French naturalism, nineteenth-century Spanish artists were early adopters of the naturalism *avant guarde* of the 1840s and 1850s. Instead, it seems that as wider movements of art swept through the Spanish Academy (i.e., first neo-classicism then romanticism, and later naturalism), different lessons were extracted from Velázquez. But when looking at *Testamento,* the critic Pí Francisco y Margall (1824-1901) said Rosales had "remembered Velázquez," what did he mean?333

Having been born and raised in Madrid, Rosales would have been steeped in Velázquez. *Testamento* may reference Velázquez, adopting ornamentation, technique, and brushwork that could be inferred to be inspired by the seventeenth-century artist. For instance, the carriage clock on the far side of the bed may be a reference to the clock in Velázquez’s portrait of *Mariana de Austria, reina de España.* From his earliest works, Velázquez included virtuosic still-life elements in works that would otherwise be admired for their figures. Rosales’s work contains several instances of ordinary objects (i.e., an oil lamp, the pillow under Ferdinand’s feet, seats, the intricate jewelry worn by Isabel and the king) that give a sense of naturalism and also show the artist’s ambitions to have a large arsenal of skills for reproducing a realistic environment.

Like Velázquez, Rosales’s brushwork is visible and loose. He did not remove strokes through feathering or use heavy varnish to achieve a

porcelain-like finish, as can be observed in many of the works of his mentor, Federico de Madrazo. And, unlike Gisbert and Casado, whose works were regularly referred to as “well drawn” (see chapter four), he applied color in cold, visible blocks that broke up line. Arguably, this was a departure — enough to merit a comparison to Velázquez.

There was also his choice of color. Rosales’s work exhibits what was known as the “Spanish palette.” This phrase was used quite loosely by academicians throughout the nineteenth century to describe works as different as that of Velázquez, Alonso Cano, and Francisco de Goya. It was almost always accompanied by qualifiers such as “severe,” “austere,” and “sober.” Perhaps the most famous example of a palette including these characteristics is in Velázquez’s depiction of his own paints in Las Meninas (see Figure 12). While some argue that this restricted palette was a deliberate choice, there is strong evidence that, despite Iberia’s New-World wealth, it was difficult for seventeenth-century artists — even court
painters like Velázquez — to acquire high-quality paints.\textsuperscript{334} Velázquez, who was surrounded by the brilliant colors of Venetian masters, had to use greyish-blue smalt as a substitute for lapis lazuli.\textsuperscript{335} Whereas Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) and Titian (1488/1490-1576) had access to some thirty-five pigments, Velázquez could only acquire twenty.\textsuperscript{336}

Despite his access to a much larger number of bright pigments, Rosales seems to have deliberately chosen a limited number of colors, even choosing a greyish-blue color for the robes of the cardinal in \textit{Testamento}; a blue that looks suspiciously close to the poor-quality smalt available to seventeenth-century Spanish artists like Velázquez. The predominant color in \textit{Testamento} is brown, followed by an off-white. The affect is an antiqued look. It is as though Rosales was using a Spanish version of a Claude glass to achieve a look intended to make the final work appear authentically seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{337}

Rosales produced dozens of compositional sketches before beginning work on the final canvas. The development of these from \textit{premier pensé} to a final compositional program has been well documented by others and will be discussed here only briefly, but even a small sampling of the drawings shows Rosales thinking about who and what to best emphasize.\textsuperscript{338} Where his final work ultimately places Isabel front and center, some of the early versions diminish the queen in favor of Ferdinand. At first, Ferdinand is in the center with Isabel, directly engaging

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{335} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{336} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{337} Arnaud Maillet. \textit{The Claude Glass: Use and Meaning of the Black Mirror in Western Art}. (Cambridge: Zone Books, 200), 1-15.
\end{itemize}
with her. But in the end, all the figures are subordinate to Isabel, hanging on her every word (see Figures 13, 14, and 15).

Figure 13: Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) *Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento*, preparatory sketch (1863) Ink on paper. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.
Figure 14: Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) *Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* (1863) Ink, graphite, and chalk on paper. Museo Nacional de Arte de Cataluña, Barcelona.

Figure 15: Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) *Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* (1863) Graphite and chalk on paper. Museo Nacional de Arte de Cataluña, Barcelona.
Almost a year after his first composition sketch, Rosales ordered a large canvas for the final painting. In a letter, Rosales said the studio was “a little small” for the painting.\(^{339}\) He would spend the next six months completing the final work, with only minor deviations from the final preparatory sketches. The painting was shipped from Rome in August and arrived in Madrid in mid-October, two months before the start of the 1864 *Exposición Nacional*.\(^{340}\)

This was the fourth *Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes*. Each year the number of works submitted increased in every category. There were 619 submissions: 467 paintings, seventy drawing (i.e., engravings and lithographs), fifty-eight sculptures, and twenty-two architectural drawings. Of the 467 paintings, fifty were historical, 145 religious, 140 genre scenes, sixty-two portraits, and seventy landscapes.\(^{341}\) It ran for one month, from December 13, 1864, to January 13, 1865, and was presided over by the director of public instruction — the government organization responsible for funding the contest and the Spanish Academies of Fine Art throughout the country. Of the twenty-two judges, most were artists or architects, with

---

\(^{339}\) The size of the average history painting submitted to the *Exposición Nacional* had increased dramatically — an average of seventy-five percent — over the four contests that had taken place. Sizes would only increase until 1897. Why artists felt compelled to make larger works may have to do with the purchasing of award-winning works by the government institutions and their subsequent public display in spacious government buildings. (See chapter seven for more discussion.)


\(^{341}\) *Catálogo de la Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes de 1864*. (Madrid: Fortanet, 1864).
the exception of a few politicians with literary careers.\textsuperscript{342} Winners were not announced until the last day of the contest.

The two most anticipated and discussed submissions were by Antonio Gisbert and José Casado del Alisal. It was the first time the two had faced off since the polemical contest of 1860. In the interim, Gisbert had been commissioned to do the portraits of several liberal political leaders.\textsuperscript{343} Casado had spent several years collaborating with moderate politicians to help with a new design for the interior of the senate building.\textsuperscript{344} But, in the year preceding the Exposition of 1864, both artists stopped other activities to prepare large history paintings for the contest.

For his submission, Gisbert chose a deliberately provocative subject:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1. Eugenio de Ochoa (1815-1872), director general of public instruction, author, writer, translator
  \item 2. Duque de Rivas (1791-1865), vice president, patriot during the French occupation, fought against Ferdinand VII, liberal exile
  \item 3. José Caveda (1796-1882), historian, politician, art critic
  \item 4. Francisco Sans Cabot (1828-1881), painter
  \item 5. Eduardo Cano de la Peña (1823-1897), painter
  \item 6. Federico de Madrazo (1815-1894), painter
  \item 7. Francisco Derdá
  \item 8. Francisco Aznar (1834-1911), painter, illustrator, engraver
  \item 9. Luis López
  \item 10. Juan Martínez de Espinosa (1826-1902), painter, engraver
  \item 11. José Méndez, painter
  \item 12. José Pagnuccioni (1821-1868), sculptor, disciple of Ponzano
  \item 13. Andrés Rodríguez, painter
  \item 14. José Grajera (1818-1898)
  \item 15. José Siro Pérez
  \item 16. Jerónimo Morán (1817-1872), poet
  \item 17. Juan Bautista Peyronet (1812-1875), architect, professor of architecture
  \item 18. Agustín Felipe Peró
  \item 19. Félix María Gómez, architect
  \item 20. Nicomedes Mendivil, architect
  \item 21. Antonio Ruiz de Salces (1820-1892), architect
  \item 22. Eugenio de la Cámara, architect, secretary
\end{itemize}


Protestants thanking God after landing on the shores of Massachusetts (see Figure 16).\textsuperscript{345} From the traditionalist Spanish perspective, the celebration of English protestants fleeing religious persecution and thanking God on the shores of North America was anti-Catholic. It called into question that “God was Spanish” — an oft-repeated saying through several centuries — and that the Puritans, not the Spanish conquistadors, had divine providence on their side.\textsuperscript{346}

Figure 16: Antonio Gisbert Pérez (1834-1902) Desembarco de los puritanos en América (1864) Oil on canvas. 294 by 395 cm. Palacio del Senado, Madrid.

\textsuperscript{345}Ibid., 78-80.

Like Rosales, Casado was in search of a universally nationalistic, non-partisan theme. For his submission to the Exposición Nacional, Casado painted the *Surrender of Bailén* (see Figure 17), a key battle during the French occupation. At Bailén, a small village near Granada, Spain won the first major defeat of Napoleon’s forces anywhere in Europe. News of the victory was celebrated throughout Europe. Ultimately, the French were pushed out by English forces led by the Duke of Wellington. Casado, however, conceived the scene as a great national victory. The painting was a *tour de force* of technique and historical accuracy. Epic in size, it was the same proportions and made unmistakable compositional references to Velázquez’s *Rendición de Breda* (1634/35). Casado even made a special trip to Paris in order to accurately depict the French arms and costume, even being careful to measure the distance between buttons on the French commander’s uniform.

---


The critical press fell into lines that had been formed during the 1860 contest. Liberal papers hailed Gisbert’s painting as both the best work he had ever done and the best at the *Exposicion Nacional.* The novelist Pedro Antonio de Alarcón (1833-1891) called it “the greatest work of Spanish art of all time.” Conservative ink praised the artistry and nationalistic character of Casado. During the first two weeks, Rosales’s work received mention, but no in-depth discussions.

It was only in early January, after staking their cases for Gisbert or Casado, that top critics began writing about *Testamento.* When they did, it was in remarkably patronizing terms. Rosales was criticized primarily for his youth and inexperience, and his historical accuracy was severely questioned. After having spent several columns praising Gisbert, Alarcón, turned his attention to Rosales, whom he praised and lectured simultaneously. Rosales was “youthful inspiration,” “rich and full of hopes,” but there was “not a little to censure” in *Testamento.* He continued:

> The drawing is wrong. And in regards to the tone, it is distorted in all parts, as if stained, a black coloring that destroys the coloring of all the flesh. The principal figure of the canvas, that of the queen, has no historical truth, no expression of severe or solemn poetry of that moment ... [Rosales] has been unconsciously inspired by the impression given him sometime in the theater by the death in *La Traviata.*

A week later, he returned to lecturing Rosales a second time:

> This is a display of courage, unbecoming of such an inexperienced

---


352 *Ibid.* Original text: “El dibujo es incorrecto, y en cuanto á la entonación, desvirtuada por todas partes y como que la mancha una tinta negra que destruye, sobre todo, el color de las carnes. La figura principal del cuadro, la de la reina, no tiene nada de presentación histórica; ni es un retrato, ni está situación, ni expresa la severa y solemne poesía de aquel instante ... se ha inspirado inconscientemente en la impresión que le produjera alguna vez en el teatro la muerde de la Traviata.”
hand. On one side it indicates some security and lack of embarrassment; on the other it causes one to worry that the artist ends where he should begin, rendering himself unaccustomed and unable to paint with greater precision and clarity.353

Another critic, Gregorio Cruzada Villaamil (1832-1884), a liberal and long-time advocate of Gisbert, spent a great deal of time patronizing Rosales, frequently referring to him as “young.” Villaamil used more than 700 words to describe a hypothetical situation in which the critic died and had a conversation with Diego Velázquez about Rosales — because “you try to imitate him.” He tells “Diego” of a young talented painter who wastes his time with patriotic paintings that “require literate” people and that cannot be understood “by foreigners”:

Do not screw up your face, young artist, because a poor old man, excited for a moment, is tough and demanding of your picture; because this proves to you that your canvas is good enough to resist criticism, and that you are a worthy painter. If you were not worthy, I would not have offered my advice ...

Like others, José Galofre (1819-1867), himself a painter, heavily criticized the lack of historical accuracy in the presence of Juana and the youth of the queen, “who appears to be thirty years old,” and made a curious statement about the aesthetic influences of Rosales:

If I am displeased by the historical interpretation of the scene, in regards to his execution he has revived the work of Velázquez … frank, easy, true, and pure in his painting. Sweet, pleasing, and well colored in tone. Vigorous, resolved, and strong in claroscuro; in a word, he is a painter with promise and an artist who understands

353 Ibid. Original text: “Hay un alarde de valentía, impropio de una mano aun inexperta, que si por una parte indica cierta seguridad y desembarazo, por otra hace temer que el artista acabe por donde debiera principiar, y se amanera é imposibilité para pintar con mas precisión y pureza.”

354 “Crítica de la Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes de 1864.” La Correspondencia. (19 December 1864),13-16. Original text: “No frunza usted el gesto, joven artista, porque un pobre viejo, resucitado por un momento, duro y exigente con su cuadro, porque esto mismo le probará a usted que su cuadro es lo bastante bueno para resistir la crítica, y que usted vale como pintor, pues si no valiera no me hubiera metido a darle consejos ...”
Spanish art and the Sevilian school.\textsuperscript{355}

All the historical research Rosales had done could not avert the scathing criticism he received for leaving key facts of the moment unaddressed. Specifically, Rosales did not choose to publicly label the individual figures. For the \textit{Exposición Nacional}, Rosales accompanied his work with text from Prescott:

Isabel died in \textit{Medina del Campo} on the 26 of November of 1504. On October 12 of the same year, in the same villa, she executed her celebrated testament that reflects so clearly the peculiar qualities of her mind and character and the most complete test of her constancy that, at the moment of her death, she would continue faithful to the principles that had directed her conduct throughout her life.\textsuperscript{356}

But in his \textit{Diario}, the artist included the following list of those present at the moment of Isabel's addition of the \textit{Codicilio}:

The favors granted to [the Queen's] faithful servants, the Marquis and Marquess Moya, the King, [Cardinal] Cisneros; the Chief Accountants, Antonio de Fonesca and Juan Valázquez; the Bishop of Palencia, Friar Diego de Deza, confessor to the King; and the secretary and accountant Juan López de Larraga.\textsuperscript{357}

This text accounts for nine people: two women and seven men. But in

\textsuperscript{355} José Galofre. “Exposición de Bellas Artes.” \textit{La Libertad}, No. 360. (12 January 1865), 3. Original text: “\textit{Si poco feliz ha sido en la interpretación histórica del asunto, en cambio en su ejecución ha resucitado el hacer de Velázquez ... Franco, fácil, verdadero y castizo es en pintar; dulce agradable y entonado en el colorido; brioso, resuelto y fuerte en el claro oscuro; en una palabra, es un pintor que promete y un Artista que siente el Arte español y la escuela de Sevilla [sic.].}”

\textsuperscript{356} \textit{Catálogo de la Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes.} (Madrid: Fortanet, 1864). Original text: \textit{La Reina Doña Isabel murió en Medina del Campo en 26 de Noviembre de 1504. En 12 de Octubre del mismo año, y en la mismavilla, otorgó su selébre testamento, que es el mejor testimonio en que resplandecen con tanto brillo las ilustres prendas de su espíritu y de su carácter, y la pureba mas completa de la constancia con que á la hora de su muerte segía fiel á los principios que habían dirigido su conducta durante toda su vida.”}

\textsuperscript{357} Modesto Lafuente. \textit{Historia de España}, Vol. VII. (Madrid: Establecimiento tipográfico de Madrid, 1852), 222-224. Original text: “\textit{Las mercedes concedidas a sus fieles servidores del marqués y marquesa de Moya, el rey; el arzobispo de Toledo, Cisneros; los contadores mayores, Antonio de Fonesca y Juan Velázquez; el obispo de Palencia, fray Diego de Deza, confesor del rey, y el secretario y contador Juan López de Larraga.”}
Rosales’s work, there are ten figures, including an unnamed woman standing behind the seated King Ferdinand. The additional figure caused a great deal of confusion among commentators.

Most agreed that the figure to the far left, standing behind the king, could not be Juana. History is very clear that Juana stayed in Flanders and did not come to claim the throne until the Spring of 1506, nearly eighteen months after her mother’s death. In this line of thinking, Xavier de Salas argued that Rosales was less interested in historical accuracy than compositional harmony. Debating the identity of the figure may miss a larger and more interesting issue: Rosales’s break with the dictum that historical painting must be historically accurate. If it is Juana, Rosales was combining history with symbolic meaning. Even though Juana was not physically present, she was directly addressed, fully present in the mind of Isabel while making the codicil. Therefore, arguably, not including Juana would have been untrue to the intent of Isabel, who very much had Juana in mind when making changes to her will.

The critic José de Villalobos largely appreciated the work, but said: “The figures are nobly drawn with expression, truth, and character, especially with the Catholic king ... but the queen is a heroine in his artistic creation.” The youth of the queen was also criticized in El Eco del País, but the anonymous critic did not get too caught up in historical facts: “ ... when we arrive before Señor Rosales, we are surprised by what we feel and the truth, the feeling, the justice, the tone, the air that constitute the


ambiance of the work.\textsuperscript{362}

Critical commentary on \textit{Testamento} largely took place toward the end of the month-long \textit{Exposición Nacional}. Given the “raucous rivalry” between Gisbert and Casado, it is understandable that Rosales’s first submission to the contest would be less considered. This also was the case in the eyes of the exhibition jury. Two weeks before the end of the contest, in a draft of the official announcement of prizes and honorable mentions, Rosales’s \textit{Testamento} was not even mentioned.\textsuperscript{363} But, just as the critics’ time spent discussing the work increased, so did the jury’s esteem for \textit{Testamento}.

Meeting a few days before the end of the contest, jurors voted for awards. The meeting’s minutes show a remarkable trajectory. From not being considered for even an honorable mention two weeks earlier, \textit{Testamento} led the tallies for first-place medals. Thirteen of twenty-two jurors voted for \textit{Testamento}, five voted for Gisbert’s \textit{Puritanos}, and the remaining four voted for \textit{Bailén} by Casado.\textsuperscript{364} The jury then took up the question of the top prize, the Medal of Honor, an award only given out once in the contest’s nineteenth-century history.\textsuperscript{365} Two paintings, \textit{Testamento} and \textit{Puritanos}, were considered. From the official announcement, it appears that \textit{Testamento} almost won out.

Despite the singular merit that all have recognized in two painting that have been put forward for the first-class prizes, the jury, after arguing the issue of maturity and the need for restraint, have come to the majority opinion that there was not sufficient merit to award the Medal of Honor, established in article 19 of the [contest

\textsuperscript{362} \textit{El Eco del País}. (Madrid: 19 December 1864), 1. Original text: “... llegamos ante el St. Rosale, sentimos una cosa que nos sorprende, y la verdad, el sentimiento, la justeza, el tono, el aire que constituyen el aspecto de la obra.”

\textsuperscript{363} \textit{Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes de 1864}. (Madrid: Colegio de Sordo-mudos y de Ciegos, 1865).


\textsuperscript{365} Bernardino de Pantorba. \textit{Historia y crítica de las exposiciones nacionales de bellas artes celebradas en España}. (Madrid: Jesús Ramón García-Rama, 1980), 34-37.
The prize, as had happened in the three previous contests, was not awarded. Once again, the issue of Rosales’s relative youth — “maturity” — seems to be the principal barrier.

The first-class medal did not translate into immediate fame for Rosales, nor demand for his work. Before the end of the contest, the Senate bought Gisbert’s work for the astoundingly high price of 120,000 reales — perhaps a good-faith gesture after having bought Casado’s painting during the polemical Exposición Nacional of 1860 (see chapter four) — and the queen took La Rendición de Bailén by Casado for 80,000 reales.367 Suprisingly, Testamento was not purchased before the end of the contest; instead, it was relegated to “Sales Day.” Usually reserved for paintings that were less desirable, Sales Day took place in the same hall where the exhibition was held. Each work was given a price by the jury and made available for public sale. The artists were able to accept and reject offers. Rosales was understandably insulted:

A tragic moment comes to pass at the Exposición. When I arrived at the moment sales were made I prepared to ride the whirlwind, and the Jury was not very well advised, for certain, in the proposals, because, among them there was not a single worthy work. Among the prices ... I was put on the list at 30,000.368

366 “Propuesta de premios que presenta el jurado de la Exposición de Bellas Artes [sic.]” Museo Universal, Year IX, No. 5. (Madrid: 29 January 1865), 55. Original text: “A pesar del mérito singular que todos han reconocido en dos cuadros que se proponen para premios de primera clase. el Jurado, después de discutido el punto con madurez y detenimiento, ha opinado por mayoría que no había mérito suficiente para dar el premio de honor que establece al artículo 19 del reglamento.”


368 Eduardo Rosales. Letter to Martín Rico y Ortega. “Paris, 7 February 1865.” Reproduced in Enrique Pardo Canalís. “Textos. Rosales.” Revista de Ideas Estéticas (Madrid, 1973), 75-90. Original text: “… ana noticia respecto al trágico desenlace que se prepara en la Exposición; como tú ya sospechabas, cuando llegó la ocasion de las compras se armó la gorda, y el jurado no ha andado muy avisado por cierto en las propuestas, porque entre éstas hay obras que ni aun debieron admitir en la Exposición; en cuanto a los precios no quiero decírtelo nada ... yo estoy puesto en lista por 30.000 reales.”
Even after all the second- and third-class medalled works had been purchased, Testamento was still available. Several offers were eventually made by individuals and provincial governments, but it wasn’t until two months after the end of the contest that the painting was bought for 50,000 reales by the Ministry of Development for display in the Museo de Arte Moderno.  

Finally, my painting has its end in the government for the quantity of 50,000 reales. They say it is very little and, I believe others have been paid worse ... The truth is that the Patrimonio was going through a terrible crisis ...

The late attention of critics, their mixed reception, the sudden and eleventh-hour reappraisal of Testamento by the jury, and the subsequent lack of interest in purchasing Testamento all stand in contrast to what would be said less than ten years later by one of the work’s greatest critics:

Painting in Spain is in search of the genius of the old masters, a solid base on which to found a regeneration of the fine arts, and it is disposed to resolutely accept this legacy from the past as a way forward. El Testamento de Isabel la Católica was the most decisive step that has been made in this new path ...

This change did not come about because of subsequent paintings by

369 From 1898 to 1915, the Museo de Arte Moderno was a repository for Spanish artists whose work was created in the nineteenth century and owned by the government. In 1915, the museum and its collections were folded into the Museo Nacional del Prado. Source: Manuel Ossorio Bernard. Galería biográfica de artistas españoles del siglo xix. (Madrid: Ramón Moreno, 1868).

370 Eduardo Rosales. Letter to Vicente Palmaroli, Luis Álvarez, and Alejo Vera. “Paris, 19 March 1865.” Reproduced in Enrique Pardo Canalis. “Textos. Rosales.” Revista de Ideas Estéticas. (Madrid, 1973), 75-90. Original text: “Mi cuadro ha sido al fin para el Gobierno por la cantidad de 50.000 reales; dicen que es muy poco y yo creo que otros han pagado peor: realmente, aun admitiendo que sea poco, han sido deferentes conmigo, porque ninguno se ha pagado más y esto se lo agradezco y es de agradecer ... La verdad era que el Patrimonio estaba entonces pasando por la terrible crisis ...”

371 La Ilustración de Madrid. Vol. II, No. 45. (Madrid: 15 November 1871). Original text: “La pintura en España busca en el genio de las antiguas escuelas una base sólida sobre qué fundar la regeneración de las artes, y se dispone á aceptar resueltamente la herencia del pasado como fundamento del porvenir. El testamento de Isabel la Católica fué el paso más decisivo que dio la pintura por este nuevo camino.”
Rosales or arguments made by prominent critics within Spain. The changing perception of Rosales began with the high opinion non-Spainiards gave the work at the Paris Universal Exposition of 1867, where it was a contender for that contest’s top prize.

Shortly after the closing of the Exposición Nacional, Testamento, along with Gisbert and Casado’s award-winning works, was shipped to Dublin for a regional arts exhibition and then to the Exposition Universelle of 1867. This is one of the more interesting and overlooked aspects of nineteenth-century art: the use of history paintings for the promotion of national image to foreign audiences. Beginning with the Exposition Universelle of 1855 and ending during the first quarter of the twentieth century, international artists were invited to present their works at hundreds of regional contests, but it was foreign governments that chose which works would be sent.

In 1862, Spain’s Department of Public Instruction, which oversaw the Exposición Nacional, formed a separate committee to promote Spanish art abroad. The committee arranged for government-owned works that had placed well in the most recent Exposición Nacional to be put to use in a variety of ways, including foreign exhibition. The existence of the committee raises interesting questions about the full motivation for the federal government’s purchase of award-winning works at the Exposición Nacional. Such works were first displayed at the Exposición Nacional, then sent abroad to national contests, and later hung in a government building or, even better, the Museo Nacional. Although the apparent intention was to promote Spanish art and Spanishness abroad, the positive reception of these works by foreign audiences, especially in the case of Testamento, led a significant domestic reappraisal of works at home that had little esteem before.

---

372 “Rosales y su cuadro.” La ilustración Española y Americana, Year 16, No. 2. (Madrid: 1872), 22.

The *Exposition Universelle de 1867 de Paris* was the second such event and the second to take place in Paris. A showcase for engineering development, agricultural innovations, literature, and an amusement park, the fine arts were only a small percentage of the spectacles on display. More than 15,000,000 people attended the event, for which the French government set aside a huge complex of thirty-eight acres, the Champ-de-Mars, subdivided into sections (e.g., architecture, engineering, agriculture). Each nation was given a pavilion within the category; within the Palace of Fine Arts was a *Section Espagnole*. Works were placed in competition against others in their native country first, then the first-place winner from each competed against the top winner from other nations.

It was a major opportunity for artists to gain exposure, especially foreigners who had precious few occasions to gain attention in Paris, the epicenter of the art world. Two years before it would take place, Federico de Madrazo positively badgered his son, Raimundo de Madrazo, who was living in Paris, to prepare a work for submission. Federico wrote at least ten letters over two years reminding him of the opportunity:

> Have you thought more about something that you could paint for the *Exposition Universelle* of '67? It is something that would have *great benefit* for you and you should take particular interest in it. It is a great occasion and you should not — you cannot — let it pass by without considering how it could serve you. The Age of the Emperor and what could possibly happen! Will it ever come again!? — Who knows?

---


376 Federico de Madrazo. “Madrid, 20 October 1865.” *Epistolario*, Vol. II. (Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 1994), 639. Original text: “¿Y vas pensando en algún asunto para lo que has de pintar para la Exposición Universal del 67? Este es negocio de gran interés para ti, y deves mirarlo con particular predilección. Es una grande ocasión que no deves, que no puedes, dejar pasar sin pervirte de ella, la edad del Emperador y lo que puede suceder, ni se hallará otra después — ¿quién sabe?”
In the history of painting, the *Exposition Universelle* is often as famous for what was not shown as for what was. Over successive Expositions, organizers of the French section rejected works by Courbet, Manet, Monet, Pissaro, and Cézanne. Courbet and Manet both opened own private exhibitions in order to take advantage of the large crowds visiting Paris; the first in 1855, the latter in 1867. For Parisians, the Exposition was an opportunity to see works that would not normally be on view at the annual Paris *Salon*. And, by comparison to their own annual events, expectations were often low. The critics who exhaustively discussed the annual Paris *Salon* with custom guides, satirical commentary, and biting critiques rarely discussed works outside of the French section of the *Exposition Universelle*. As a result, most art commentaries were made by non-critics and were included in tourist guides, which gave advice on the best places to stay and eat. With 2,000 works on display in the Palace of Fine Arts, the forty paintings in the Spanish section had poor odds of gaining much attention.

Despite the general lack of critical attention and the comparative small number of Spanish works on display, several French authors wrote glowingly of the Spanish works collectively and about *Testamento* in particular. In his practical guide for visitors to the *Exposition Universelle*, Hippolyte Gautier said Rosales’s work was a “*chef-d'oeuvre, de l'avis de tous.*”

While Rosales was universally praised in these accounts, the French took

---


378 For starters, works shown at the *Salon* were submitted by and at the cost of individual artists, then they were subject to *Salon* judges. Works at the *Exposition Universelle* were selected and sent by foreign governments.

379 There were 791 works presented by French artists, 108 by Italians, 200 from Belgium, and more than 300 from the United Kingdom.

little notice of Gisbert’s *Puritanos*.

The relatively small exhibited number of 42 Spanish paintings on show was remarkable: an interior by [Pablo] Gonzalvo y Pérez, *The Sermon in the Sistine Chapel* by [Vicente] Palmaroli, a new composition by [Antonio] Gisbert, and especially *The Death of Isabella the Catholic* by [Eduardo] Rosales. It proved that Spanish artists have made considerable progress in recent times.\(^\text{381}\)

These French critics brought a remarkably different set of criteria to bear on their analysis of *Testamento*. Unlike Spanish audiences, they were unburdened with the demands of historical accuracy, the knowledge of artistic rivalries, relative experience, and the context of national politics. Without these considerations, Rosales’s work far outshone that of his countrymen to win over French audiences on the basis of artistic merit alone:

> It is a work designed in grand style and executed by the hand of a master. The canvas is animated — true to the eye — and the figures posses a character of truth and denote that the author is a true talent.\(^\text{382}\)

French critics made frequent comparisons between *Testamento* and the works of Velázquez and Ribera, a result of French exposure to Spanish artists on show at the *Galerie Espagnole*. Without any other context for contemporary Spanish art, the French drew a direct line between Rosales and 300-year-old Spanish works. This simple formulation did not take into account the French training imbued in Rosales’s education. The prominent

\(^{381}\) *Exposition Universelle de Paris en 1867: Documents et Rapports*. (Brussels: E. Guyot, 1868), 269. Original text: “Relativement au nombre restreint de ses toiles exposées 42 seulement l Espagne avait un salon très remarquable Un intérieur par Gonzalvo y Perez Le sermon de la chapelle Sixtine par Palmaroli les différentes compositions de Gisbert et surtout La mort d Isabelle la Catholique de Rosales prouvaient que les artistes espagnols avaient fait des progrès considérables en ces derniers temps seulement on eût pu ranger leurs œuvres dans le salon français sans que personne se fût aperçu de l annexion de l école espagnole La France eût compté quelques bons peintres de plus et voilà tout.”

critic Paul Mantz (1821-1895) said that in Spain there still resided the spirit of Velázquez because Rosales was “un des plus experts dans la peinture historique”:

Southern races have a persistant vigor, a force that has been slumbering for years; but now seems to awake with brilliance. In Paris in 1855 and London in 1862, we talked about these [Spanish and Italian] schools as having rather bad form. But, with the help of the [Exhibition at] the Champ-de-Mars, shows us they live on. This revelation is greeted with joy by this French critic. No one should be surprised. The success of our neighbors does nothing to harm our national pride. In the field of art, there is room for a generous rivalry ...

At the end of the *Exposition Universelle*, a jury of French judges gave two sets of awards: one within each national pavilion, and another for the overall contest. Within the Spanish Pavilion, *Testamento* was unanimously awarded first prize — Gisbert’s *Puritanos* placed third. While this must have surprised and delighted Rosales, the news paled in comparison to an even greater honor: His was the only Spanish work to be considered for a top prize for the overall contest, competing against all artists from all countries who had submitted works to the international contest.

---

383 Paul Mantz. *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*. (Paris: 2 November 1867), 283. Original text: “… chez les races méridionales une virilité persistante, une force qui a pu sommeiller pendant des années, mais qui paraît aujourd’hui se réveiller avec quelque éclat. À Paris, en 1855, à Londres en 1862, les deux écoles dont nous venons de parler avaient fait une assez pauvre figure; le concours du Champ-de-Mars nous apprend qu’elles vivent encore. Cette révélation a été accueillie avec joie par la critique française; nul ne doit s’en étonner: les succès de nos voisins n’ont rien qui puisse inquiéter notre amour-propre national: dans le domaine de l’art, il n’y a place pour les rivalités généreuses …”

In the final count, Rosales's *Testamento* was narrowly beaten by the Italian painter Stefano Ussi's (1822-1901) work *The Expulsion of the Duke of Athens from Florence* (see Figure 18) for the *Exposition Universelle*’s top prize:

I should make you aware that the canvas by Mr. Rosales missed obtaining the Prize of Honor by only four votes, and that his first-place medal was obtained by unanimous vote, being the only work to received the honor of uniting the entire jury.\(^{385}\)

Rosales’s name was mentioned in the same list at Jules Bretón (1827-1906), Isidore Pils (1813-1875), and Jean-François Millet (1814-1875). For his accomplishment, the Spanish artist was made a member of the French Legion of Honor and a fellow of the French Academy.\(^{386}\)

\(^{385}\) *La Correspondencia de España*. Year XX, No. 3399. (19 May 1867), 1. Original text: “Debo también hacer presente á V. E. que el cuadro del Sr. Rosales obtuvo el premio de honor por haberle faltado tan solo cuatro votos, y que su primera medalla la ha obtenido por unanimidad, siendo la única que ha tenido el honor de reunir todos los sufragos.”

\(^{386}\) *La Correspondencia de España*. Year XX, No. 3304. (8 February 1867), 3.
In Spain, the reaction was universally ecstatic. Queen Isabel's personal spokesperson wrote in the state’s official paper:

> Who would have believed it? The Iberian Peninsula, isolated from the rest of Europe by the Pyrenees — that geographic barrier, theater of constant political fights, even with the natural difficulties of our land ... Today, Spain occupies first place in the whole world.\(^{387}\)

The following description appeared in the official state press and was reproduced in nearly all national and regional newspapers the following day:

Undoubtedly [Rosales] has received more rewards in proportion to the number of exhibitioners: 87 was the number of prizes distributed among 1,417 exhibitors and 1,893 works, all of indisputable merit. Each nation had been very careful to choose the best of the best, in order to be represented with dignity. Spain has received four medals of such importance that even the third-class medals are equivalent to first-class in other exhibitions ... It is important to note that of the 1,417 exhibitors and 1,893 artworks, only 33 exhibitors and 40 works were from Spain.\(^{388}\)

Critics who, before the *Exposition Universelle*, had dismissed Rosales as young and criticized *Testamento* for its lack of historical accuracy completely reversed themselves:

> We already know Rosales ... author of *Testamento de Isabel la Católica*. He has been awarded in [the Universal Exposition]. Rosales deserves it and much more. He paints so well and like few

---

387 “España en la Exposición Universal de 1867.” *Gaceta de Madrid.* (13 December 1867), 13. Original text: “¿Quién lo hubiera creído? La Península Ibérica, aislada del resto de Europa por los Pirineos, esa barrera geográfica, teatro constante de luchas política que, más aun que las dificultades naturales del suelo, paralizan los esfuerzos de los Gobiernos ... La España ocupa hor el primer lugar en el mundo entero.”

388 “Exposición Universal: Premios á la pintura española.” *El Museo Universal.* No. 19, Vol. V. (1867). 166. Original text: “Indudablemente ha obtenido más recompensas recompensas en proporción del número de exposidores: 87 eran los premios que había que distribuir entre 1,417 exposidores y 1,893 obras todas de un mérito indisputable, pues cada nación ha tenido buen cuidado de escoger lo mejor entre lo mejor, para verse dignamente representada. España ha conseguido cuatro medallas de tal importancia que, aúl las de tercera clase, equivalen á las primeras de otras Exposiciones ... Conviene saber que de los 1,417 exposidores y 1,893 cuadros, corresponden tan sólo á España 33 exposidores y 40 cuadros.”
others. He has his own style: frank and enchanting. He is an artist who knows well and knows much; he knows a great deal about history, much about science, much about the arts. His modesty and formality appeal to all our senses.\textsuperscript{389}

Rosales’s accomplishment in Paris not only vindicated his abilities in comparison to other, more experienced Spanish painters, but significantly raised the profile of contemporary Spanish artists in the minds of foreign artists. From 1867 onward, the prestigious Spanish arts journal, \textit{La Ilustración Española y Americana}, almost exclusively referred to Rosales with the honorific, “\textit{el distinguido pintor don Eduardo Rosales}.”

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure19.jpg}
\caption{Eduardo Rosales Gallinas (1836-1873) \textit{La Muerte de Lucrecia} (1871) Oil on canvas. 258 by 347 cm. \textit{Museo Nacional del Prado}, Madrid.}
\end{figure}

Following the \textit{Exposición Nacional} and while his painting was on display in

\textsuperscript{389} “Noticias.” \textit{El Cascabel}, Year V, No. 300. (Madrid: 12 May 1867), 2. Original text: “Ya sabes que Rosales, aquel jó ven que conocimos en Madrid, que nos lo enseñó Perico un día en el café de la Iberia y luego le vimos en Panticosa, el autor del Testamento de habel la Católica, ha sido premiado en esta Exposición. Rosales merece eso y mucho más; además de que pinta como quiere y como pocos, y tiene un estilo propio, franco y encantador; es un artista que sabe y que sabe mucho, mucho de historia, mucho de ciencia, mucho de artes, y cuya modestia y formalidad le atraen todas las simpatías.”
Dublin and Paris, Rosales had used the modest monies from the sale of *Testamento* to establish himself in Rome. At his new studio, he had already begun a work that he believed — then and to his death — would be his greatest: *La Muerte de Lucrecia* (1871) (see Figure 19). Upon receiving a letter from Raimundo de Madrazo announcing that *Testamento* was being considered for a top prize, Rosales told his friend that he was planning to send his new work “directly to Paris” upon completion. He would not send it or any future works to the *Exposición Nacional* at all.\(^{390}\)

In other words, having placed so well in an international forum, he would no longer submit himself to the minor leagues. The contrast between his reception in Spain and France had revealed an entrenched bias, a pettiness. And, the quick reversal of Spanish critical opinion on the news of his success in France demonstrated a shallowness that was equally distasteful.

Over the next several years, Rosales rarely returned to Spain. When Rome was occupied by various forces during the Italian War of Unification, he went to northern Italy and France.\(^{391}\) This behavior was very different from that of Gisbert and Casado, who capitalized on their fame among Spanish audiences, collaborating on government projects and becoming portraitists for wealthy Spaniards and visiting professors to the *Academia de San Fernando*. By comparison, Rosales was positively aloof — a stance that seemed to only increase his unofficial and aspirational influence on Spanish artists.

---


Figure 20: Lorenzo Vallés (1831-1910) *Demencia de doña Juana de Castilla* (1866) Oil on canvas. 238 by 313 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.

Figure 21: Ignacio Pinazo Camarlench (1849-1916) *Últimos momentos del rey don Jaime el Conquistador en el acto de entregar su espada a su hijo don Pedro* (1881) Oil on canvas. 299 by 419 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.
Rosales’s influence on Spanish history painting became clear as a new generation of Spanish artists — those who were still young in 1867 — were exhibiting at the Exposición Nacional in the late 1870s and 1800s. The Exposición Nacional was inundated with dozens of large-scale history paintings that directly quoted figures from Testamento. Lorenzo Vallés (1831-1910), for example, considered his work, Demencia de doña Juana de Castilla (1866), a companion piece to Testamento392 (see Figure 20). Others, such as Ignacio Pinazo (1849-1916), borrowed Testamento’s composition and took Rosales’s diffuse brushstrokes to an extreme in his painting Últimos momentos del rey don Jaime el Conquistador en el acto de entregar su espada a su hijo don Pedro (see Figure 21). As well, works prominently featuring historical figures in moments of death and dying became a dominant theme (see chapter seven for a number of works inspired by Rosales). Setting aside these compositional and thematic considerations, perhaps the most important shift was the mass adoption of naturalism. Within a decade of Testamento, the classical and romantic schools of Spanish history painting were almost completely replaced by works in which figures occupied their environments as real people.

Rosales himself was dogged by Testamento. He presented La Muerte de Lucrecia (1871) at the Exposición Nacional of 1871. Although it also treated the death of a dynastically important woman, Rosales had diverged dramatically from Testamento in nearly every way. It is not a Spanish history painting; rather, in subject, it is the first Spanish history painting since the neo-classical era of José de Madrazo to adopt a narrative from ancient times. By choosing the subject, he was able to almost completely abandon the need for historical accuracy. He was looking more at David than Delaroche. The application of paint is radically diffuse, causing one critic to call it a “colossal oil study” rather than a

finished painting.\textsuperscript{393} (Rosales believed he was reinterpreting Velázquez’s brushwork.\textsuperscript{394}) With blues, greys, and sandy browns, \textit{La Muerte de Lucrecia} is even more monochrome than \textit{Testamento}, although the palette is completely unrelated. Whereas the figures in \textit{Testamento} are reserved and unreacting, in this work the figures are large, dynamic, and intertwined. Rosales considered it his greatest work.\textsuperscript{395} But the critics could not see past \textit{Testamento}: “Rosales’s art seeks to resuscitate the style of Velázquez ... but with the exception of \textit{Testamento}, where truth is contained within just and reasonable limits.”\textsuperscript{396}

Despite critical unease with Rosales’s new approach, he was awarded the top prize for \textit{La Muerte de Lucrecia}. That same year he was given perhaps the greatest honor that could be bestowed by the Spanish Academy: He was named director of the newly created \textit{Real Academia Española} in Rome.\textsuperscript{397} For decades the Spanish government had negotiated with successive Italian, papal, French, and revolutionary forces to secure a permanent home for Spanish artists in Rome (see chapter three for more discussion), the destination for the most exceptional graduates of the Spanish Academy. Making Rosales the director introduced a famous artist who had deliberately avoided a position within the administration of the arts in Spain and signaled to other Spanish artists that the Spanish Academy — at least those leading it in Madrid — saw Rosales as a role model.

\textsuperscript{393} Aureliano Beruete y Moret. \textit{La Ilustración de Madrid}. Year II, No. 44. (Madrid: 30 October 1871), 11.

\textsuperscript{394} Luis Rubio Gil. \textit{Eduardo Rosales}. (Madrid: Ediciones Aguazul, 2002), 120-123.

\textsuperscript{395} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{396} Quoted in Bernardo de Pantorba. \textit{Historia y crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes celebradas en España}. (Madrid: Jesús Ramón García-Rama, 1980), 103. Original text: “El arte de Rosales quiere resucitar aquella manera de Velázquez ... pero, excepto en el Testamento de Isabel la Católica, donde la franqueza se contiene dentro de limites justos y razonables ...”

The Real Academia in Rome opened in 1874. Tragically, Rosales died only a few months before taking up the directorship. Twelve months later, his friend Mariano Fortuny (who will be treated at greater length in chapter six), also passed away in Rome. Both died of tuberculosis. Both were thirty-six years old.

In a very short time, another Spanish painter has been lowered to the grave. If different in style, [Fortuny] was equal in his heights of genius and the noble aspirations of his character to the author of El Testamento de Isabel la Católica, laureled by our century, Eduardo Rosales: the glory of Europe. Their souls find themselves in that eternity that holds no distance between spirits and there, these painters of the heavens will be inspired with the interminable focus and liveliness of all that is perfect. Poor Spain! Pertubed, distraught, bloodied. Rosales and Fortuny were the illustrious poets who, with science and art, were sustaining pilgrims of prestige and glory for the Patria. Their canvases, as some authors’ books, were prayers of protest against the bad opinions of foreigners. Their paintings were opuses of Spain, and they said to Europe: “Spain has not died!” Whose names will recompense such glory to Europe in place of these, who have been taken by death? 

It could be argued that Fortuny and Rosales’s fame was sealed by having died so young and on the heels of great success. Countless memorials were made in their honor, both in word and painting. Retrospectives of their works were held in Rome, Barcelona, Valencia, and Madrid. Souvenir and collectors’ reproductions of their most famous works were printed in national and regional papers (see chapter six for more).

In 1885, José Casado del Alisal — made director of the Real Academia in Rome upon Rosales’s death — gave a major speech at the Academia de El Constitutional. Year II, No. IX. (28 November 1874), 1. Original text: “No hace aun mucho tiempo bajaba al sepulcro otro pintor español, si diferente en su estilo igual en el alto vuelo de su génio y en las nobles aspiraciones de su carácter: el autor do El Testamento de Isabel la Católica, laureado por el siglo, Eduardo Rosales, otra gloria europea. Sus almas se habrán encontrado en esa eternidad que no tiene distancia para el espíritu; y allí, pintores del cielo se inspirarán en aquel foco perdurable y vivo de todas las perfecciones ¡Pobre España! Perturbada, destrozada, ensangrentada en su interior. Rosales y Fortuny eran de la pléyade ilustre que en ciencias y artes sostiene tras los Pirineos el prestigio y la gloria del nombre patrio. Los cuadros de estos, como los libros de otros, oran páginas de protesta contra el desprecio estranjero; sus obras eran obras:de España, y y decían á Europa, ¡España no ha muerto ! ¿Con qué nombres de gloria reemplazaroraos on Europa estos gloriosos nombres que ha borrado la muerte?”
Bellas Artes de San Fernando in Madrid (see chapter three). Using the
opportunity to recount the origins, development, and character of the
Spanish Academy, he listed Rosales as one of two key figures in what he
called the “Spanish renaissance of the nineteenth century”:

... [Mariano] Fortuny and [Eduardo] Rosales, whose names awaken
ennobled pride within all Spaniards, resound in my soul a singular
love for the sincere and ancient love that united me with them in life.
We have among us their successors, I’ve said; not inheritors. These
geniuses of such heights and so personal, have not left behind
themselves families of artists, but they have left us a more
important legacy, something more transcendent: a noble example in
its limitless workmanship and in its profound love for art, cultivated
in an ardent faith in the glory of their names and for the glory of
Spain.399

Nearly one hundred years later, Bernardino Pantorba made even greater
claims on Rosales’s place in the history of Spanish art:

In the Exposición Nacional of 1864, Rosales presented El
Testamento de Isabel la Católica and, in 1871, La Muerte de
Lucrecia. Then something extraordinary happened to our painting:
It became Spanish once more. The name of Rosales is placed
immediately after that of Goya.400

In 2007, when the first new wing of the Museo Nacional del Prado was

399 José Casado del Alisal. “Discurso Leído ante la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San
Fernando, el día 15 de Noviembre de 1885.” (Madrid: Fortanet, 1885), 16. Original text:
“Dignos sucesores de Fortuny y de Rosales, cuyos nombres, si despiertan en todo
español noble movimiento de orgullo, resuenan en mi alma con singular amor, y por la
sincera y antigua amistad que con ellos me unió en vida, tenemos entre nosotros;
sucesores he dicho, que no continuadores, que estos ingenuos tan altos y tan personales,
no han dejado tras de sí familias de artistas, pero nos han legado algo más importante,
algo de más transcendencia: el camino más amplio y más iluminado, y un noble ejemplo
en su laboriosidad sin límites y en su profundo amor al arte que cultivaron con tan
ardiente fe para gloria de sus nombres y para gloria de España.”

400 Bernardino de Pantorba. Historia y crítica de las exposiciones nacionales de bellas
text: “En la Exposición Nacional de 1864 presentó Rosales El Testamento de Isabel la
Católica, y en la de 1871 La Muerte de Lucrecia. Algo extraordinario pasó entonces en
nuestra pintura: volvió a ser española. El nombre de Rosales puede colocarse
inmediatamente después del de Goya.”
opened, the first exhibition it housed was dedicated to The Nineteenth Century in the Prado. Spain’s political and social elite attended the opening (see chapter one). For the first time in nearly 100 years, many of the most important works from the collection — the museum’s largest collection, at more than twice the size of all its other collections combined — was put on display. Of many works that would go on display, José Luis Diez and Javier Barón, curators of the exhibition, chose to hang Rosales’s Testamento first. The headline in El Cultural read: “El Testamento de Isabel la Católica inaugurates the new extension of the Prado.”

Rosales’s Testamento became the canon by which all subsequent Spanish history paintings were measured. This was due to his choice of a universally admired subject, the move away from French romanticism toward naturalism, and, perhaps most of all, its reception by foreign — particularly French — audiences as a masterwork. From 1864 onwards, Spanish artists attempted to repeat these achievements, by submitted increasingly large and more dramatic history scenes (see chapter seven), often imitating the aesthetics of Testamento. Some, like Francisco Pradilla (see chapter six), achieved some measure of the same success, but none ever surpassed Testamento as “the greatest Spanish history painting.”

---


CHAPTER SIX

The Most Popular Spanish History Painting
In 1908, the art historian Aureliano de Beruete y Moret (1876-1922) was asked to write an article about the recent death of the Spanish artist Martín Rico y Ortega (1833-1908). Beruete took great pains to place Rico’s work within the context of his contemporaries. To do so, he singled out two paintings as fundamental for understanding Spanish nineteenth-century art:

We said, in talking about Rosales, that with *Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* Spanish painting had achieved its highest manifestation. And now we affirm that with *Doña Juana la Loca*, comes its most dramatic; reaching its most popular and overall triumphant.\(^\text{403}\)

Beruete originally included the statement in the first book-length survey of nineteenth-century Spanish art, written in 1906; but, not published until 1926.\(^\text{404}\) The distinction he made between one painting being “great” and the other being “dramatic” and “popular” is significant, in that it is a commentary about both the quality of the artists themselves and the audiences viewing them. Rosales’s *Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* (1864) and Pradilla’s *Doña Juana la Loca* (1877) are separated by thirteen years — a short span that belies the dramatic political and cultural events that occurred in the interim. Rosales’s was painted four years before the revolution that dethroned Queen Isabel II. Pradilla’s premiered three years after the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy. The rise and fall of the revolution was followed by a return to the monarchy that caused the novelist and one Spain’s most widely read chroniclers of the era, Benito Pérez Galdós (1843-1920), to later write about the period: “Spain is mad. Its madness consist in making the absurd

\(^{403}\) Aureliano Beruete y Moret. “Martin Rico.” *Cultura Española.* (Madrid, 1908), 542. Full quote: “En efecto, es digno de la popularidad que goza. Una crítica estrecha y excesivamente rigorsa, podría encontrar en él alguna deficiencias pictóricas, pero lo interesante y bien dispuesto del asunto y su efecto dramático lo hacen único en su género. Decíamos al hablar de Rosales, que la pintura española había llegado con Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento, a su más alta manifestación, y ahora afirmamos que con Doña Juana la Loca llega a su manifestación más dramática y alcanza su más popular y general triunfo.”

\(^{404}\) Aureliano Beruete y Moret. *Historia de la pintura española en el siglo XIX.* (Madrid: Ruiz Hermanos, 1926), 118.
reality.”405 Pradilla’s depiction of a ruler, pregnant and incapacitated with her love of a dead past, captured the imagination and mood of the moment. *Doña Juana la Loca* became the most reproduced painting in nineteenth-century Spain, marking the height of interest in history painting.406 Aesthetically, it demonstrated the full force of realism in the Spanish school of art. This chapter will adopt the structure of the previous two, examining the creation, exhibition, and reaction to *Doña Juana la Loca*, the “most popular” Spanish history painting. In the process, it will consider the cultural and institutional context in which Pradilla was brought up and created the work. It will show that Pradilla was part of the first generation of Spanish painters, who able to graduate from and take full advantage of a nationalized art education despite their economic circumstances. These artists were poorer and more provincial than those who had previously reached the national stage, but because of the freedoms granted during the revolutionary government, their artworks were being reproduced and more widely distributed than any made before. An examination of Pradilla and the painting makes it possible to map significant changes in the development of Spanish history painting and its audiences.


Figure 1: Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz (1848-1921) *Doña Juana la Loca* (1877) Oil on canvas. 340 x 500 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid. [Click here for high-resolution image.]
In 1875, the satirical paper *La Madeja* published a cartoon summarizing the political regimes from just before the revolution of 1868 to just after (see Figure 2). The cartoon succinctly encapsulates the many reversals of political fortunes taking place in the thirteen years between Rosales’s *Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* and Pradilla’s *Doña Juana la Loca*.

![Figure 2: Tomás Padró (1840-1877). “DESDE ALCOLEA A SAGUNTO. PASANDO POR VARIOS PUNTOS ...” *La Madeja*, Year III, No. 9. (Madrid: 14 March 1875), 2.](image)

As discussed in chapter five, *Isabel la Católica* was a poignant commentary on the loss of empire. It showed what many considered the greatest monarch of Spain, Isabel la Católica, passing on her last instructions to subsequent generations. Three-and-a-half centuries later, Spain had lost most of the empire she had bequeathed abroad and was in a civil war that divided the nation she united. Rosales’s *Testamento* was the distillation of a national regret, shared by Spaniards of all political persuasions, for what might have been. If Rosales’s painting was about a nation that lost its way, Pradilla’s *Juana la Loca* was about a society that had lost its mind.
As discussed in chapter four, the reign of Isabel I was plagued by civil war, economic stagnation, and personal scandals. By mid-1868, the two military defenders of the queen, Generals Leopoldo O’Donnell (1809-1867) and Ramón María Narváez (1800-1868), had passed away of natural causes. Sensing the court’s isolation and weakness, General Prim and Admiral Topete called on military forces to revolt. Even before revolutionary military forces had taken Madrid, the queen left for Paris.⁴⁰⁷

Perhaps even more surprising, before General Prim and Admiral Topete had arrived in Madrid, a coalition of politicians and worker unions had set up a Provisional Revolutionary Government, with the intent of forming a new regime along the lines of the liberal Constitution of 1812. The Constitution of 1868 promised freedom of religion, universal suffrage (male and female), judicial reform, land reform, and economic stimulus. A raft of liberal changes that had been attempted, but not implemented since the French occupation (1806-1814), it was almost immediately hailed as the “Glorious Revolution” — a reference to the English revolution of 1688 — by progressives. And, just like their seventeenth-century counterparts, Spanish revolutionaries hoped to replace one unreasonable monarch (i.e., Queen Isabel II) with a new, more malleable one. After five years, Amadeo I (1845-1890 | Reign, 1870-1873), son of the new Italian monarch Victor Emmanuelle II (1820-1878 | Reign, 1861-1878), agreed to take the throne (1873).⁴⁰⁸

From the beginning, the marriage of military leaders who sparked the revolution with the often radical politics of worker unions lead to a disorganized, unstable government. The day he arrived, General Prim, acting head of the government, was assassinated. Amadeo I stayed for one

---


more tumultuous year before declaring Spain “ungovernable.”

Unable to acquire a new monarch, leaders of the Spanish government declared Spain’s first republic on the same day. But, the promise of a liberal constitutional government was swallowed up in rival agendas among the various military and civilian interests. Over the next seventeen months, there were five new presidents of the republic. Finally, on 29 December 1873 faced with a new Carlist uprising — the third and final stage of the seventy-year-long civil war — General Martínez Campos (1843-1920), a founding member of the revolution of 1868, came out publicly in favor of a restoration of the Bourbon monarchy.

The greatest chronicler of this period was arguably the novelist Benito Pérez Galdós (1843-1920). Galdós began his career in the late 1860s, writing for a pro-republican paper. But, his revolutionary fervor turned into pessimism as the movement became increasingly ineffective and the monarchy was restored:

... our sick nation acknowledges with sadness the sterility of efforts throughout the past century to become a liberal European political regime. The sad thing is it took some years to discover that the mechanism that governs us is an apparatus of admirable form, but it does not work. All the wheels and levers, all the gears and transmissions take the form of cute painted machines, which are used for show. Our political system conjures the most seductive abstractions. Examined from the outside, our codes and all our reams of laws and regulations in their application appear to be, without doubt, a perfect organism that regulates the existence of the happiest people on earth. Viewed from the inside, one can see everything is a smeared tempera painting with some remarkable workmanship, but the painting is already aging badly, and the artifice becomes clearer. There are no eyes ignorant enough to be deceived by it ... The moment has arrived to open one’s eyes widely

---
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and see in all its nakedness and ugliness the error that has been made. Can a nation be indefinitely a witness and victim of wrong without remedying it? Impossible. Men of greater political wisdom recognize it cannot continue thus, and flounder in the net that they themselves have woven, and it hinders them in every great reform effort. But, no one decides to break up artwork, even tearing tiny mesh where a finger can enter, and later a hand, and, after successive tears in the fabric of the liberty of this unfortunate nation...

For Galdós and others who were initially enthusiastic supporters of liberal reform, the previous six years had led to mass disillusionment with liberal, progressive politics and begrudging hope that a return to monarchy was a viable alternative.

The revolution and restoration also altered the Spanish Academy. Previous to the revolution, most major appointments to arts institutions were made directly by the monarchy, under advisement of court artists. But within days of the queen’s abdication, several artists who had been very close to the monarchy and served in multiple positions were dismissed.

---

414 Benito Pérez Galdós. “La España de Hoy.” La Publicidad. (11 April 1901). Reproduced in Laureano Bonet. Benito Pérez Galdós. Ensayos de crítica literaria. (Barcelona: Península, 1990), 229-230. Full text: “Al propio tiempo, nuestro enfermo [se refiere a España] reconoce con tristeza la esterilidad de sus esfuerzos durante todo el pasado siglo para darse un régimen político liberal a la europea. Lo más triste es que ha tardado algunos años en descubrir que el mecanismo que nos rige es un aparato de formas admirables, pero que no funciona; todas sus ruedas y palancas, todos sus engranajes y transmisiones son figurados, como las lindas máquinas pintadas que sirven para el estudio. Forman nuestro régimen político las más seductoras abstracciones. Examinados desde fuera, nuestros Códigos y todo el papelerío de leyes y reglamentos para su aplicación parecerán, sin duda, un perfecto organismo que regula la existencia del pueblo más feliz del mundo. Mirado por dentro, se ve que todo es cartón embadurnado al temple, en algunos trozos con singular maestría; pero ya va envejeciendo notoriamente la pintura, y se clarea de tal modo el artificio, que no hay ojos bastante inexpertos para ilusionarse con él …. Llegado el momento de abrir bien los ojos y de ver en toda su desnudez y fealdad el error cometido, ¿puede un país ser indefinidamente testigo y víctima callada del mal que padece sin ponerle remedio? Imposible. Los hombres de más saber político reconocen que así no se puede seguir, y forcejean dentro de la red que ellos mismos han tejido, y que les entorpece para toda obra grande de reforma. Pero ninguno se decide a romperla con arte, destruyendo siquiera alguna malla por donde sacar un dedo, después una mano, y llegar por sucesivas rupturas de hilos a la libertad de esta desgraciada nación, esclava de lo que aquí llamamos caciquismo, tristísima repetición de los tiempos feudales y de las demásias de unos cuantos señores, árbitros de los derechos y de los intereses de los ciudadanos.”

The most notable of these was Federico de Madrazo (1815-1894), who at the time served as pintor de cámara (court painter), director of the Academia Central de San Fernando, director of the Museo Real del Prado, juror for the Exposición Nacional, and royal advisor to the restoration of the Palacio Real de San Lorenzo del Escorial. In his and other court artists’ places, the Provisional Revolutionary Government appointed artists who, if not overtly liberal in their politics, were at least not as closely associated with the ancien regime. As discussed in chapter four, the artist who perhaps benefited the most from the revolution was Antonio Gisbert (1834-1901), author of Los Comuneros (1860) and Los Puritanos (1864). In addition to portrait commissions for several leaders of the new government, Gisbert was made director of the Museo Nacional del Prado, along with many other official duties. With the dissolution of the First Republic and restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, many of the artists associated with liberal politicians were considered personae non gratae. Gisbert left Spain for France, vacating his position as director of the Prado and abandoning his long-cultivated reputation in Spain to start anew in France. (See chapter four for more.)

As the government switched from revolution to republic to restoration, many positions within the Spanish Academy were taken away and mostly returned to pre-revolutionary arts administrators, but not without the positions themselves being altered in the process. For example, with the revolution, Federico de Madrazo was removed from his position as director of the Real Museo del Prado and Gisbert. At the same time, the Gobierno Provisional Revolucionario renamed the it Museo Nacional del Prado. To reflect the new national nature of the Prado, Gisbert reorganized the royal collection — which, after all, reflected royal collecting — to emphasize Spanish artists to the marginalization of foreign artists, such as

---


Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), Titian (1485-1576), and Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (1696-1770). Eight years later, Federico de Madrazo and, then, his brother Pedro were made the Prado Museum’s directors under the restored monarchy. But, the museum retained the name Museo Nacional and the new emphasis on Spanish over foreign artists remained in force, arguably to the present time.

Another institution heavily affected by the chaos of the period was the Exposición Nacional. Only one contest (1871) had been held during the six-year revolutionary period. This is both because many of experienced artists who had helped organize the contest since 1856 (e.g., Federico de Madrazo) were no longer as involved in the planning of the contests and because the government had other priorities. The Exposición Nacional of 1871 — the one and only presided over by King Amadeo I — featured new rules that reflected the democratic spirit. For example, it was the first contest in which international artists were invited to compete for prizes against native Spaniards. (Twenty-four Portuguese painters and sculptors participated.) Also, artists were no longer limited to the number of pieces they could submit. (Previously, they could submit only four works.) Perhaps most significantly, the jury and voting system changed. Instead of all members of the contest’s jury being made by appointment or statute, from 1871, artists submitting to the contest were able to nominate and

---

418 This change in emphasis of Spanish paintings came, at least in part, as a result of the collections of the Museo de la Trinidad being made part of the Prado Museum in 1872. The Museo de la Trinidad contained large numbers of Spanish paintings that were mostly from religious institutions in provincial Spain. Source: Álvarez Lopera, José. El Museo de la Trinidad: historia, obras y documentos, 1838-1872. (exh. cat. Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 2004).
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elect half of the jury.423

As a result of greater freedom of the press granted in the Constitution of 1869, art — especially that shown at the Exposición Nacional — was being reproduced and distributed on a much larger scale.424 Between 1869 and 1885, the number of popular journals published in Spain that featured original and reproduced works by Spanish artists ballooned from less than a dozen to nearly sixty.425 Not only was there more to read, but more readers. In 1803, only 5.96 percent of Spaniards read periodicals; by the 1870s, some 30 percent had access to print journals.426 This increased capacity and audience for artists meant that, for the first time perhaps in the history of Spanish art, a painting could truly be considered “popular.”

The Spanish Academy itself had undergone significant demographic changes. By the 1870s, as a result of the Ley Moyano, which standardized and centralized education, more students were attending fine art academies both in the capital and in provincial schools. (See chapter three for more about educational reform.) Those attending were poorer and more provincial. This meant that not Francisco Pradilla benefit from the wider availability of arts education; but also, a truly popular distribution of art. Before Pradilla, star painters at the Academia de San Fernando had been almost exclusively from well-to-do backgrounds. Madrazo, Gisbert, Casado, and Rosales had come from wealthy, educated families. They relied almost exclusively on royal or state patronage for their work and income. Pradilla, on the other had, was the abandoned son of migrant farm workers. Even as he studied at fine art academies, he painted

423 Ibid., 98-100.
houses, worked on theater scenery, and illustrated news stories in weekly journals.

Little is known about Pradilla’s life, mostly because he kept so much to himself. On more than one occasion he claimed to be an orphan, which was perhaps more true for want of material support than for lack of parents. Born in 1848 and raised ten kilometers outside the provincial capital of Zaragoza, Pradilla was the second of five children and the eldest surviving. His parents worked at odd jobs and as seasonal field workers. According to later accounts, his family hoped Pradilla would enter the priesthood, but at an early age he displayed a talent for art. Recognizing this, and despite their lack of resources, Pradilla’s family sent him to away to study, hoping that he would be granted a meritorious scholarship. At the age of eleven, he was enrolled in the Institute of Zaragoza, an exclusive private school that served many of the province’s elite families. After submitting a portfolio of his work, Pradilla was granted admittance and a limited scholarship; but money ran out sometime during his second year of studies at the three-year school. Pradilla was thirteen. In his own words: “I was without any support or funds and had to leave the Institute to shop signs.”

This lower-class background was later folded into the narrative of Pradilla’s life, which could itself be seen as the story of a generation of artists and Spaniards who, in modern Spain, were able to achieve previously unattainable goals. In the words of Pradilla’s first biographer:

Indeed, Pradilla, the son of a poor man, was raised by and spent his childhood in the modest and honorable home of a worker. He arrived by his own merits to the utmost dignity in Art, to the “great

427 Wifredo Rincón García. *Francisco Pradilla.* (Zaragoza: Aneto Publicaciones, 1999), 35.

428 Ibid., 35-36.

He soon found employment working at the studio of one of Zaragoza’s most prestigious set designers: Mariano Pescador (1816-1886). Pescador offered invaluable lessons in painting that couldn’t be had at most Spanish or European art academies. From the seventeenth century onward, the education of young artists increasingly moved from the practical craftsman environment of ateliers and guilds toward academies and philosophy. From the eighteenth century to mid-nineteenth century, most artists in training at the academies were not even allowed to paint, only to draw. Painting was learned or experimented with after graduation. This separation from the practice of painting was a common lament of many well-regarded western artists.

Unlike many of his peers, who did not need to work while attending the Academy in Zaragoza, Pradilla gained a practical material education in a working artist’s studio that supplemented his studies at the Academy. In Pescador’s studio, he stretched canvases, ground colors with a mortar and pestle, and made preparatory drawings for Pescador — the kind of work that, for most nineteenth-century painters, was a relic of a lost master-apprentice atelier practice.

Through the theater, Pradilla was also introduced to a rich literary and religious vocabulary. Pescador’s studio produced sets for the Teatro Principal in Zaragoza. The theater was well known for producing works

---

430 Luís Martinez García. *Homenaje a Francisco Pradilla.* (Zaragoza, 1921), 8. Original text: “En efecto, Pradilla, hijo de un desheredado, criado y deslizada su infancia en el modesto y muy honrado hogar del obrero, llegó por sus méritos propios a la dignidad suma en el Arte; ’más allá’ de donde llegan pocos ...”


that appealed to the revolutionary and democratic. For example, in 1865 Pradilla painted the backdrops for Spain’s first production of Giacomo Meyebeer’s (1791-1864) Les Huguenots (1836). The central conflict of the opera is the romance between protestants and Catholics during the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre of 1572. The opera took on special meaning with anti-monarchy audiences throughout Europe. For example, the work was notoriously popular among republican audiences in Paris during the French Revolution of 1848. It’s revival in Spain in the years just before the revolution of 1868 surely must be evidence of similar, republican audiences.

Working with Pescador opened a door to the local Spanish Academy. Pescador was an associate professor of painting at the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Luis in Zaragoza. The Academia de San Luis was a second-tier school in the Spanish academic system and, therefore, its classroom studies were regulated by the Academia de San Fernando in Madrid. With Pescador’s help, Pradilla studied at San Luis from 1862 to 1865, while continuing to work as a scenery designer in order to pay for his studies. He was an excellent student, winning many prizes and distinctions during his studies.

However, no matter Pradilla’s level of success in Zaragoza, a provincial education was nothing more than a stepping stone to a serious career in the Spanish Academy. To progress, he needed to earn the respect of those at the country’s most prestigious arts institution: Academia de San Fernando in Madrid. Pradilla moved to Madrid in April of 1866 at the age of

434 Ranón Casas. “El teatro Principal de Zargoza y su influencia en la escena española durante los dos últimos siglos.” Heraldo de Aragón. (12 December 1943).

435 Xosé Aviñoa. Historia de la Música Catalana. (Barcelona: Ediciones Peninsula, 1999), 104.


eighteen. As in Zaragoza, he started at the bottom and began working his way up. In the words of Carretero, a friend of Pradilla:

Back in Madrid, a couple of set designers, [Augusto] Ferri and [Giorgio] Busato, then fashionable, admitted the young artist into their studio with the responsibility to grind pigments and prepare canvases for painting. Recalling the sleepless nights doing this work, the poverty in which he lived, his suffering eyes, and rejection by periodicals for the lack of artistic taste where it is lacking most, bring us closer to the obscure youth, without looking at his work ... 438

No doubt his work with Pescador either directly or indirectly opened the door with Ferri and Busato. Working as a stage painter in Madrid provided a good living and likely have a significant effect on Pradilla’s art, forcing him to be a quick draughtsman, comfortable with large-scale works.

Pradilla moved in with his paternal uncle, Simón Pradilla, who lived only a short distance from the Prado Museum. 439 Within days of arriving, Pradilla’s signature appears on the Registry of Copiers. The first painting he requested to copy was Rosales’s Doña Isabel la Católica. 440 It was the beginning of a life-long exacting and self-imposed education. Over the next several decades, Pradilla spent hundreds — perhaps thousands — of days in the museum copying works. 441 In 1867, the Prado exhibited roughly 1,700 paintings and sculptures, all from royal collections. There, according to hundreds of entries in the Prado’s Register of Copyists,

438 A. Carretero. Notas de Mi Vida. (Zaragoza: Cervantes, 1905), 43. Original text: “Ya en Madrid, unos escenógrafos, Ferri y Busato, entonces de moda, admitieron al joven artista en su taller con la obligación de moler los colores y prepara las telas para el pintado. Recordando las noches en vela que pasó en estos trabajos, la penuria en que vivía, su enfermedad de la vista, de la que por poco pierde un ojo, los dibujos rechazados en los periódicos por la carencia de gusto artístico hasta donde más falta hace, el paso que todos cierran al joven desconocido, sin mirar su trabajo ...”


Pradilla copied works by Titian, Ribera, El Greco, Goya, and, especially, Velázquez.\textsuperscript{442} In October 1866, Pradilla was at the museum each day it was open.\textsuperscript{443} In the first four months of 1867, his signature appears six times in the Prado's \textit{Register of Copyists}. Copying took up a substantial amount of his time as visits increased: twelve days in May, fourteen in June, twenty-four in July, twenty-five in August, twenty-five in September, fourteen in October, five in November, and ten in December.\textsuperscript{444}

[Pradilla’s] was a perfectly delineated temperament, which cannot be separated from the workings of a slavish and studied preparation. He was inspired by [Francisco] Goya, reproducing true-to-size versions of his magisterial portraits in order to tease out the secrets of their palette ...\textsuperscript{445}

Not only would copying these works provide a remarkable education, but it would also put young Pradilla’s work in view of some of Spain’s most powerful contemporary artists, opening doors for his career.

The Spanish art world was small, and having his easel and canvas in public view at the Prado was not only an education, but an advertisement of his ability and serious intentions. Pradilla’s name appears on the registry on the same day — and often just before or after — some of Spain’s most successful painters of the time: Mariano Fortuny (1835-1874), Eduardo Rosales, Carlos de Haes (1829-1898), and Federico Madrazo. It was a regular gathering place for prominent foreign artists, too. More than 500 foreign artists, including Édouard Manet,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{442} \textit{Ibid.}, and D. Gregorio Cruzada Villaamil. \textit{Catálogo Provisional Historial y Razonado del Museo Nacional de Pinturas}. (Madrid: Manuel Galiano, 1865).
  \item \textsuperscript{443} \textit{Ibid}. NOT CLEAR – USE ABBREVIATED FULL REFERENCE.
  \item \textsuperscript{444} \textit{Registro de Copiantes, 1867-1878}. (Madrid: Archivo-Biblioteca Museo Nacional del Prado, 1867-1878).
  \item \textsuperscript{445} A full-scale copy by Pradilla of \textit{The Family of Carlos IV} was auctioned in Paris in 1878 — at the same time \textit{Doña Juana la Loca} was on display in the \textit{Exhibition Universelle}. Source: Wifredo Rincón García. \textit{Francisco Pradilla}. (Zaragoza: Aneto, 1999), 45. Original text: “... fue un temperamento perfectamente delineado, que no se apartó en sus modalidades de la esclavitud de una estudiada preparación. Se inspiraba en Goya reproduciendo al mismo tamaño sus magistrales retratos para sorprender el secreto de paleta ...”
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Thomas Eakins, John Singer Sargent, and Mary Cassatt, copied at the Prado Museum in the 1860s and 1870s.\textsuperscript{446}

Beginning early in 1867, Pradilla began visiting the private studio of a prominent sculptor, Ponciano Ponzano (1833-1877). Originally from Zaragoza and a graduate of the Academia de San Luis, Ponzano received a scholarship to study in Italy and worked in the Roman studio established by Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770-1844).\textsuperscript{447} Returning to Spain, Pozano became the court sculptor to Queen Isabel II, responsible for restoration and design of the royal tombs — El Pantéon de Los Reyes — at El Escorial.\textsuperscript{448} Ponzano was also an associate professor of the Academia de San Fernando.\textsuperscript{449} With his help, in the same way Mariano Pescador had helped in Zaragoza, within the year Pradilla was accepted into the Academia de San Fernando.\textsuperscript{450}

Although he would one day become one of the Academy’s most celebrated painters, Pradilla was not fully welcomed as a budding artist:

> According to some of his friends, Pradilla, who was at the time a student of the Escuela Especial de Pintura [Academia de San Fernando], did not — despite his hard working ethic — win over Federico de Madrazo ... Even great masters can be mistaken! And Madrazo was mistaken ... [Pradilla] became known to [Eduardo] Rosales and was taken under the wing of the author of Queen Isabel Dictating Her Will and entered into the studio of this great

\textsuperscript{446} Registro de Copiantes, 1867-1878. (Madrid: Archivo-Biblioteca Museo Nacional del Prado, 1867-1878).
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Madrileño. And with this approval, Pradilla thrived. Eduardo Rosales considered him the greatest hope for art.451

The lack of enthusiasm from Federico de Madrazo may have been an exaggeration, because he was impressed enough to invite Pradilla to study in his private studio and, even, allow him to assist in teaching.452

With Madrazo, Pradilla entered the highest circles of the Spanish art world. José Casado del Alisal (1832-1886), a professor at the Academia de San Fernando, invited Pradilla to attend classes at the newly formed Agrupación de Acuarelistas (Society of Watercolorists), founded in 1870. That same year, Pradilla joined the studio of the preeminent Spanish watercolorist of the day, Ramón Guerrero. Taken together, his activities were exhaustive. Yet, he found time to copy almost daily at the Prado.453

It was at the height of his activities in Madrid that a notice appeared in the government's official weekly paper, La Gaceta, signed by the minister of state:

Let us send our youth to Rome with certainty that we provide true progress to our arts. For this we need resources … since the September Revolution, the Ministry of State has had resources at
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451 Rafael Balsa de la Vega. Artistas y críticos españoles. (Barcelona: Editorial Arte y Letras, 1891), 171. Original text: “Según contaba alguno de sus compañeros, Pradilla, que en esa época era alumno de la Escuela Especial de pintura, no logró entusiasmar, a pesar de su laboriosidad, a D. Federico de Madrazo. No creía este, contra la opinión de los condiscípulos del novel artista aragonés, que rebasara de los límites de una medianía menos que discreta. ¡También los maestros se equivocan!, y Madrazo se equivocó. No sé si debido al juicio que el entonces director del Museo y de la Escuela de Bellas Artes había formado de Pradilla, o si porque este obra espontáneamente, es lo cierto que, habiendo conocido a Rosales, y habiéndole recibido como discípulo el autor del Testamento de Isabel la Católica, bajo la dirección del excelsa madrileño estudió, y con tal ahínco y provecho, que Eduardo Rosales le consideró una verdadera esperanza del arte.”


453 According to friends, Pradilla “abstained from going to cafés, theater, and gatherings … even from having friends. Night and day he worked with pencil in hand, and only took time to go to the Museo del Prado and the National Library.” Source: Rafael Balsa de la Vega. “Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes de Madrid, 1899.” La Ilustración Artística. (Barcelona: 3 July 1899), 571. Original text: “Comenzó por abstenerse de ir a cafés, teatros, reuniones de ninguna especial y … de tener amigos. Día y noche estaba con el lápiz en mano, y únicamente lo dejaba para ir a copiar al Museo del Prado y a la Biblioteca Nacional.”
hand. To what greater cause can we give to the thinking of our donors than the work of educating artists? Art is a religion. Lifting between this uncertain world and eternity. Art consoles, strengthens, elevates, as a soul’s prayer, as the vapor of incense disappears into the vaulted ceiling of a temple. And, it is not possible to develop the Republic and the liberty of a people, if we do not unchain the heavy chains of positivism and unless we rise to the heights of the ideal, where the mysteries of the “sursum corda” can be heard and all things which are created soar toward their Divine Creator.454

Founding a school in Rome had been the ambition of leaders of the Academia de San Fernando since the mid-eighteenth century.455 As discussed in chapter three, Spanish artists had informally gone on artistic pilgrimages to Rome since at least the sixteenth century, but artistic scholarships were not institutionalized until the mid-eighteenth century.456 From the 1760s, graduates of the Academia de San Fernando could compete for royal funds, the Spanish equivalent of the Prix de Rome.457 (Francisco de Goya lost the contest, but went to Italy on his own dime.458)

Until the mid-nineteenth century, Spaniards sent to Rome were funded by the crown and supervised by a local director, appointed by the Academia

454 Margarita Bru. La Academia Española de Bellas Artes en Roma. (Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, 1971), 246-47. Original text: “Enviemos pues la juventud a Roma, seguros de que prestamos un verdadero servicio al progreso de nuestras artes. Para ello tenemos recursos. Hay en la Ciudad Eterna fundaciones piadosas, cuyo patronato concierne a este Ministerio ... Desde la revolución de Septiembre el Ministerio de Estado dispone sus fondos. ¿Que empleo puede darsele más acertado al pensamiento de sus donadores que el empleo de educar a los artistas? El arte es una religión. Levantando entre este mundo contingente y la eternidad. el arte consuela, fortalece, eleva, como plegaria del alma, como la nube del incienso que se pierde entre las bóvedas de un templo. Y no es posible educar para la República y para la libertad a un pueblo, si no le desligamos de los lazos pesados de positivismo y no lo subimos a las cimas de lo ideal, donde oye el misterios ‘sursum corda’ que todas las cosas creadas elevan a su divino creador.”
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458 Joan Sureda. “Goya & Italy: from Hannibal to Los Caprichos.” Goya & Italy. Exh. cat. (Museo de Zaragoza, 1 June-15 September 2008), 17.
**de San Fernando.** But, they found their own housing, followed their own regimens, and often supplemented the lack of formal instruction by attending classes at the French Academy.

Successive leaders of the Academy had petitioned for a location of their own in Rome. But, negotiations between the Vatican and Spain had reached dead-ends due to a lack of finances, changing priorities among unstable governments, and lack of a suitable location. When the Provisional Revolutionary Government declared that all church property formerly owned by the crown was now under control of the state, it included a little-utilized monastery: *San Pietro in Montorio.* The site was traditionally considered the location of Saint Peter’s Martyrdom. During the height of relations with the Holy See and Castile, the property was acquired by the Spanish crown and a monastery was built on the site in 1472. With government control of what were formerly church-owned properties, the site was secured as the future home of the Spanish Academy in Rome.

In the summer of 1873, a committee chaired by Federico de Madrazo was formed to create a comprehensive plan for the new school. An official announcement titled “The Obligations of the Pensioners” appeared in the *Gaceta de Madrid* a few months later. The announcement included several significant changes that would differentiate the new program in Rome from any that went before.

First, the new school was to be called the “**Real Academia Española en**

---


462 “Obligaciones de los pensionados.” *Gaceta de Madrid.* (October 7, 1873), 1.
“Roma” (Royal Spanish Academy in Rome). The use of “Royal” in the title was important: It showed that the time had come to an end when, leading to and during the revolutionary period, institutional names were changed from “Royal” to a host of new federalized versions (e.g., Real Academia de San Fernando to Academia Central de San Fernando).

Second, Eduardo Rosales was named director of the new Academy. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Rosales’s success in the Parisian Exposition Universelle had made the painter Spain’s most celebrated artist. Rather than return to Spain and enjoy his success in ways that had been done by other artists — such as Antonio Gisbert and José Casado del Alisal, who used their success to become portraitists and collaborators on government building projects — Rosales eschewed direct involvement in the Academy. Unofficially, he and Mariano Fortuny had been mentors to artists in Rome for several years. The role of the director of the Academy was, for the most part, that of an occasional mentor and supervisor, not a full-time job. The arrangement gave Rosales the freedom to work on his own projects — a combination of private commissions and a relationship with the French printmaker Adolphe Goupil — and the new school an aspirational figurehead.

Third, the number of scholarships was increased. Previous to 1873, three scholarships were awarded to graduates of the Academia de San Fernando: one for painting, another for sculpture, and one for architecture. (Occasionally, as in the case of José Casado del Alisal and Antonio Gisbert — see chapter four — the scholarship committee would send two in the same category.) The new reglamento added landscape as a
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separate and stand-alone scholarship category.\textsuperscript{465}

Fourth, the new Academia en Roma also expanded the definition of what a student would be. Two classes of students were delineated in the reglamento: número and mérito. Students of número were graduates of the Academia de San Fernando who had won the scholarship competition and would be given funds from the central government. Students of mérito had been approved by regional academies of art (e.g., Academia de San Carlos in Valencia, Academia de San Luis in Seville). They were allowed to stay at the Academy in Rome and had to perform the same yearly tasks, but students of merit were required to find alternative funding for their education — usually through their local municipality or a patron. And, they submitted their work to their respective regional academies for approval or disapproval. (As will be discussed in chapter eight, this created a number of problems. It essentially meant there were different standards for students of number and those of merit. The latter were often subject to the demands of less-educated, non-artist bureaucrats working in provincial governments.) Despite its problems, opening up the Academy to a much broader student base changed the demographics of those reaching for a long-term career in the fine arts.

Fifth, competition for scholarships to attend the school was made more rigorous. At the Academia de San Fernando, where there had always been considerable competition for the scholarship to Rome, the announcement for the new school led to a dramatic three-fold increase in the number of applications.\textsuperscript{466}

\textsuperscript{465} This reflected the growing influence of Carlos de Haes, who taught landscape painting at the Academia de San Fernando. Several of his students, including Martin Rico y Ortega, had received major awards at the Exposición Nacional and in foreign contests. Also, during the Sexenio Revolucionario, landscape painting gained a certain patriotic element, as Spanish artists went about painting natural features unique to Spain. Source: Ana Gutiérrez Márquez. Carlos de Haes (1826-1898) Biografía y trayectoria artística. (Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 2002), 95-98.

The year after Francisco Pradilla graduated, nineteen recent graduates from the Academia de San Fernando applied, forcing the scholarship jury to choose between former students, all well known to each other and to the jury.\footnote{Esteban Casado Alcalde. Pintores de la Academia de Roma: La Primera Promoción. (Madrid: Lunwerg, 1990), 39-42.} To both raise the bar and eliminate a higher number of candidates, the scholarship competition was changed from one task to three. These closely followed those undertaken in the French Prix de Rome competition.\footnote{Richard A. Moore. “Academic Dessin Theory in France after the Reorganization of 1863.” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol. 36, No. 3. (October 1977), 145-174.} Competitors were eliminated at the end of each task.\footnote{Paul Rabinow. French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 52.}

Assignments were designed to demonstrate each applicant’s mastery of the various disciplines taught at the Academy: composition, color, tone, the human figure. In previous years, the competition had been a private, institutional affair. But, perhaps due to the public announcement of the new Academy in Rome and the increased public interest in art events, such as the Exposición Nacional, the results of the competition were made public at each stage of the process; published and discussed in newspapers. And, the product of the final task, a history painting, was put on public exhibition in the Ministry of Development.\footnote{Wifredo Rincón García. Francisco Pradilla. (Zaragoza: Aneto Publicaciones, 1999), 38-42.}

The first task was a 35 by 25 cm. boceto (oil sketch) for a Spanish-themed history painting, to be completed over two days.\footnote{A boceto is an oil study, closely related to the French ébauche. Both terms are derived from the Italian abozza (roughing in), the basic cutting in of the painting’s elements in what will become the final painting. Sources: Luis Réau. Lexique Polyglotte. (Paris: Henri Laurens, 1928), 23. Christine Lindey. Keywords of Nineteenth-Century Art. (Bristol: Art Dictionaries, 2006), 62.} The subject, drawn

\footnote{Wifredo Rincón García. Francisco Pradilla. (Zaragoza: Aneto Publicaciones, 1999), 38-42.}
from a hat, was the “Apparition of Saint James to King Ramiro.” The theme was taken from the *Tractatus Septem*, a history of Spain written in 1609 by the religious scholar Juan de Mariana (1536-1624). According to Mariana, the king was unwilling to pay tribute to his Islamic overlords and went to war against a force far greater than his own. By the miraculous intervention of Saint James, the Christian king overcame the odds. Unfortunately, Pradilla’s sketch has been lost. However, records show that he did poorly in the first exercise, placing sixth of fourteen. His classmate and good friend, Casto Plasencia (1846-1890), placed second. Both would advance to the second round.472

For the second exercise, contestants had eight days — three hours each day — to paint a nude model. That they were painting, rather than sketching, the model was significant. It is evidence that by 1873 the Spanish Academy, like the French *Ecoles des Beaux-Arts*, had incorporated the use of oils and not just graphite or charcoal.473 At the end, only four were allowed to move to the third round. Pradilla and Plasencia placed third and fourth, respectively.474

The third and final exercise was the most difficult. Similar to the first, a number of scenes — this time classical in nature — were placed in a hat. The “Rape of the Sabine Women” was selected. The four remaining applicants were given one day to produce a *boceto* for a final work. Each was produced under the supervision of jury member, who ensured that the contestants did not use any reference materials. As can be seen in


473 In 1863, the French Academy hired three painters — Jean-Leon Gérôme, Alexandre Cabanel, and Isidore Pils — to instruct students in oil painting. It was the first time since the founding of the school that oil painting was offered to students, who generally learned to paint while working in the studios of more established painters. Source: Albert Boime, “The Teaching Reforms of 1863 and the Origins of Modernism in France.” *The Art Quarterly*, Vol. I, new series (1977), 1-39.

Pradilla's and Plasencia's works (see Figures 4, 5, and 6), both artists cited another classical subject, the *Rape of Proserpina*. A plaster cast of the work by Vincenzo Rossi (1525-1587) had been part of the curriculum of the Academy.⁴⁷⁵ (See Figure 3 for another version of Rossi's work.)

After a day's work, each applicant's *boceto* was given to the jury and placed in an envelope. The artists were dismissed and given two months to create a finished canvas based on their studies.⁴⁷⁶

Figure 3: Vincenzo de' Rossi (1525-1587) *Rape of Proserpina* (c. 1565-1570) Bronze. 22.5 x 160.3 x 120.2 cm. Victoria & Albert Museum, London.

⁴⁷⁵ *Catálogo de las pinturas y esculturas que se conservan en la Real Academia de San Fernando.* “111, Signatura F-738 bis.” (Madrid: Archivo-Biblioteca de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, 1824.)

Figure 4: Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz (1848-1921) *El rapto de las sabinas*, boceto (1873) Oil on board affixed to canvas. 24.5 x 31.6 cm. Private Collection, Madrid.

Figure 5: Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz (1848-1921) *Rape of the Sabines* (c. 1873-1874) Oil on canvas. 115 x 150 cm. *Facultad de Bellas Artes, Universidad Complutense*, Madrid.
At the end of the two months, the works were put on public display at the Ministry of Development. According to the jury’s own minutes, members were unable to choose between Pradilla and Plasencia. Their works had “excellent but different qualities.” Pradilla was praised for his figures, while Plasencia’s work was considered superior in composition and coloring. In the end, the scholarship jury decided that both artists “deserved to be proposed without preferences between them.” The result was the jury dismissing the scholarship quotas, at least for this first group of scholarship winners, and two applicants, rather than one, from each category (narrative and landscape) were given scholarships to attend

---


478 Ibid.
It would be Pradilla’s first journey outside of Spain. The trip took nearly two weeks. In Rome, he and the other artists rendezvoused with their new director, Eduardo Rosales. But, only a few days after the scholarship winners arrived in Rome, Rosales became ill and died on November 13, 1873. One year later, on November 21, Mariano Fortuny also died. Pradilla became the chief correspondent for news coverage of the deaths and funerals of both artists. Having worked for years as a sketch artist for the *Ilustración Española y Americana*, Pradilla wrote a lengthy dedication to Mariano, accompanied by pictorial accounts of Fortuny’s funeral that would be reproduced widely (see Figure 7). [480]

[479] The following are the first scholarship holders to attend the Academy in Rome, with each one’s specialty:
- Francisco Pradilla (Narrative)
- Plasencia Maestro (Narrative)
- Alejandro Ferrant (Narrative, Meritorious). Ferrant, was allowed to attend the Academy by merit of his success in the *Exposición Nacional* of 1872 and not for competing.
- Manuel Castellano (Landscape)
- Jaime Morera (Landscape)
- Baldomero Galofre (Landscape, Meritorious).


Their deaths were a major blow that threatened the Spanish aspirations of establishing a lasting Academy in Rome. Despite all the high hopes that accompanied the scholarship winners’ arrival at the new Real Academia Española en Roma, renovations on the physical Academia had not begun. The site for the school had been secured, but it was still a functional monastery. It would take several years before students actually lived or attended classes at San Pietro de Montorio. Instead, the artists found studios near the Spanish steps.

---


Despite spending little time with them, Rosales and Fortuny loomed largely over Pradilla and his contemporaries. The two were arguably the only Spanish artists of international recognition — Rosales through his success at the *Exposition Universelle*, and Fortuny in work widely reproduced by the print dealer Adolphe Goupil. They were friendly with one another and jointly hosted informal gatherings of artists at their studios and homes. Like these artists, the scholarship winners surely hoped for both the artistic mentoring that would come from associating with Rosales and Fortuny, but also possibility of a career in the international print market. (Fortuny had performed as a talent scout for Goupil and boosted the careers of several Spanish artists.)

Within days of receiving word of Rosales’s death, the *Academia de San Fernando* named José Casado del Alisal as the new director in Rome. Although not the first choice, Casado was well suited to his position. He was a key member of the scholarship jury and, according to at least one source, he was so disappointed with those who initially applied that he was responsible for recruiting Pradilla and Plasencia to apply. At the time, both artists were in Galicia — Northwestern Spain — where they were employed by the *Ilustración Española y Americana* to create a series of genre works for the weekly publication. Throughout the three years, Casado would be Pradilla’s director at the *Academia* in Rome, an ever-present counselor.

Throughout the three-year period of their studies, pensioners were governed by *Reglamento de la Escuela española de Bellas Artes en*

---


Roma. Known in contemporary records and this study as simply the “reglamento,” it consisted of seventy-two articles, divided into five sections, that dictated the Academy’s management, competition for scholarships, supervisory responsibilities of the local director, and requirements of each scholarship holder while in Rome. Articles 46 through 64 dictate the tasks to be completed by each pensioner in order to graduate from the program. These articles, perhaps more than any other documentation, illuminate what skills the Academy aspired to cultivate in its most accomplished artists.

The first article in the section titled “Obligaciones de los de los pensionados” (“Obligations of pensioners”) states that, in the first year, students were encouraged to travel to cities in Europe “famous for their academies, monuments, and museums.” Near the end of his first year, Pradilla traveled with other scholarship holders to Paris. En route, they stopped in various French and Italian cities, including Pisa, Florence, Venice, Lyon, and Marseille.

Article 48 of the reglamento required scholarship holders to submit two small drawings and a copy of an old master work or fragment from antiquity “that cannot be studied in the National Museum [of the Prado].” As already discussed, Pradilla had spent a great deal of time in the Museum, copying works. His choice to copy this particular work may be seen supplementing a gap in Spanish collections, already replete with significant works by the Raphael. As José Casado del Alisal, the Academy’s director, stated in his first quarterly report:

> The pensioner of merit, Alejandro Ferrant, from the outset, devoted himself with preference to Raphael’s frescoes ... among them, he

---


has chosen a beautiful fragment. Pradilla, along with his friend Ferrant, both diverting somewhat from their initial tendencies in subject and dividing up the work proportionally, are reproducing the lower part of the fresco “Disputation of the [Holy] Sacrament” [1509-1510]. In this great work, they are motivated by a desire that in Spain such a choice, beautiful, and masterful composition be known and studied.490

This approach to the first-year task by Ferrant and Pradilla was notable for several reasons: first, for the cooperation between scholarship students who, if considering the examples of others (e.g., Antonio Gisbert and José Casado), were typically rivals. Second, Ferrant had been given a scholarship for landscape, yet he was allowed to copy figurative compositions. Finally, Pradilla and Ferrant did not consider this to be an exercise solely for their benefit. Instead, they took on the roles of artistic missionaries, for lack of a better term, whose work was integral “to develop the Republic and the liberty of a people.”491

Their copy of Raphael's *Disputation* was sent back to Madrid and hung in the *Academia de Bellas Artes*. There it was assigned to students for

490 Ana García Loranca. *Pintores del siglo XIX: Aragón, La Rioja, Guadalajara.* (Zaragoza: Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad de Zaragoza, Aragon y Rioja, 1987), 46. Original text: “… el pensionado de mérito Alejandro Ferrant, desde un principio, se consagró preferentemente a los frescos de Rafael ... entre los que ha elegido un precioso fragmento. Pradilla, junto con su amigo Ferrant, modificadas por el estudio sus primeras tendencias de elección y dividiéndose proporcionalmente el trabajo, reproducen la parte inferior del fresco de la ‘Disputa del Sacramento,’ en cuya superior empresa les anima el deseo de que en España se conozca y pueda estudiarse tan florida y hermosa composición del maestra.”

491 Margarita Bru. *La Academia Española de Bellas Artes en Roma.* (Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, 1971), 246-47. Full quote: “Enviemos pues la juventud a Roma, seguros de que prestamos un verdadero servicio al progreso de nuestras artes. Para ello tenemos recursos. Hay en la Ciudad Eterna fundaciones piadosas, cuyo patronato concierne a este Ministerio ... Desde la revolución de Septiembre el Ministerio de Estado dispone sus fondos. ¿Que empleo puede darsele más acertado al pensamiento de sus donadores que el empleo de educar a los artistas? El arte es una religión. Levantando entre este mundo contingente y la eternidad. el arte consuela, fortalece, eleva, como plegaria del alma, como la nube del incienso que se pierde entre las bóvedas de un templo. Y no es posible educar para la República y para la libertad a un pueblo, si no le desligamos de los lazos pesados de positivismo y no lo subimos a las cimas de lo ideal, donde oye el misterios ‘sursum corda’ que todas las cosas creadas elevan a su divino creador.”
Pradilla’s first-year task had fulfilled both the letter of the law — by passing the scholarship committee’s requirements — and the spirit of the law — by creating something that entered the bloodstream of the Spanish Academy.

For the second year, according to Article 48 of the reglamento, Pradilla was required to create a painting with “one or two nude figures.” This was not a new requirement. The archive of the Academy of San Fernando has examples of nudes created by Spanish artists working in Rome from José de Madrazo to Eduardo Rosales, who sent back a nude to demonstrate their mastery of the human figure. Pradilla painted a grown man and a child as survivors of a shipwreck, titled Náufragos (see Figure 8). It differs from almost all other works sent by a scholarship holder — past and future — in two respects: It features the male figure, and is placed in an ambitious seascape.

As mentioned before, Pradilla was an avid landscape artist and had competed for both the figurative and landscape scholarships to Rome. In the year between his graduation and the scholarship competition, Pradilla worked as a correspondent for the popular publications La Ilustración de Madrid and the La Ilustración Española y Americana illustrating the difficult lives of Galician fishermen in Northwestern Spain. (There he met and, eventually, married the daughter of a fisherman.) The dark, choppy waters and rocky shore of the painting could easily be the coast of Galicia. In the Náufragos, ambitious in its demonstration of figurative work, Pradilla arguably spent as much time exhibiting his skills as a landscape artist as he had meeting the requirements to paint one or two nude figures.

---

492 Wifredo Rincón García. Francisco Pradilla. (Zaragoza: Aneto Publicaciones, 1999), 57.


494 Examples include La Ilustración de Madrid, Año III, No. 58 (30 May 1872) and La Ilustración Española y Americana, Año XVII, No. 10 (8 Mar. 1873).
The painting, however, was not as well received. It was sent to Madrid, as required by the reglamento, where the scholarship jury gave it an “honorable” rating, which, according to the governing document, meant “meeting the requirements of the rule, or below standards.” Pradilla was censured for being “too realistic,” “to romantic,” “unambitious,” for producing a “work of genre” and, overall, for “lacking obvious progress.” Pradilla was not alone in his less-than-glowing review by the committee. That year, all scholarship holders received a “meeting the requirements of the rule” classification for their second-year works. As director, Casado was also censured for not pushing the scholarship holders hard enough. The common theme in the jury’s criticism seems to be a lack of focus on classical approach to figures and a tendency toward realism. Reading the various reports, it seems clear that leaders at the Academia de San Fernando in Madrid had a particular expectation that artists working in Rome would naturally be drawn to more idealized aesthetics, only to find they were influenced by international trends — predominantly from France — toward realism. Before the jury’s reaction to Los náufragos had reached Pradilla, he was already working on the third and most important task of his studies: a large, multi-figural painting that would be submitted to the jury and, perhaps more importantly, the Exposición Nacional of 1878.

---


Figure 8: Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz (1848-1921) *Los náufragos* (1876) MEDIUM? 265 x 158 cm. Ayuntamiento, Madrid.
On the 23 May 1876, Casado, in his capacity as director, visited Pradilla’s studio in order to help choose a subject for his third-year task. For the visit, Pradilla prepared two *bocetos*, one of “Saint Paul Preaching at the Acropolis in Athens” and the other a “Proscription of Marius by Sulla.”

Both were subjects set in classical scenery. The next day, Angel María Barcía, a Spaniard living in Rome, visited Pradilla’s studio and recorded the debate surrounding Pradilla’s proposed final scholarship work:

This afternoon, I went with Alejandro [Ferrant] to the studio of Pradilla to see the *bocetos* for the painting he will make — beautiful *bocetos*. I couldn't choose between the three of them. Of the three *bocetos*, one is of “Saint Paul at the Acropolis,” another of the “Proscription List of Marius by Sulla,” and another of “Doña Juana la Loca accompanying the body of the King,” her husband, to Granada. The difference between the subjects is evident in the *bocetos*. That of Proscription is very beautiful; the makings of a first-class work. Under the counsel of Casado, Doña Juana la Loca has been chosen; and, he has counseled well, not just as a painter, but as someone who knows how things are. The subject of Doña Juana does well with Spaniards because it is Spanish and dramatic, and because there they understand it. Saint Paul is not for our country at this time, and that of the Proscription, even if it is a marvel, will not be understood. It is Roman, and, as the Romans say, Spaniards are not Romans. There will be exceptions. Who doubts it!? But, except these few, that is how Spaniards are in this regard (and in others they are barbarians).

The three subjects — classical, religious, and historical — and the idea

---

497 From Barcía’s notes, dated 24 May 1876, documented in Enrique Pardo Canalís. Francisco Pradilla. (Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico, 1952), 271.

498 Ibid. Original text: “Esta tarde he ido con Alejandro [Ferrant] al estudio de Pradilla a ver los bocetos que ha hecho para el cuadro que ha de pintar. Bellos bocetos. Ha estado dudando cual de los tres asuntos escogería. De los tres ha hecho bocetos, uno es San Pablo en el Areópago; otro las lista de proscripción de Mario y otro Doña Juana la Loca conduciendo el cadáver del Rey su marido, a Granada. La diferencia que hay en los asuntos, hay en los bocetos. El de la lista de proscripción bellísimo; se adivina un cuadro de primera. Se ha decidido por Doña Juana por consejo de Casado; y le ha aconsejado bien, no sólo como pintor, sino como conocedor de las cosas. El asunto de Doña Juana es viable para los españoles por ser español y dramático y de lo que por allá entienden. El de San Pablo no es asunto de actualidad en nuestra tierra y el de la proscripciones así hiciera una maravilla no lo entenderían; es cosa romana y ellos son para esta lo que los romanos decían a los no romanos. Habrá excepciones ¿Quién lo duda? Pero salvas estas, los españoles en este punto (y en otros bárbaros.)”
that they were being evaluated, according to Barcía, by their ability to speak to “our country at this time,” is a remarkable insight. It confirms that Pradilla and his cohorts were thinking hard about a national audience. And, if forced to choose between the artistic merit and appealing to audience interest in a particular subject, the latter would win.

The first subject mentioned by Barcía was of “St. Paul Preaching at the Acropolis.” A great deal could be read into the choice. With the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, Catholicism received new life. King Alfonso XII restored many of the ties between the church and monarchy. Referring to the revolutionary period as “godless” and its failure as being “divinely wrought,” was common practice. Painting Saint Paul calling on the pluralistic society of Athens to repentance could easily be mapped onto lively Catholic revival. It is unclear why Barcía dismissed it as not being the best choice for the moment.

The second boceto, described as the “Proscription by Sulla,” would have also had special resonance in Spain. Between 87 and 82 BCE, Rome was torn between the democratic rule of ordinary citizens, led by Marius, and the traditional leadership from the aristocracy, which supported Sulla. Marius and his followers — known as the populares — overcame and banished Sulla from the capital. Marius served in Rome for only one year before dying. His attempts to replace the Roman old guard in the Senate and bureaucracy was considered a failure and led to widespread economic failure and violence throughout the empire. After his death, Sulla returned, reestablished the ancien régime, and instructed his army to execute supporters of Marius named on proscription lists. Reference to the historical struggle between Sulla and Marius — the traditional and the popular — would have had a particular interpretation in Spain, which was

---


experiencing what has become known as the “pax canovana.”

On 29 December 1874, the First Republic of Spain was dissolved by a military pronunciamiento and Antonio Cánovas del Castillo (1827-1897) was named the “premier” of Spain. Cánovas was not involved in the military order, but he was widely regarded by traditionalists (e.g., those who supported a monarchy) to be the most experienced leader who had not been involved in the preceding six years of revolutionary governments. Under Isabel II, he had served in various domestic and foreign positions. Cánovas was the principal author of the Constitution of 1876. He brokered the return of the Bourbon monarchy. And, over the next twenty-two years, Cánovas stood at the center of Spanish politics. He famously stated: “In little time, liberty without a strong and sound authority is not liberty, but anarchy.”

In the two years between Cánovas’s appointment to head of the government and Pradilla’s boceto, Cánovas, like Sulla, was using police forces to suppress political adversaries who supported popular reforms. According to Charles Esdaile: “ … the bureaucracy, the judiciary, the officer corps, local government, and the universities were all subjected to a brutal purge; school and university courses were inspected to establish their religious and political orthodoxy; the republicans and socialists experienced greater repression than ever … opposition meetings were prohibited; and the new local authorities were ordered to restore respect for property and hierarchy.” Cánovas’s reforms the language of popular reforms from the Revolution, but in practice they were a reversal of many

---


502 “Proclamación Oficial.” La Correspondencia de España, Año XXV, No. 6238. (31 December 1874), 1.

freedoms. For example, the Constitution of 1876 retained universal voting rights for men, but only those carefully vetted by Cánovas — often wealthy landowners or those with powerful business interests — were allowed to run in local and federal elections. Once asked about this seemingly contradictory arrangement, Cánovas responded: “I am an enemy of universal suffrage; but its practical management doesn’t frighten me.”

It would be insightful to know whether or not Pradilla portrayed Sulla’s purge of populists as a positive or negative. Unfortunately, neither it nor the boceto depicting St. Paul has resurfaced. And, if Barcía is to be believed, they were not of great interest to Casado. During the gathering, a consensus was formed around a subject that had not been expressly considered for Pradilla’s final task. In the previous weeks, Pradilla had created a study for a commission from a “Russian Prince” living in Rome; a person not further identified in the literature. It was a boceto of Queen Juana of Castile (1479-1555, Reign, 1516-1555), known as “Doña Juana la Loca,” accompanying her husband’s funeral train. Casado reportedly believed Pradilla’s approach to the subject was “unique.”

Juana of Castile was the third child of Isabel and Ferdinand. Never expected to rule in Spain, sixteen-year-old Juana was married to Felipe the Handsome (1478-1506), a Habsburg with claims to the Duchy of Burgundy and the Burgundian Netherlands. When Juana’s older siblings unexpectedly died, she became the heir to the Kingdom of Castile at the passing of Isabel. Juana moved from Flanders to Spain in order to assume the crown. But, even before arriving in Spain, Juana’s father, Ferdinand, allied with Felipe, to label Juana as unfit to rule. These claims were based on Juana’s public fits of rage against her husband, who had numerous


506 From Barcia’s notes, dated 24 May 1876, documented in Enrique Pardo Canalis. Francisco Pradilla. (Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico, 1952), 271.
affairs with other women. From 1504 to 1506, Juana fought attempts to label her actions as the result of madness. Several examinations from religious leaders and members of the Cortes deemed her fit to rule. But, over time, unable to compete with alliances formed by Ferdinand and Felipe with Spanish nobles, Juana agreed to joint-rule, first with her father and, then, with her son, Charles I (later known as Holy Roman Emperor Charles V). Charles eventually had his mother confined to a nunnery in Tordesillas, where she spent the last forty-three years of her life.  

Like the other subjects proposed by Pradilla, a painting of Juana had more than just a purely historical element. According to a recent scholarly survey of historical writings on the queen: “During her lifetime, and in the century that followed, speculations about Juana’s mental condition provided historians with a case to study, analyze, criticize, and denigrate the political, social, and cultural conditions that explain Spain’s emergence as a nation, as the capital of a vast empire, and its decline into decadence.”

At the time of Pradilla’s painting, there was a lively scholarly debate on the character and legacy of Juana. In 1868, the German historian Gustave A. Bergenroth (1813-1869) unwittingly initiated a serious controversy in the final volume of his Letters, Dispatches, and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain. The volumes reproduced translated and annotated Spanish royal documents from the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries. While discussing the reign of Charles I, he opined: “The madness of Juana was, as it were, the foundation stone of the political edifice of Ferdinand and of Charles, which would have immediately crumbled to pieces if she had been permitted to exercise her


Drawing on further accounts of Juana’s forty-three-year confinement, Bergenroth — a staunch Catholic — suggested that Juana’s inconstant observance of Catholic rites was evidence that her so-called “madness” was in fact an attempt to hide a greater problem: heresy. In response to Bergenroth, Louis Prosper Gachard (1804-1885), a Belgian historian, translated and published the writings of Francisco Borja y Navarro (1441-1511), a cardinal and close confidant of Juana. His memoirs record vibrant religious conversations with the queen during her confinement. The cardinal would later become close advisor to his father, Pope Alexander VI, and continued to vouch for Juana’s good character as it was questioned. Therefore, Gachard believed that Juana was an upstanding Catholic who was truly mad. Responding to both Bergenroth and Gachard, the Spanish historian Antonio Rodríguez Villa weighed in, stating that Juana was neither heretical nor mad, but simply driven to distraction by her love for an unfaithful husband.

That scholars were debating the origins and nature of Juana’s madness is evidence of the growing and changing theories regarding mental illness. Throughout the nineteenth century, the characterizations of Juana closely follow scientific theories of mental illness.

Although the dynamic exchange between history and literature is common in the fictionalization of any historical personality or event, the case of Juana is especially remarkable. Instead of fiction mirroring history, here historiography seems to have mirrored fiction. Indeed, many of the supposedly objective historical and psychiatric studies of Juana have proven to be prejudiced by the


511 Antonio Rodríguez Villa. Bosquejo biográfico de la Reina Doña Juana. (Madrid: Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, 1874).
traditional representation of her in literature and the visual arts, in particular, the popular, romanticized version of a queen whose jealousy drove her mad. This nineteenth-century portrayal of Juana influenced not only later fictional representations of her, but also historical studies.512

Although Casado had described Pradilla’s approach to Juana as “unique,” there had been many successful treatments of Juana in painting and literature. And, just as Pradilla’s work would reflect the prevailing theories of mental illness of his time, so did those created before.

Before Pradilla’s Doña Juana la Loca, perhaps the popular image of Juana had largely been established by Locura de Amor, a play by Manuel Tomayo y Blaus (1829-1898). The play was first staged in Madrid in 1855 and was performed successively in the capital and Barcelona until the 1920s. As suggested by the title — Madness of Love — Tomayo’s play is centered on Juana’s relationship with her husband, Felipe the Handsome. In the original version of the play, Tomayo’s depiction — even in the title of the play — of Juana conformed to theories of mental illness proposed by the French psychiatrist Jean-Étienne Dominique Esquirol (1772-1840). Esquirol coined the term “monomania” to describe madness caused by an unhealthy obsession with a person or thing. Several works of literature during the 1840s and 1850s were inspired by monomania, including Moby Dick (1851) and Wuthering Heights (1847). In these and Locura de Amor, the principal characters would become normal when the object of their obsessions was removed. Therefore, their madness did not fully corrupt the individual. It was temporary or, in the parlance of Esquirol, “insulated.”513

Tomayo’s Juana was not irrational; throughout the play, she is never


referred to as “Juana la Loca,” but as “The Queen,” “Her Majesty,” or, simply, “Juana.” The plot is driven by the ecstasy and rage Juana feels toward her husband. At the climactic end of the third act, Juana’s sanity is clearly on display when she is put on trial. Standing before a gathering of nobles, she turns on King Ferdinand’s accusation of madness:

KING: Yes; you are mad, poor wretch.
QUEEN: Mad! ... Mad! ... Could it be true? And why not? The doctors confirm it, many who surround me believe it ... Therefore everything must be the work of my madness, and not the unfaithfulness of a beloved husband ... You, my husband, are you not sure I am mad? It is certain, no one doubts it. My God, what joy! I thought it was because I was disgraced; but not so. It was because I was mad!514

Throughout *Locura de Amor*, Tomayo’s Juana is sound enough to diagnose the cause of her own monomania. As the queen fends off accusations and makes passionate claims for her right to rule Castile, she employs reasoned arguments, often outwitting those who call her “mad.”

---

514 Manuel Tomayo y Baus. *Locura de Amor.* (Madrid: F. Abienzo, 1855), 69. Full text:
“REY: Sí, loca estais, desdichada. REINA: ¡Loca! ...¡Loca! ... ¿Si fuera verdad? ¿Y por qué no? Los médicos lo aseguran, cuanto me rodean lo crean ... Entonces todo sería obra de mi locura, y no de la perfidia de un esposo adorado ... tú, esposo mío; ¿no es cierto que estoy loca? Ciento es; nadie lo dude. ¡Que felicidad, Dios mío! ¡Creía que era desgraciada, no era eso: ¡era que estaba loca!”
Eleven years after the premiere of *Locura de Amor*, the painter Lorenzo Vallés (1831-1910) won second prize at the *Exposición Nacional* for his work *La Demencia de Juana* (1866; see Figure 9). Painted only two years after *Testamento de Doña Isabel la Católica* was first shown at the *Nacional*, Vallés’s work is heavily indebted to Rosales, and could almost be seen as a companion piece. The grouping of figures, careful attention to historical detail, pallette, and composition of figures alongside a bed all parallel elements in *Testamento*. The subject was inspired by a sixteenth-century account of the queen by Pietro Mártir de Angleria (1457-1526). Vallés has Queen Juana guarding the corpse of her husband, which she ordered removed from his coffin and placed in his bed, believing Felipe

---

was not dead, but asleep.\footnote{Catálogo Oficial de la Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes. (Madrid: Sorodomudos, 1878.) Original text: “La Reina hizo estar del sepulcro el cadáver de su esposo D. Felipe el Hermoso y colocarlo en su habitacion [sic.] sobre un rico lecho; acordándose de lo que cierto fraile cartujo le había contado de un Rey que resucitó á los 14 años de tenerlo guardado, no se separaba un momento de su lado esperando el feliz instante de verle volver á la vida; todas las instancias de la más respetables personas de su corte eran ineficaces para disuadir de sus manía, contestando siempre, que callasen y esperan que presto despierta su señor. (Epístolas de Pietro mártir de Anglería).” Also cited in Bernardino de Pantorba. Historia y Crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes Celebradas en España. (Madrid: Jesus Ramon Garcia-Rama, 1980), 90-92.} (According to contemporary historians, although Angleria was in close contact with the queen, his accounts of her madness were rejected by other contemporaries as exaggerations or outright fabrications.\footnote{Bethany Aram. Juana the Mad: Sovereignty & Dynasty in Renaissance Europe. (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 2005), 137-150.} The painting shows Juana guarding the corpse, placing a finger to her mouth to keep visitors from awakening her dead husband. Unlike Tomayo’s Juana, who is aware of her malady and capable of reason, Vallés is not depicting the “madness of love,” but a case of “dementedness.” In the mid-nineteenth-century, this kind of dementia was a common reason for admittance to lunatic asylums throughout Europe. While the term applied to a huge variety of cases — from those suffering from head injuries to patients with violent behavior — dementia, unlike monomania, was the result of anatomical problems and considered permanent, rendering the “demented” incapable of reason.\footnote{Simon A. Hill and Richard Laughame. “Mania, dementia and melancholia in the 1870s: admissions to a Cornwall asylum.” Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, No. 96 (July, 2007), 361-363.}

Bergenroth, Esquirol, Tomayo, and Vallés were all concerned with the historical Juana. Within the context of Pradilla’s other two subjects, however, he was perhaps more interested in the possibilities of Juana had as a symbol. It has been the argument of much of this thesis that with the establishment of the Exposición Nacional, historical paintings became, in part, proxies for political and cultural issues. Whether or not it is possible to demonstrate the intentional effects of Los Comuneros (see chapter four)
and Doña Isabel La Católica Dictando Su Testamento (see chapter five), it is clear that they became vehicles for a national discussion. Therefore, Pradilla’s Juana had the possibility of being much more than a reconsideration of the historical Juana. Rather, it is reasonable to see Pradilla using Juana as a way to consider Spain.

Using the theories of nineteenth-century clinicians, at the time of Pradilla’s depiction of Juana’s madness, Spain itself was experiencing a kind of collective madness, called degenerescence. The term was first used by Bénédict Augustin Morel (1809-1873) in his Traité des Dégénérescences (1857). Morel’s treatise was an attempt to explain the recurrence of multiple diseases, both physical and mental, across societies. In the introduction, he explains: “The incessant progression in Europe, not only of insanity, but of all the abnormal states which have a special relation with the existence of physical and moral evil in humanity, was ... a fact which struck my attention.”

The state and individual health had been the subject of political treatises from Plato’s Republic to Rousseau to Hegel. But, within the context of multiple revolutions that sought to dismantle old forms and institute new, often failed forms of government, Morel was perhaps unique in using scientific inquiry to question the costs of progress to the health of individuals. He sparked decades of debate, in medicine and the arts, about whether progress should displace tradition.

Pradilla was painting Juana in the wake of the failure of the First Spanish Republic and during the early years of the restored Bourbon monarchy. Similar public debates on the virtues of progress versus tradition — hellenistic reason versus religious piety — had taken place in France following the fall of the French Second Republic (1851). An observation made in a study of degenerescence regarding the failure of the Second

French Republic could easily be said of the attitudes that prevailed following the failure of the Spanish Revolution: “The course of political events in 1848 and then from 1848 to 1851 bewildered those liberals who had envisioned modern history as inexorable advance. Moreover, conservative denunciations of liberalism gained a new influence and power ... terms such as liberty, science and progress were characterized as pernicious and incendiary ideas.”

About the same time as Pradilla was working on his painting, the French philosopher and author Gustave Flaubert (1821-1880) was developing his unfinished novel *Bouvard and Pécuchet*. It followed the lives of two Parisian clerks through the Revolution of 1848. In his notes — written mostly in the mid-1870s — Flaubert sketched out the ideological struggles his readers would experience vicariously through his protagonists:

Modern man had been diminished and has become a machine.  
Final anarchy of the human race.  
Impossibility of peace.  
Barbarity caused by excessive individualism and ravings of science.  
Three hypotheses: 1. Pantheistic radicalism will break every link with the past, and inhuman despotism will result; 2. if theistic absolutism triumphs, the liberal which has pervaded mankind since the Reformation will collapse, everything is overturned; 3. if the convulsions existing since the [French] Revolution of 1789 continue endlessly between two outcomes, these oscillations with carry us away with their own strength. There will be no more ideas, religion, morality.

In the wake of their own revolution, Spanish philosophers, novelists, and artists — nearly always heavily influence by French ideas — expressed similar concerns, couched in similar language, about which would prevail: the *ancien regime* with its stability and, arguably, its stagnation or revolutionary elements that brought instability and the promise of progress.

---


The author and cultural commentator Benito Pérez Galdós (1843-1920) was like many Spanish intellectuals who initially supported the Revolution of 1868, only later to become conservative apologists.\footnote{Juan Oleza Simó. “Galdós y la ideología burguesa en España: de la identificación a la crisis.” \textit{La novela del XIX: del parto a la crisis de una ideología.} (Valencia: Bello, 1976), 89-137.} In his recounting of the revolution and restoration of the monarchy, Galdós expressed doubts about the benefits of positivism. A philosophy derived from the writings of Auguste Comte (1797-1857), positivism was a “religion of humanity” as well as a theory of communal evolution based on the application of scientific study of “the social.”\footnote{Richard von Mises. \textit{Positivism: A Study in Human Understanding.} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 1-10.} In Spain, it became the predominant political philosophy of the revolutionary government and liberal elites — but its application was considered threatening and anti-traditional.\footnote{Juan Montañés Rodríguez. \textit{Urbano González Serrano y la introducción del positivismo en España} (Cáceres: Diputación Provincial, 1989), 120-130.}

During the 1860s and 1870s, the novelist Galdós had been a widely read newspaper columnist and social commentator.\footnote{Félix Rebollo Sánchez. \textit{Periodismos y movimientos literarios contemporáneos españoles} (Madrid: Huerga y Fierro Editores, 1998), 149-151.} Writing in 1899 about the period, he observed:

Much has been said to denounce positivism in cities: that plague that, between galas and high life, corrodes the moral foundations of society. But there is a more terrible plague: it is the positivism in villages that petrifies millions of people, killing all their noble ambition, enclosing them in a circle of mechanical, brutal, and dark existence.\footnote{Benito Pérez Galdós. \textit{Marianela.} (Madrid: 1899). Original text: “Se ha declamado mucho contra el positivismo de las ciudades, plaga que entre las galas y el esplendor de la cultura corre los cimientos morales de la sociedad; pero hay una plaga más terrible, y es el positivismo de las aldeas, que petrifica millones de seres, matando en ellos toda ambición noble y encerrándoles en el círculo de una existencia mecánica, brutal y tenebrosa.”}

Beginning in the the late 1870s, Galdós moved away from journalism and
toward historical fiction. His multi-volume *Episodios Nacionales* (1875-1917) told the history of Spain from the beginning to the end of the nineteenth century, and are still assigned reading in Spanish public schools.\(^{527}\) In the 1870s, while writing his fictionalized historical novels, Galdós was working on a play about Queen Juana de Castilla. Titled *Santa Juana de Castilla*, the central conflict in the play was between Queen Juana and Flemish ministers in the government. As a result of her weak will and mental instability, she was unable — not unwilling — to represent the interests of traditional values.\(^{528}\) To Galdós, Juana was the metaphorical personification of Spain. Pradilla’s depiction of the queen a year after the return of the Bourbon monarchy, if seen as the personification of Spain itself, may be considered a masterwork of social commentary.

As the embodiment of Spain, Juana was the heir to Castile and all its promise. Juana had never been expected to inherit the throne of Castile. In the wake of political and financial success, Isabel and Ferdinand used their newfound status and capital to marry their daughters, Juana and Catherine of Aragon, to ascendant European families. Away from Spain, Juana fell in love with Felipe, a foreigner. When she unexpectedly inherited the throne, Felipe coveted her power and found willing collaborators within Spain — including Ferdinand, who had no claim on Castile — to take it from her. Her love of Felipe and duty as queen of Castille were incompatible. Love and duty caused madness — or, at least, the accusation of madness.

In Pradilla’s painting and Galdós’s works, the Flemish husband could be seen as the metaphorical personification of foreign ideas (e.g., positivism, krausism), which sought to overthrow what was authentically Spanish


(e.g., Catholicism, a strong monarchy). These liberal policies took place in many forms. They included the centralization of education, land reform, and the adoption of a new constitution.

In Spain, education had largely been the province of the Catholic church, whose priests, both in large cities and provincial towns, acted as school teachers and administrators. For some priests, teaching was the primary source of income. However, the reforms of the Ley Moyano (see chapter three) centralized education in the secular government and attempted to force the standardization of both the curriculum for students and professionalization of teachers. For many rural communities, this educational reform was interpreted as the central government’s anti-Catholic agenda.529

This perception of an embattled Catholic church was furthered by land reform. While Spain’s agricultural sectors (e.g., wool, wheat) had long been the nation’s biggest source of income, only a small number of wealthy landowners benefited from the system. Among the largest land owners, and therefore beneficiaries, of this was the Catholic church, which allowed farmers to work but not own land. Liberal reformers believed that modernization of Spain’s economy depended on increasing land ownership and, as a result, the wealth of these farmers, who would become the basis for a new middle class. To accomplish this, the revolutionary government appropriated Catholic land and sold it at auction. In practice, only a few wealthy landed oligarchs were able to buy the former Church properties, and the government, again, appeared to be anti-Catholic.530

Finally, the Constitution of 1869 was written to grant religious freedom and, while recognizing Catholicism’s special place in Spanish society, separate


530 Ibid.
This meant no longer subsidizing the annual salaries of the priesthood and removing government sponsorship of all kinds of religious activities. In small towns, especially, where Catholic rituals and festivals were inseparable from daily life, this secularization of government was a direct contradiction of Spanish identity.

For conservative and moderate Spaniards, liberals and revolutionaries who had “fallen in love” with foreign philosophies, overthrown the monarchy, and spent several years attempting to implement their failed policies demonstrated that these foreign ideas were incompatible with Spain. Metaphorically, Juana had fallen in love with something foreign in hopes of great benefits.

The revolution had been a painful, failed experiment. In a sense, after six years, Spain, like Juana, was mad — enamoured with something that was incompatible and gazing at the corpse of the revolution, both hopeful and perhaps worried that it could awaken at any moment. In this light, Pradilla’s painting could be the diagnosis of Spanish society as suffering from monomania by obsessing over the death of the revolution, permanently demented from the trauma of recent events, or degenerence, becoming unwell from moving away from its true nature.

531 There are many examples of the contradictory attitudes toward the Catholic church, both calling for the separation of church and state. One worth quoting is a speech by the politician Álvaro Gil Sanz, which called for what he called “religious liberty” and “freedom of conscience,” even while he called for the church to be the “Official Church of State.” Source: Álvaro Gil Sanz. “Contra la separación iglesia-estado.” Diario de Sesiones de las Cortes Constituyentes (1869 - 1971), Vol II. (Madrid: 6 April 1869), 862.


533 This metaphor could be taken even further. Spain joined the European Union in hopes of ensuring a more secure, prosperous future. Two decades later, in deep recession, and forced to meet the demands of foreign leaders, many Spaniards feel that their way of life is fundamentally incompatible with larger European values. With nearly 35 percent unemployment, weekly strikes, and riots, Spain has gone mad.

Looking at Pradilla’s process of creating the painting reveals the artist’s ability to increasingly tease greater meaning out of the work with each version of the scene. In his first known *boceto* (see Figure 10), Juana is imprisoned in the Castillo de la Mota, where she had been confined by her father. She is located on the far right, leaning against a short wall that overlooks the landscape. Someone in the background is holding a torch — indicating it is dark — while several figures come to the queen’s aid. But, the action and figures are confined to the short walkway between the castle and the wall. The drama of the moment is almost entirely limited to the attitude of the queen. As a metaphor, it shows Juana a confined, impotent, and deeply lost figure.

![Figure 10: Francisco Pradilla (1848-1921) Doña Juana la Loca en los adarves del castillo de La Mota (1876) 24 x 38 cm. Oil on canvas. Museo del Prado. Madrid. Inscription: “La Reina Doña Juana la Loca en el ardarve del Castillo.”](image)

---

Perhaps because of these limitations, Pradilla abandoned this treatment in favor of an event that reportedly happened much earlier in the narrative of the “mad queen.” Pradilla settled on a scene from *La Historia de España* by Modesto Lafuente. It described pregnant Juana accompanying the casket of her husband on a 423-mile (681 km) journey from Burgos, where he died, to the royal burial site in Granada:

The funeral train, composed of a multitude of prelates, ecclesiastics, nobles, gentlemen and ladies; a large number of commoners followed on foot and by horses with candles lit. They traveled only by night, because “an honest woman,” Juana said, “after losing her husband, who is her sun, should flee from the light of day.” In the little towns where they rested by day, people wanted to make offerings, but the Queen would not permit any woman near the casket. Her passionate jealousy was the fruit of her transformed mind, which died along with her husband.

During one of these travels, between Torquemada and Hornillos, the Queen ordered the casket be taken from a convent — who she thought was of friars, but who, as she later found out with horror, was filled with nuns — and carried it to an open field. Everyone came to the unforgiving place, suffering rigorous winter cold (December 1506) with the wind blowing out their candles (Pedro Mártil de Angleria, epistolario 339). Time after time, she ordered the casket be opened to be certain that no one had taken the body. In this way, the disgraced Sovereign went from town to town, with a
funeral train and her husband’s body.536

The passage was reproduced for the official catalogue of the Exposición Nacional of 1878, as the painting’s official description.537 Lafuente’s account is apocryphal, based on a story by Esteban de Garibay (1533-1600), who was writing about Juana decades after the queen’s death.538 True or not, it portrays the full absurdity of her madness. And, as an artistic challenge, it allowed Pradilla to demonstrate his skills as both a multi-figural history and a landscape painter.

Pradilla worked at breakneck speed. From the time of Casado’s visit in May, it took Pradilla six months to finish the work. (This compared to the average twelve months used by other students working in Rome on their final task.) From his first sketches to the final work, Pradilla’s varied experience as a stage painter, landscapist, historical painter, and popular printmaker are in evidence.

536 Catálogo General de la Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes. (Madrid: Sorodomudos, 1878), 67-68. Original text: “Viajó de la Cartuja de Miraflores á Granada acompañando el féretro de Felipe el Hermoso, su marido. ‘ … Componían la comitiva multitud de prelados, eclesiásticos, nobles y caballeros: seguía una larga procesión de gente de á pie y de á caballo con hachas encendidas. Andábanse solamente de noche, porque una mujer honesta, debía ella, después de haber perdido á su marido, que es su sol, deber huir de la luz del día. En los pueblos en que descansaban de dá se le hacían los funerales pero no permitía la Reina que entrara en el templo mujer alguna. La pasión de sus celos, origen de su trastorno mental, la mortificaba hasta en la tumba del que los había motivado en vida.Refiérsese que en una de estas jornadas, caminando de Torquemada á Hornillos, mandó la Reina colocar el féretro en un convento que creyó ser de frailes, más como luégo supiese que era de monjas, se mostró horrorizada y al punto ordenó que le sacaran de allí y le llevaran al campo. Allí hizo permanecer toda la comitiva á la intemperie, sufriendo el riguroso frío de la estación (Diciembre de 1506) y apagando el viento las luces (P. Mártir de Anglería, espit. 339.) De tiempo en tiempo hacía abrir la caja para certificarse de que no se lo habían robado. De esta manera anduvo aquella desgraciada Señora paseando de pueblo en pueblo en procesión funeral el cuerpo de su partido.”

537 Ibid.

Doña Juana la Loca is among the most compositionally sophisticated works of Spanish history painting. Nearly all the winners of the Exposición Nacional from 1856 to the 1870s featured strong horizontal lines of figures grouped in threes and placed in the first few inches of the canvas. There
are two surviving early sketches in graphite. The first (Figure 11) conforms to familiar compositional schemes: a wall of figures with little depth of field. The second (Figure 12) breaks from compositional conventions of Pradilla’s contemporaries. Perhaps taking inspiration from his work as a set painter and designer in Zaragoza and Madrid, Pradilla stages the scene with a full cast of characters — a principal, secondary characters, a chorus — placed along multiple diagonals that cross several horizontals. Despite the large number of figures (forty in all), the viewer is drawn to Queen Juana without distraction. It raised the level of compositional mastery for Spanish history painting.

Figure 13: Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz (1848-1921) Study for Doña Juana la Loca (1876) Oil on canvas. 43.8 x 57.7 cm. Private collection. Signed: “F. Pradilla esp Juana la Loca. Diciembre 1876.” Inscripted on the reverse: “Estudio pintado de mi mano para mi cuadro ‘Juana la Loca,’ el año 1876, (españa-Roma) y conservado en mi estudio hasta el presente año. Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz. año 1916”
Before *Doña Juana la Loca*, most Spanish nineteenth-century history paintings had been set indoors. Those that were placed out of doors (e.g., *Los Comuneros* by Gisbert, *La Rendición de Bailén* by Casado) only suggested the landscape. Pradilla was arguably the first to confidently combine the skills of a landscape and figurative artist. Pradilla and his fellow graduates of the *Academia de San Fernando* were among the first Spanish painters to take formal lessons in landscape painting. Their teacher was the Belgian artist Carlos de Haes (1826-1898), who studied French Barbizon painting in Brussels and Paris. During the 1840s and 1850s, he traveled throughout Spain to capture its diverse terrain and became the first and only to win a top prize at the *Exposición Nacional* for a landscape. His rigorous approach led to a teaching position at the *Academia de San Fernando*.

The popularity of Haes’s classes drew large numbers of talented students, which eventually led to creating a dedicated scholarship for landscape artists attending the *Real Academia* in Rome. Haes effectively took landscape painting from next-last-place in the hierarchy of art to being almost equal with figurative painting. But, in his own work, Haes only occasionally included figures and, when he did, they were generally suggested rather than detailed. With *Doña Juana la Loca*, Pradilla instigated a sea change in the relationship between figurative and landscape painting. As mentioned before, he had competed for both the figurative and landscape scholarships. For the setting of *Doña Juana la Loca*, Pradilla traveled with the Spanish landscapist Jáime Morera y Galicia (1854-1927) to Lake Trasimeno, about 200 kilometers north of Rome.\(^5\)\(^3\)^\(^9\) There, he did multiple studies of clouds and soil (see Figure 13).\(^5\)\(^4\)^\(^0\)

With *Doña Juana la Loca* and his subsequent works, Pradilla developed


\(^5\)\(^4\)^\(^0\) Wifredo Rincón García. *Francisco Pradilla*. (Zaragoza: Aneto Publicaciones, 1999), 54.
the reputation of a history painter’s historian. He read widely and had strong opinions about historical subjects. In a copy of *The History of the Catholic Kings* (Prescott) owned by Pradilla, the artist made the following note in the second volume at the end of chapter twenty:

> It is worthy to note that much is written before the *History of Spain* by Lafuente and that both authors are in harmony in language and style, which demonstrates that both Lafuente and Prescott translated their works from Pedro Mártir.541

Pradilla was equally concerned that his understanding of history would be demonstrated in his work. Despite his lack of funds, he hired dozens of models, tailored clothing for each one, and even created a scaled-down version of the scene in clay. He described this in a letter to a friend:

> I hardly know how to procure the means to paint my *Doña Juana*; I hope, nevertheless, with the information gathered as God has given me to understand, regarding the era and costume, I can begin to tailor clothing and create accessories.542

As had been the case in previous works shown in the Exposición Nacional, a great deal of critical commentary would be focused on the perceived historical veracity — or lack of — achieved by Pradilla.

---

541 Cited in Ana García Loranca and Jesús García Rama. *Vida y Obra del Pintor Francisco Pradilla Ortíz*. (Zaragoza: Caja de Ahorros de Zaragoza, 1987), 195. Original text: “Es digno de notar que ésta se escribió mucho antes de la Historia de España de Lafuente y que sin embargo concuerdan ambos escritores en el lenguaje y estilo, lo cual demuestra que así lafuente como Prescott lo han traducido de Pedro Mártir.”

542 Ibid. Original text: “Apenas sé cómo procurarme los medios para pintar mi Doña Juana; espero, sin embargo, que con los datos reunidos como Dios me ha dado a entender, sobre la época e indumentaria, podré bien prontar cortar trajes y construir accesorios.”
Figure 14: Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz (1848-1921) Doña Juana la Loca (c. 1876) Oil on board. Museo Jáime Morera.

Figure 15: Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz (1848-1921) Doña Juana “La Loca” ante el sepulcro de su esposo, Felipe “el Hermoso” (1877) Oil on canvas. 52 x 72.2 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid

Pradilla’s earliest known oil sketch, while rich in color, is painting in strong contrasting colors (see Figures 14 and 15). Although some would later attribute his contrasts and palette to Velázquez, Pradilla pointed to other sources:

I am enamored with Rembrandt, even though I have only seen fragments of his work and some etchings. Looking at them, I dreamed of creating my Doña Juana with a rich and consistent paint, in such a way that even at a good distance it would not be possible to see outlines [around the figures], only solid figures, enveloped in the atmosphere. But, this required that I do several preparatory studies, and I had no more than six months, so that I did the best I could to paint as well as I could, finishing my painting in the required time without erasing or repeating anything, due the difficult working conditions, I lacked exactly the opposite.544

At the time of this comment, Pradilla had already won the award, and one can sense a certain sense of inevitable success. But, Pradilla faced serious competition from his fellow figurative-art scholarship holders, who were also at work on their final tasks. All of their paintings would compete for prizes at the Exposición Nacional of 1877. Due to various circumstances, the scholarship holders would be competing more against one another than anyone else. Many of the artists who had been successful in past years would not be submitting to the Exposición Nacional. Eduardo Rosales had recently died. At the end of revolutionary rule, Antonio Gisbert packed his bags, along with other members of the regime, and moved to France. José Casado had spent his time mentoring the scholarship holders.

Unlike Pradilla, the other scholarship holders had chosen scenes from

544 Cited in Wifredo Rincón García. Francisco Pradilla. (Zaragoza: Aneto, 1999), 67. Original text: “Enamorado de Rembrandt, aunque no conozco de él sino fragmentos y aguafuertes, soñaba con pintar mi Doña Juana con una ejecución muy fundido y de pasta consistente, de modo que a la conveniente distancia no se viese trazo alguno, sino las figuras sólidas, si, pero envueltas en atmósfera; pero es el caso que para ello necesitaba hacer muchos estudios previos y no me quedaban más de seis meses, de modo que empecé a pintar como buenamente pude, acabando mi cuadro en la época prescrita sin haber borrado ni repetido apenas nada, cuando por las dificultades del ambiente, hacia falta precisamente lo contrario.”
Roman history. Like Pradilla, their paintings were multi-figural, monumental in size, and their subjects could easily be seen as commentaries on Spain’s recent or current cultural troubles. In order to understand the critical and popular success of Doña Juana la Loca, it is helpful to know the work in context of its competitors.

Figure 16: Alejandro Ferrant y Fischermans (1843-1917) El entierro de San Sebastián (San Sebastián hallado en la Cloaca Máxima) (1877) Oil on canvas. 305 x 430 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid. [Click here for high-resolution image.]

Alejandro Ferrant y Fischermans, who had collaborated with Pradilla to copy a fresco by Raphael during their first year, painted the Burial of Saint Sebastian (Saint Sebastian found in the Cloaca Máxima; see Figure 16). The painting depicts a small group of faithful Christians recovering the body of Saint Sebastian, who was tortured and martyred by Roman government officials for his faith. A Christian acts as a lookout as Saint Lucina — member of the Roman elite and secret Christian — oversees the relocation of Sebastian’s body from the Cloaca Maxima (i.e. Rome’s
principal sewer) to consecrated ground. The subject had obvious appeal for those who felt that the revolutionary government had been anti-Christian in its efforts to limit Catholic influence in public life. As a work of art, it demonstrates a mastery of the human figure that was common among all graduates of the Academia Española in Rome.

For his work, Pradilla’s longtime friend and chief competitor during the scholarship contest, Casto Plasencia, created the largest canvas ever submitted to the Exposición Nacional. The painting, Origin of the Roman Republic (year 598, before the Christian era; 1877, see Figure 17), depicts the events that caused Rome to transition from an hereditary monarchy to a republic.

![Figure 17: Casto Plasencia Mayor (1846-1890) Origin of the Roman Republic (year 598, before the Christian era) (1877) Oil on canvas. 428 x 690 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.](image)

Artistically, it was not only ambitious for its almost seven-meter length and dozens of figures, but for Plasencia’s blatant attempt to demonstrate continuity between his work and the recently deceased Eduardo Rosales.

---

Plasencia’s painting could be considered a sequel to Rosales’s final work, *La Muerte de Lucrecia* (1871). As a subject, it is a criticism of the restored monarchy. Lucretia was reportedly the daughter of a prominent Roman/Latin citizen. She was raped by the son of the Etruscan King and, rather than live with the consequences, committed suicide. Her death shocked the two peoples who had been at war, and led to an alliance between the leading families and the foundation of the Roman republic.\footnote{José Luis Diez. “Eduardo Rosales, La Muerte de Lucrecia.” *El siglo XIX en el Prado.* Exh. Cat. (Museo Nacional del Prado, 31 October 2007-20 April 2008), 218-224.}

On 25 August 1877, all three works (*Doña Juana la Loca*, *The Burial of Saint Sebastian*, and *The Origin of the Roman Republic*) were included in an exhibition of the *Societá di Amatori e Cultori* at the *Piazza del Popolo* in Rome. The Spanish ambassador to Italy, Diego Coello y Quesada, reported that the exhibition was:

... visited by very many personalities of the highest classes of society: foreign diplomats, the directors of the French and German academies, along with those of other nations, and eminent artists like the German sculptor Müller and the Italian painter Morelli. They were especially taken with *Doña Juana la Loca* by Pradilla ...\footnote{Cited in Ana García Lorancà. *Pintores del siglo XIX: Aragón, La Rioja, Guadalajara.* (Zaragoza: Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad de Zaragoza, Aragon y Rioja, 1987), 56. Original text: “... visitada por numerosísimas personalidades de las altas clases sociales, cuerpo diplomático extranjero, directores de la Academia Francesa y Alemana y otras naciones y de artistas tan eminentes como el escultor alemán Müller y el pintor italiano Morelli; llaman la atención en episodio sobre Doña Juana la Loca de Pradilla ...”}

Correspondents for Spanish weeklies attended the event and filed stories from Rome. Reaction to *Doña Juana la Loca* was reportedly so intense that women who came to the exhibition “couldn’t help but look upon the scene of melancholy and sadness without crying themselves.”\footnote{Bernardo Ferandis. *Los Primeros Pensionados.* (Valencia: Diputación Provincial, 1965), 47. Original text: “... la impresión fue tan intensa que no faltaron mujeres a quienes la escena de melancólica tristeza arrancó lágrimas.”}

The capital work of this small salon is Pradilla’s painting “Juana la Loca”; Masterfully captured, this stunning composition is of a rich...
color and a beautiful quality of painting. The costumes are treated with great skill, and the accessories in the foreground are of a just and firm execution that they appear to leave the picture without diverting attention from the principal figures. Harsh critics have found certain postures too academic and certain figures without character; if there is some truth in this, the qualities of this just and powerful painting represent themselves of sufficient quality to compensate.\textsuperscript{549}

The exhibition of student works acted as a kind of press event, promoting them several weeks before the scholarship committee and jury for the \textit{Exposición Nacional} would see the pieces in Madrid. In this quarterly report, dated 10 September 1876, Casado wrote:

In an inspired composition, full of romanticism and beauty, Mr. Pradilla has painted an episode from the life of Doña Juana la Loca, and created a canvas that is bound to cause a sensation because of its beauty.\textsuperscript{550}

By several accounts, Pradilla went on a charm offensive. Arriving in Madrid before \textit{Doña Juana la Loca}, he gifted several preliminary sketches for the painting, which were autographed with personal dedications (Figures 13, 14, and 15 are three of these) to several teachers and painters who happened to be members of the scholarship committee and jury for the \textit{Exposición Nacional}. The painting arrived in Madrid in November and the scholarship committee met on December fourth. Pradilla received the highest possible categorization, according to the \textit{reglamento} — “very honored qualification” — along with a special commendation, added just

\textsuperscript{549} Quoted in Raymond Reynders. “L’Exposition de l’Academie d’Espagne à Rome.” \textit{L’Art}. (Paris: 1877), 69-70. Original text: “La obra capital de este pequeño salón es el cuadro de Pradilla ‘Juana la Loca’: esta imponente composición magistralmente plasmada, es de un colorido muy rico y de una bella calidad de pintura. Los paños están tratados con amplitud, y los accesorios de primer plano son de una justicia y firmeza de ejecución tales, que casi les hacen salir del cuadro, sin que desvien la atención de las figuras principales. Severos críticos han hallado ciertas posturas demasiado académicas y ciertas figuras sin carácter; si hay algo de verdad en esto, las calidades de esta pintura ajustada y poderosa se afirman con la suficiente calidad como para compensarlo.”

\textsuperscript{550} Esteban Casado Alcalde. \textit{Pintores de la Academia de Roma: La Primera Promoción}. (Barcelona: Lunwerg Editores, 1990), 65. Original text: “El Sr. Pradilla en una inspirada composición llena de romanticismo y de belleza pinta un episodio de la vida de Doña Juana la Loca y va creando un cuadro que ha de causar gran sensación por su hermosura.”
for the occasion — “most honorable.”

It was only a few days later that the jury for the Exposición Nacional of 1877 was convened. As had been the case in past contests, members were made up of politicians, painters, sculptors, architects, and scholars. Unlike previous exhibitions, jury members were not appointed by the court. Half of the judges were there by legislative mandate and the other half were elected by artists competing in the contest. (This closely mirrored similar rules established in the French Salon.)

Four hundred and four paintings were accepted by the jury. By their own admission, the task of judging between them was overwhelming both in number and in artists submitting to the contest for the first time. As discussed before, many of the familiar artists from past Exposiciones Nacionales had not submitted works in 1877. Most were from recent graduates of regional academies:

... In no other Exposición have such a great number, or of such great dimensions, of notable historical pictures been presented. As a result, the Jury believes it is necessary to congratulate our young artists, expressing the pleasure produced by their enthusiasm for having undertaken the true path of art, noble aspirations,

---

551 Ibid., 67. Full quote: “El Señor Presidente propuso en vista de la conformidad de todos los Señores Jurados, sobre la superioridad del cuadro del Señor Pradilla, respecto a los demás de los Señores pensionados, hacer constar en Acta, que la citada obra, merecía el aplauso unánime del Jurado, que con la mayor satisfacción le otorgaba la calificación ‘más honrosa.’”


The president of the jury, José de Cárdenas (director of the public instruction), believed that members should take into consideration the recent exhibition in Rome and grant Doña Juana la Loca a medal of honor. Three votes were taken on the measure. The first regarded whether a medal of honor should be awarded. All twenty members voted unanimously in the affirmative. The second vote was to decide which category of the contest (i.e., painting, sculpture, or architecture) should be under consideration for the medal of honor. Unsurprisingly, votes were made largely along the background of each jury member: sculptors for sculpture, architects for architecture, and the rest for painting. Painting won a large majority. The final vote was for which painting would be given the award. The final vote was twelve for Doña Juana la Loca by Pradilla, two for El Entierro de San Sebastián by Alejandro Ferrant, and four protest votes. According to the painter Enrique Mélida y Alinari (1838-1892), he and four other jury members voted in protest because the vote did not “consider the concrete work itself.” If he is to be believed, the vote was taken without jury members being allowed to discuss the work in any way. Only a “yay” or “nay” is recorded in the minutes.

In the end, Pradilla was the first recipient of the medal of honor since the

554 Cited in Bernardino de Pantorba. Historia y crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de bellas artes celebradas en España. (Madrid: Jesús Ramón García-Rama J., 1980), 15. Original text: “Grata por más de un concepto ha sido la misión llevada a feliz término por el Jurado … en ninguna otra exposición se presentaron en tan gran número cuadros históricos notables, de grandes dimensiones y del Jurado se cree en el deber, con tal motivo, de felicitar a nuestros jóvenes artistas, expresándose la complacencia que le produce el entusiasmo y la abnegación con que emprenden el verdadero sendero del arte, aspirando noble y patrióticamente a ser los continuadores de nuestras glorias tradicionales.”


creation of the *Exposición Nacional* in 1856. Casto Plasencia and Alejandro Ferrant were each given first-place medals. All graduates — painters, sculptors, and architects — from the *Real Academia* in Rome were given first- or second-place medals. Each graduate from the *Academia Española* in Rome was granted a first-place medal. In all, there were four first-prize medals, five second-place medals, and fourteen third-place medals.\(^557\)

Critical reaction to Pradilla’s painting was overwhelmingly and nearly universally positive. Criticisms of the work were few, and remarkably deferential and focused on small, technical issues. For example:

[These women] don’t feel the cold of Burgos's rigorous December nights, where they are in the open air. There is no one suffering in Pradilla's painting, no semblance of the unsupportable, miserable temperature ... We don't note these defects in order to diminish or detract from the merit of *Doña Juana la Loca*. We commit these observations to the judgment of Mr. Pradilla. And, if he finds them valid, they will be an antidote against the venom of unreflecting praise which may detain him on his path ... \(^558\)

Peregrín García Cadena, who had been severely critical of Pradilla’s work the year earlier, wrote:

Mr. Pradilla has made a big step in his career. When, only some months ago in the privacy of the jury of certification of works by pensioners in Rome, we examined *El Náufrago* ... we could not imagine that in such a short time [Pradilla] would awaken his faculties to such work as is seen in this competition .... The luck will not run out on this painting by Mr. Pradilla: *Doña Juana la Loca* represents a real and lasting value, but we must not forget that this is one of enormous value. The work of the distinguished pensioner

---

\(^557\) Bernardino de Pantorba. *Historia y Crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes Celebradas en España*. (Madrid: Jesus Ramon Garcia-Rama, 1980), 104-105.

\(^558\) Peregrin Garcia Cadenal. *Ilustración Española y Americana* (30 January 1878), 62. Original text: “ ... no sienten el frio de Burgos de una noche rigorosa de diciembre, pasada al aire libre. No hay ningún cuerpo arrecido en el cuadro del Sr. Pradilla, ningún semblante que expresa el malestar de una temperatura insoportable ... No notamos estos defectos para amenguar ni en un ápice el mérito de Doña Juana la Loca. Cometemos estas observaciones al juicio del Sr. Pradilla, por, si, creyéndose fundadas, pueden servir de antídoto contra el veneno de un elogio irreflexivo que le detenga en su camino ...”
in Rome has great qualities of beauty, qualities superior to any since the beginning of our movement ...559

A local paper from Pradilla’s hometown of Zaragoza celebrated the success *Doña Juana la Loca* by making comparisons to another painter from the region:

Francisco Goya remained in heaven
and Francisco Pradilla came to earth.560

The same critics who, a few years earlier, had criticized Rosales for being a young upstart praised Pradilla for being a young genius and the inheritor of Rosales’s mantle. The critic Jacinto Octavio Picón wrote:

The canvas of Mr. Pradilla, *Doña Juana la Loca*, is, without any doubt, not just the most notable work of those numbered in the *Exposición*. It is also the best conceived by a Spanish painter since the death of Rosales ... The grouping of figures is full of poetry and truth; its drawing is of such naturalism and such pure reason that not only does it delineate the proportion, but it imprints the character of the human figure, and it is at the same time true and natural, graceful without affectation and vigor without hardness, constructs bodies solidly, indicating clothing, modeling forms. In a word, the soul of this work is extraordinarily conceived.561

559 Ibid. Original text: “El Sr. Pradilla ha dado un gran paso en su carrera. Cuando hace algunos mese examinábamos en el seno del Jurado de calificación de los trabajos de los pensionados en Roma El Náufrago ... no imaginábamos ciertamente que en tan breve espacio de tiempo realizará este artista un desenvolvimiento de sus facultades como el que se manifiesta en la obra destinada al concurso actual…. No correrá esta suerte el cuadro del Sr. Pradilla: Doña Juana la Loca representa un valor real y duradero; pero no hay que olvidar que se trata de un valor á cuenta. El trabajo del distinguido pensionado de Roma tiene grandes condiciones de belleza; condiciones superiores á las que han realizado desde el principio de nuestro movimiento ...”


561 Jacinto Octavio Picón. El Imparcial. Original text: “El lienzo del señor Pradilla, Doña Juana la Loca, es, sin duda alguna, no solamente la obra más notable de las que figuran en la Exposición, sino también la mejor concebida por un artista español desde la muerte de Rosales … La agrupación de los personajes está llena de poesía y de la verdad; su dibujo es de tal naturaleza, de raza tan pura, que no sólo sirven sus líneas para fijar las proporciones, sino que hasta llega a imprimir carácter a la figura humana, y siendo a la vez que verdadero y natural, graciosos sin afectación y vigoroso sin dureza, construye sólidamente los cuerpos, señala los ropajes, modela las formas; en una palabra, el alma de esta extraordinaria concepción.”
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The comparison to Rosales is not surprising, but it raises several questions about what, if anything, the two shared in common. Unquestionably, they were like-minded in subject, at least in regards to historical period (but the same could be said of Plasencia’s painting and its connection to Rosales’s *Lucrezia*). In regard to style, the term “naturalism” was used to describe the works of Rosales and Pradilla. (See chapter five to revisit the contemporary use of “naturalism.”)\(^{562}\)

Regardless of their similarities, there is a great deal to differentiate Rosales and Pradilla. Compositionally, they are worlds apart. All of Rosales’s scenes are tightly grouped figures placed within an interior space. Pradilla, in this and nearly all his works, spread his figures throughout a large landscape. There is also huge difference in the demeanor or attitude exuded by each work. Rosales’s *Isabel la Católica* is reserved. The figures are idealized and nearly expressionless. Pradilla’s painting is full of drama. In this sense, Rosales’s *oeuvre* was a continuation, rather than a break from a tradition going back to the neoclassicism of José de Madrazo (see chapter three). The theatricality of *Doña Juana la Loca* would, arguably, become its most enduring and influential characteristic. In his survey of Spanish history painting, the historian Carlos Reyero wrote:

> Indeed, Pradilla’s *Juana la Loca* is a milestone work: From a

\(^{562}\) Peregrín García Cadena. *Ilustración Española y Americana* (30 January 1878), 62. Full quote WHAT IS THIS QUOTE??: “... cualesquiera que sean los defectos de concepción y de imitación literal de que adolece, está sentido y pensado; se aparta completamente de esa escuela, o por mejor decir, de esa falta de escuela que busca la belleza del arte en la reproducción, siempre imperfecta, de la realidad; que imagina que la excelencia de la pintura se encierra en los secreto del procedimiento y del color en la fiel reproducción del dato sometido al análisis del artista y a las sabias o felizmente instintivas combinaciones de la paleta, y que califica con el nombre inconscientemente desfeñoso de académicas las obras sublimes, que aún en los tiempos en que la crítica tiende a identizar la personalidad original y soberbia del escritor, rechazando o poniendo puntos y comas a las ideas recibidas, están reputadas como la más alto expresión de la belleza a que ha llegado el genio artístico de la humanidad. En este concepto el Sr. Pradilla ha realizado un gran progreso, ha dado un paso de gigante que le coloca resueltamente en el camino por donde se llega a las eminencias reservadas en el porvenir a los artistas que, en medio de la confusión en que vivimos, buscan en sus obras la realización de un ideal.”
thematic and iconographic point of view, although the argument is not new, it contributes mightily to the “de-imperialization” of the genre in the sense that it strengthens a history of sentimental character, more poetic and, also, more fantastic. From a formalist point of view, its incidence is of even greater cause: Even though direct observation of reality is an old requirement [for Spanish painters], only beginning with Pradilla can it be spoken of realism in history painting, so much so that contemporaries used the terminology “style of Pradilla.”

Reyero, it appears, was concerned with putting Pradilla and Doña Juana la Loca within the narrative of the history of art. But, as was shared at the beginning of this chapter, the historian-painter Aureliano Beruete y Moret seemed more interested in placing the work in the history of socio-political life and the fortune of paintings:

It has been said that with [Eduardo] Rosales’s painting Queen Isabel Dictating Her Will, [Spanish painting] was at its greatest manifestation. And now we affirm that with Doña Juana la Loca, it reached its most dramatic, popular, and triumphant.

It is perhaps the dramatic nature combined with wide distribution that aided its popularity. Before 1868, critics spent a great deal of energy describing the work. But, the explosion of print journals resulting from new freedoms of the press meant that reproductions of works submitted to the Exposición Nacional were available throughout Spain. Having worked

563 Cited in Bernardino de Pantorba. Historia y Crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes Celebradas en España. (Madrid: Jesus Ramon Garcia-Rama, 1980), 112-113. Original text: “En efecto, la Juana la Loca de Pradilla se trata de una obra-hito: desde el punto de vista temático-iconográfico, aunque el argumento no es nuevo, contribuye poderosamente a “desimperializar” el género en el sentido de que fortalece una historia de carácter sentimental, más poética y más fantástica también; desde el punto de vista formal su incidencia es acaso mayor: aunque la observación directa de la realidad es exigencia antiqua, sólo a partir de Pradilla puede hablarse de realismo en la pintura de historia; tanto es así, que los contemporáneos extienden la terminología ‘estilo de Pradilla.’”

564 Aureliano Beruete y Moret. Historia de la pintura española en el siglo XIX. (Madrid: Ruiz Hermanos, 1926), 118. Original text: “En efecto, es digno de la popularidad que goza. Una crítica estrecha y excesivamente rigurosa, podría encontrar en él alguna deficiencias pictóricas, pero lo interesante y bien dispuesto del asunto y u efecto dramático lo hacen único en su género. Decíamos al hablar de Rosales, que la pintura española había llegado con Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento, a su más alta manifestación, y ahora afirmamos que con Doña Juana la Loca llega a su manifestación más dramática y alcanza su más popular y general triunfo.”
successfully as a correspondent for the *Ilustración Española y América*, Pradilla was perhaps more aware than most artists of how his final work would be translated into print. For the year following his graduation from the *Academia de San Fernando*, he did oil painting and watercolor genre scenes, which were then sent to Madrid to wood engravers, who processed them into black and white for the weekly magazine. He undoubtedly learned over time what translated well into print and what did not.

Using their relationship to mutual benefit, Pradilla collaborated with his former colleagues to provide a special center fold-out woodblock print that was distributed in the country’s most popular weekly artist magazine (see Figure 18):

Shortly, all subscribers of the *Ilustración Española y Americana* will receive an excellent copy of the painting *Doña Juana la Loca* drawn by the same triumphant artist, Francisco Pradilla, and [wood] engraved by A. Carretero; something that we will be the first to offer to the public. Mr. Pradilla, to this point, had not authorized its reproduction, not even in photographs, reserving the honor and right for his old friend, *La Ilustración*, given our long history together.\(^{565}\)

---

\(^{565}\) From 1869 to his scholarship period in Rome, Pradilla had worked as an artist for the *Ilustración Española y Americana*, depicting contemporary scenes in Spain’s northwestern region of Galicia. Source: “A Los Señores Escritores.” *La Ilustración Española y Americana*. (8 September 1878), 146. Original text: “En breve recibirán los Sres. suscriptores de la Ilustración Española y Americana una excelente copia del cuadro de Doña Juana la Loca (en tamaño planos periódico), dibujada por el mismo laureado artista don Francisco Pradilla, y grabada por D.A. Carretero; obra que seremos los primeros en dar a conocer al público, pues el Sr. Pradilla no ha autorizado hasta ahora la reproducción de su cuadro, ni aún por fotografía, reservando a su antigua amiga La Ilustración un honor y un derecho por los cuales le estamos profundamente conocidos.”
Although Reyero was writing several years after the fact, Pradilla’s contemporaries — in stark contrast to their initial lack of positive reaction to *Isabel Dictando su Testamento* — recognized the significance of *Doña Juana la Loca* immediately and the talent of Pradilla in particular. Peregrín García predicted that *Doña Juana la Loca* would not only never be forgotten, but that it would “regenerate our effeminate school of painting.”

For García, Casado, and others at the time, “effeminate” was another word for “French.” In art, literature, and even politics, France was the subject of frequent, jealous attacks. But, as was shown, with the success of *Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* (see chapter five), the Spanish were very serious about French reactions to Spanish art. Shortly after the closing of the *Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes* in Madrid, another *Exposición Nacional* was to take place in Paris — the first since Rosales’s resounding

---

success. So, it is safe to assume that, when selecting the recipient of the medal of honor for the national event, the jury was also considering what would be a good representative of the nation in the international event.

From May to November 1878, *Doña Juana la Loca* was on show in Paris, along with 115 contemporary paintings. All of the first-place medal winners’ works from that year’s *Exposición Nacional* in Madrid were on show, including multiple works by Eduardo Rosales and Mariano Fortuny, with *Doña Juana la Loca* taking center stage and hung directly opposite the entrance. As a result, the 1878 Exposition was a much stronger and representative showing of what was happening in Spain than what had happened four years earlier. French critics were notably surprised and delighted:\footnote{Exposition Universelle Internationale de 1878 à Paris. Catalogue Officiel publié par le Commissariat Général, vol. I Groupe. I: Œuvres d’art. (Paris. 1878), 223-228.}

The exhibition of Spanish painting has been a surprise to everyone. Just a short time ago, Spain wasn’t considered one of the “artistic nations”... After many centuries of silence, it asserts itself once more. The old genius of Spain is reborn, more powerful and more vigorous than ever ... We need to take note: Spanish art has been revived with an autonomy and originality all its own.\footnote{F. Dufour. “Voyage autour du monde artistique.” L’art contemporain, Paris, (1879), 26-32. Original text: “... la exposición de la pintura española ha sido para todos una sorpresa. Desde no hace mucho tiempo España no contaba entre las naciones artísticas ... Después de varios siglos de silencio, viene a afirmarse de nuevo. El viejo genio español renace, más potente y más vigoroso que nunca ... Hoy tiene lugar el despertar, y el arte español resucita con una autonomía y una originalidad propias.”}

By all accounts, Pradilla’s painting was the jewel of the event.\footnote{Charles Tardieu. “La peinture à l’Exposition universelle de 1878. L’Ecole espagnole,” L’Art. XIV, March 1878, 297-304, and La Correspondencia de España. “Variedades: La Exposición de París.” Year XXIX, No. 4790, 25 June 1878. Original text: “¿Recuerdan Vds. Las locas de la Salpêtrière, de M. Robert Fleury? Están en aquel cuadro presentados con notable maestria todos los géneros de locura, menos una, la locura tierna. Al contemplarlo se experimentó pena, pena en que el horror domina, donde la compasión no aparece. Aterroriza, más no necesita al pesar. El horrible realismo excluye de él esta poesía, madre de la piedad que se une a ciertos seres privados de razón. Nada de aquella locura dulce, en una palabra, que atrae en vez de alejar ver las espaldas; Juana la Loca está impregnada de toda esa poesía en el cuadro del Sr. Pradilla ... Es ofelia que tiene recuerdos y cuya imaginación esta sida, si tiñe lo más sonrientes colores ...”}


\footnote{F. Dufour. “Voyage autour du monde artistique.” L’art contemporain, Paris, (1879), 26-32. Original text: “... la exposición de la pintura española ha sido para todos una sorpresa. Desde no hace mucho tiempo España no contaba entre las naciones artísticas ... Después de varios siglos de silencio, viene a afirmarse de nuevo. El viejo genio español renace, más potente y más vigoroso que nunca ... Hoy tiene lugar el despertar, y el arte español resucita con una autonomía y una originalidad propias.”}

a central talking point and representation of what the Spanish school was. Having seemingly sprung from nowhere, critics had some difficulty trying to orient Spanish art in relation to other schools of art. One critic began by comparing Doña Juana la Loca to works by Slavic artists working in Paris, and at least one Frenchman:

I do not know, among modern history paintings, any work superior to that of Pradilla ... Machart, Piloty, Siemiradski, Matejko, and perhaps even Munkacsy, who are the princes of large-scale modern art in the manner of Titian, Rubens, and Velázquez. After Ussi, Italy has not produced a rival; and, in France, only Laurens could compare to these masters. Pradilla had equaled them, if not surpassed them. There is only one defect — one that is serious for many: He is Spanish and has produced a one-of-a-kind.

There is interest in comparing Jean-Paul Laurens (1838-1921) and Pradilla, in particular, L’excommunication de Robert le Pieux (1875, see figure 19). Laurens’s painting had a high-profile showing at the 1875 Salon. While there is no known record of Pradilla referring to Laurens or the painting, Pradilla had traveled to Paris in the summer of 1875 with other scholarship holders. It is extremely likely that he saw it in print, if not on the walls of the Salon. The two paintings share an obvious sense of historical aesthetic, and even compositional depth. But, more importantly, they share a similar kind of theatrically, one that is not derived from depicting the moment of action, but the emotional consequences of the action. It is the space between the climax and the denouement. This is in contrast to Gisbert’s Comuneros and Rosales’s Testamento, both of which

---

570 Anonymous. “Les Beaux Arts à Etranger. En Espagne.” Moniteur des arts. (30 June 1882). Original text: “No conozco, entre las pinturas históricas modernas, una obra superior a la de Pradilla ... Machart, Piloty, Siemiradski, Matejko y tal vez también Munkacsy, son los pincipes del arte moderno en grande, a la manera de Ticiano, Rubens, y Velázquez. Después de Ussi, Italia no ha dado a conocer otro que pueda ser comparado, y en Francia sólo Laurens podría aproximarse a los maestros señalados. Pues bien, Pradilla los ha igualado, si no superado. Sólo hay un defecto, muy grave para muchos, es que es español y ha producido una obra fuera de serie.”

571 José Casado del Alisal. Letter dated “20 April 1875.” Archivo Asuntos Exteriores, Madrid. Original text: “Los pintores Señores Pradilla y Morera y el arquitecto Álvarez han determinado visitar y estudiar la Exposición de Bellas Artes de París, y recorrer algunas ciudades de importancia artística; y al efecto saldrán en breve de Román, según oficialmente me han comunicado.”
attempted to put the viewer into the center of each respective moment (see chapters four and five).

Figure 19: Jean-Paul Laurens (French, 1838-1921) *L’excommunication de Robert le Pieux* (1875) Oil on canvas. 130 by 218 cm. Musée d’Orsay, Paris.

As had been the case with French opinions of *Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento*, French critics were interested in style and execution, rather than content. One critic writing about *Doña Juana la Loca* was aware of the immediate situation in the painting, but had little knowledge or interest in the larger narrative:

It is without a doubt the deceased’s wife, or lover ... this mad woman must belong to some Great House. Who knows? A princess, a Great Woman of Spain ... Lady Joanna is in the center, she sets the tone from which the vigor and brilliance of this painting emanates.\(^{572}\)

In short, Pradilla’s painting was a critical success. The French jury

---

\(^{572}\) The accounts of French criticism used in this paper are largely taken from Spanish nineteenth-century sources. I have been able to track down some of them, and plan to track down all of them over the next two years. Source: Pierre Véron. *Ressemblance Garantie.* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1878), 384-385. Original text: “Es sin duda su marido, o su amante . . . esta loca debe de pertenecer a una gran casa, Quien sabe? Una princesa, una grande de España ... Doña Juana es el verdadero centro, la nota y el vigor en torno a las cuales brillan todas las ideas corolarias.”
awarded *Doña Juana la Loca* the first-place medal of honor — Pradilla’s descendants still have the porcelain trophy,573 and Pradilla was inducted into the French Legion of Honor.574 The French general-interest weekly, *Le Monde Illustré*, commissioned the sculptor and printmaker Adolphe Jules Lavée (d. 1904) to make a woodblock engraving of *Doña Juana la Loca* that was published in a special edition to provide readers with a representation of the winning work (see Figure 20).

![Image](image-url)

Figure 20: Adolphe Jules Lavée (d. 1904) and J. Ansseau "Jeanne La Folle — Tableau de M. F. Pradilla — Grande médaille d'honneur." *Le Monde Illustré* (Paris: 1 March 1879), 136-137.

As had been the case in 1874, the Spanish press closely followed and translated developments in the French press for Spanish readers. Spanish papers, like *La Ilustración Española y Americana*, dedicated regular space to this effort:

We promised in our previous edition to translate the opinion of

573 Wifredo Rincón García. *Francisco Pradilla*. (Zaragoza: Aneto, 1999), 81-82.

French critics regarding Spanish Fine Arts ... It is the opinion of Paris that is as important as our own.575

Following the painting’s successful reception in Paris, a foreign buyer offered to buy Doña Juana la Loca for 30,000 pesetas (about £117,500 in today’s currency).576 Spanish politicians panicked. Previous to being sent to Paris, the government, per regulation, had offered 9,000 pesetas (about £36,000) to purchase the painting for the Museo de Arte Moderno. But, with the new offer on the table, the Spanish congress took the unusual step of passing legislation that set aside 40,000 pesetas (about £127,000) to buy the work and institute a law that would make it illegal to sell the work to a foreign buyer or anyone who would take it permanently outside of Spain.577 To sweeten the deal, the Senate commissioned Pradilla, for the sum of 60,000 pesetas (about £152,000), to paint the Surrender of Granada (1882). To be completed in five years, the painting would depict the handing over of the last Islamic stronghold in Spain to the Catholic rulers Isabella and Ferdinand in 1492.578 For someone who, five months earlier, had been desperate for 20 pesetas (about £63.50) to pay rent, the

575 La Ilustración Española y Americana. 8 May 1878. Full quote: “Prometimos en nuestra carta anterior traducir la opinión de la crítica francesa acerca de las Bellas Artes españolas ... es la opinión de París es tan importante como la opinión propia. Hasta ahora no nos podemos quejar; ha reconocido que le cuadro de Pradilla es un acontecimiento ... Digamos a Blavet ... Doña Juana la Loca, de Pradilla ... es una obra capital, si no la obra capital de esta Exposición. Pradilla nos hace asistir a los funerales de Felipe el Hermoso ... He examinado este cuadro largo tiempo y con toda minuciosidad y he tratado de analizar sus detalles; pero siempre mi análisis ha venido a para a la gran silueta de la Reina ... ¡Qué majestad en la curva que describe el cortejo, y qué honra para el maestro de ceremonias que le ha dirigido! ... La locura de Doña Juana no es la locura estúpida que excluye la poesía, madre de la piedad; es la locura que atrae, no es la locura que aparta; el la locura que hace que le tendamos la mano, no es la locura que hace que volvamos la espalda. De esta hermosura poesía está impregnada la figura de Doña Juana la Loca. Parece que la enajenación mental ha abierto un momento las paredes de aquel cráneo, dejando penetrar con la luz de la razón todo el mundo de los recuerdos felices de un día ...”


578 El Eco. “Crónical de la Semana.” Year III. No. 62. (March 1878), 1.
sums must have been a welcome and dizzying victory. The Congress approved the measure on 2 April 1878. The Senate approved it on 16 May.

Although it was not allowed to be sold to a foreign buyer, *Doña Juana la Loca* would be sent to several international exhibitions. It won the medal of honor in the Vienna Universal Exhibition of 1882, and was put on show in Düsseldorf from 1882 to 1883 and in Berlin in 1892. According the art historian Richard Muther (1860-1909), these Austro-German showing had a significant effect on German artists and represented the greatest contribution of Spanish art:

... the *ne plus ultra* is attained by the bold and winning art of Pradilla, which is like a thing shot out of a pistol. He is the greatest product of contemporary Spain, a man of ingenious and improvising talent, moving with ease in the most varied fields.... His historical pictures are works which compel respect ... these indeed are performances of painting beside which as a musical counterpart at best Paganini’s variations on the G string are comparable — sleights of art of which only Pradilla is capable in these days, and such as only Fortuny painted thirty years ago. In this marvellous acrobat of the pallet the strength of the Romance genius is embodied. He only prescribes subject, technique, and colour for the Spaniards of the present, but he is also the spiritual ancestor to

579 In 1870, the Spanish *peseta* was set according to the gold standard of one *peseta* equal to 0.290322 gram of gold. The 1875-1880 value of gold per ounce was $21-23 USD. Using an historical calculator and determining price by historic Consumer Price Index, I was able to arrive at the approximate amount Pradilla was paid in contemporary terms. Source: Carlos Reyero. “El valor del precio. Tasación y compraventa de pinturas en el Madrid Isabelino (1850-1868).” *e-ArtDocuments: Revista Sobre col-lecciones & col-leccionistes*. (Madrid: No. 1, 2009), 1-33.

580 *Legislatura de 1878*. Proposición de ley núm. 10, legajo 197, No. 17 (Madrid: Archivo del Congreso de los Diputados). Selected original text: “... *Pradilla que ha merecido en la exposición extraordinaria de Bellas Artes de 1878 el premio de honor, recompensa hasta ahora por ningún otro artista alcanzada, ha estudiado con el debido detenimiento, todos los antecedentes de este asunto, y creyendo intrepretar fielmente los sentimientos patrióticos del congreso, impidiendo que obra artística de tan reconocido mérito salga para siempre de España, tiene la honra de someter al Congreso el siguiente proyecto de ley. Artículo único — Se concede al Ministerio de Fomento un crédito extraordinario de 40.000 pesetas, para adquirir el cuadro de Rafael Pradilla, relativo a un episodio de la vida de Dña. Juana la Loca, que ha obtenido el premio de honor en la última Exposición Nacional de Pintura.*"
whom modern Italian painting may be traced.\textsuperscript{581}

With national and international success, Pradilla’s star in the constellation of the Spanish Academy was secured. He was immediately inundated with public and private commissions that would last until his death in 1921. Two years after the \textit{Exposition Universelle}, Pradilla was made the new director of the Spanish Academy in Rome. From there, he held various professorships and briefly served as director of the Prado Museum.\textsuperscript{582}

Curiously, although Pradilla would go on to paint a number of large, ambitious paintings, he never again submitted another work to the \textit{Exposición Nacional} or any other contest. But, he would paint Queen Juana again (see Figure 21). He received a private commission from the Spanish industrialist Luis de Ocharan to paint Juana la Loca. The finished work says a great deal about Pradilla and the state of history painting

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image21.png}
\caption{Francisco Pradilla (1848-1921) \textit{La Reina Doña Juana la loca recluida en Tordesilla con su hija, la infanta doña Catalina} (1906) Oil on canvas. 85 x 146 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid. [Click here for high-resolution image.]
}
\end{figure}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{582} Wifredo Rincón García. \textit{Francisco Pradilla}. (Zaragoza: Aneto, 1999), 28.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
some thirty years on.\textsuperscript{583}

As a subject, the painting is out of step with other turn-of-the-century works that were then \textit{en vogue}. As will be discussed in chapter eight, from about 1897, history paintings were rare, replaced with scenes from modern life. Pradilla, along with many painters of his generation, including Alejandro Ferrant, would continue to be productive until the 1920s, but they were still painting period historical and religious scenes. However, by the 1890s, public commissions for large-scale paintings had dried up. Instead, as was the case with \textit{La reina Doña Juana la Loca recluida}, painters had become reliant on private commissions. The difference between painting for public buildings with a popular audience and a housebound work for a single patron can be seen in this work.

Figure 21: Francisco Pradilla (1848-1921) La Reina Doña Juana la loca recluida en Tordesilla con su hija, la infanta doña Catalina, Detail (1906) Oil on canvas. 85 x 146 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.
[Click here for high-resolution image.]
Figure 22: Francisco Pradilla (1848-1921) *La Reina Doña Juana la loca recluida en Tordesilla con su hija, la infanta doña Catalina*, Detail (1906) Oil on canvas. 85 x 146 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.
[Click here for high-resolution image.]
It is small and full of detail; meant to be examined up close. Theatricality is replaced with a meditative, domestic scene. The queen is surrounded by the trappings of everyday life: children, toys, carpets, wall hangings, a burning fire. Were it not for the title and period costume, this could be a genre scene — the kind serious academicians might scoff at for lacking serious content and being overly sentimental. Yet, the painting is an astonishing demonstration of Pradilla’s arsenal (e.g., the treatment of light, his mastery of the human figure, absolute command of color and texture) and rich with symbolism (e.g., the crown seized by the knight, the caged bird; see Figures 21, 22, and 23.).

The next two chapters will discuss the forces that dramatically changed the production, exhibition, and reaction to Spanish history painting between Doña Juana la Loca and La Doña Juana la Loca recluida. Like
Pradilla, the generation of painters working in Spain would need to adapt their skills to new audiences. Nurtured and trained by a national system of fine art academies, it was perhaps the largest number of highly trained painters in the history of Spain. Yet, even the most successful struggled to make the transition from wards of the state to commercial successes. Chapter seven briefly explores those who tried to follow in Pradilla’s footsteps by creating ever more dramatic and large-scale history paintings. Chapter eight looks closely at the career of one of Pradilla’s students, Joaquín Sorolla, who abandoned historical subjects and adapted his skills as an academic painter to paint commercially successful scenes of everyday life.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Little Shame on Lots of Canvas
“Little shame on lots of canvas.” That is how the critic and painter Augusto Comas y Blanco (1862-1953) described his experience walking through the Exposición Nacional of 1887. A decade had passed since the national and international success of Doña Juana la Loca (1877). In their attempts to gain similar attention, Spanish history painters followed what seemed to be a formula for success: history plus drama and size. The largest number of history paintings ever submitted to the Exposición Nacional took place in 1883. These works were larger, more violent and salacious than ever. Artists looked to the same historical sources for inspiration (i.e., Prescott, Lafuente, Martir) to find subjects to make their own, as Gisbert, Casado, and Pradilla had. This search led to less well-known historical figures or events — some obscure, others completely fabricated. As a whole, the historical works painted between 1878 and 1895 were made by artists who were just as talented — in many cases more skilled than those who went before — but their works are less well remembered. This is largely because the Spanish Academy was rewarding art that was increasingly dependent on diminishing government commissions and not intended for a growing private market for art at home and abroad. Lacking the kind of private market that could support a wider range of genre, style, and subject, the large numbers of artists graduating Spanish academies were rewarded for painting history works addressed to state patrons and national narratives. It is a period that, for lack of another characterization, will be referred to as Spanish mannered historicism; a period of excess, ornamentation, and sensationalism that came to dominate official Spanish art. These two decades gained the reputation that would be associated with all Spanish history painting until

---

584 Augusto Comas y Blanco. *La Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes de Madrid 1890.* (Madrid: Sucesores de Rivadenevra, 1890), 20. Original text: “… Poca vergüenza en mucha tela …”

585 The term “mannered historicism” is my own. It is derived from the word “mannerism” as used by John Shearman (1931-2003), who described the stylistic break made in Italian painting following the very symmetrical and ordered works of the first half of the sixteenth century toward more loose and varied approaches to art that were of varying success. For more, see John Shearman. *Mannerism.* (London: Penguin Books, 1991 edition).
today. This short chapter will select a few award-winning works, from the six Exposiciones Nacionales between 1878 and 1895, that represent the competition for increased size and drama. It will examine the reactions of contemporary critics who were attempting to articulate the changes they believed needed to take place within the Academy for it to modernize. It will also demonstrate that, during this period, artists themselves began moving away from Madrid and toward regional centers — especially Valencia and Seville — and away from Rome toward Paris.

In 1904, the British essayist and journalist Catherine Gasquoine Hartley (1867-1928) wrote a book-length, century-by-century account of Spanish painting. Although Hartley is not remembered for making a significant contribution in art history, her book included perhaps the first chapter in English describing the work of Spanish history painters in context of other Spanish artists. She was not kind. Following her chapter dedicated to the “virility” of Francisco de Goya y Lucientes, she writes a short few pages on the “present condition of Spanish painting.” Hartley describes a period of art “lost in shoals of academic incapacity,” overseen by José de Madrazo, the “Spanish David,” who introduced a “rigid classicism. While this “new impulse,” as Hartley describes it, was misguided, it was not nearly as bad as what would come next:

In Spain the new impulse gave birth to a band of industrious but ineffectual workers — painters who essayed to be Spanish, by laborious reconstruction of historic scenes, and by elaboration of local detail. They forgot the spirit of the old masters, and in pursuing a false patriotism, they lost their personal reality. Their pictures masquerade in mock garments, cut in the Spanish mode, but they are untouched by the rugged national traits. They are Spanish scenes, they are never Spain. The leader of these pseudo-naturalists was Francisco Pradilla. His compositions are dull pageants of costume parades; they prefigure the worthlessness of


587 Ibid, 299-300.
In 1904, there would have been many Spanish artists and critics who agreed with Hartley, writing off the period as a deviation, blaming the Academy, and glossing over many works that garnered significant critical acclaim by contemporaries. Critics working between 1878 and the late 1880s (i.e., from the debut of Doña Juana la Loca to a transition toward social history painting discussed in chapter eight) were often aware that Spanish history painting as a genre was becoming outmoded. But, even while pointing this out, they recognized that significant social commentaries were being made in works and that artists were adapting sophisticated, avant-garde techniques to historical subjects.

The year 1881 was the beginning of a sea change in the Spanish Academy. Ignacio Pinazo y Carmalench (1849-1916) made his award-winning debut at the Exposición Nacional. From its beginning in 1856 to 1878, winners of the Exposiciones Nacionales had either been born in Madrid or, if born elsewhere, had been trained at the Academia de San Fernando. It was a national competition, but it was painters familiar to the jury who were largely winning the contests’ prizes. Pinazo was among the first regionally born and trained winners to make a name for himself on the national stage. He attended the Academia de San Carlos in Valencia, won a local scholarship to attend the Real Academia in Rome as a student of merit, and then submitted his final work, Últimos momentos del rey don Jaime el Conquistador en el acto de entregar su espada a su hijo don Pedro (1881; see figure 1), to the national contest, where he won a second-class medal.589

588 Ibid., 300-301.

Just as Rosales had in *Isabel la Católica*, Pinazo was borrowing from a long tradition of deathbed or *dormition* paintings in western art. For contemporaries, the composition and coloring would have had a clear aesthetic relationship to “the greatest Spanish history painting.” But, the works had dramatically different messages. Whereas Rosales was eager to send a message about a shared national heritage, Pinazo’s work was about reclaiming and maintaining regionalism.

As the title describes, Pinazo’s painting depicts King Jaime of Aragón, known as the Conquistador for his many successful battles to take Islamic

---

590 Aureliano Beruete y Moret. “Martin Rico.” *Cultura Española.* (Madrid, 1908), 542. Full quote: “En efecto, es digno de la popularidad que goza. Una crítica estrecha y excesivamente rigurosa, podría encontrar en él algunas deficiencias pictóricas, pero lo interesante y bien dispuesto del asunto y su efecto dramático lo hacen único en su género. Decíamos al hablar de Rosales, que la pintura española había llegado con Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento, a su más alta manifestación, y ahora afirmamos que con Doña Juana la Loca llega a su manifestación más dramática y alcanza su más popular y general triunfo.”
holdings. On his deathbed, the king administers an oath to his son, Pedro, making him promise to continue fighting until the moors were ejected from Iberia. It was the second version of the painting by Pinazo. The first had been commissioned by his native Valencian government and hung in the regional seat of government. The subject and its context was meant to reclaim some of the regional histories of Spain that had not been and, perhaps, could not be subsumed into a national narrative. By the 1880s, Modesto Lafuente’s Historia de España, telling the story of Spain from its earliest times to the nineteenth century, had become the nation’s best-selling and most widely read book. Lafuente praised the reign of Don Jaime el Conquistador, citing him as an early figure in the “visionary” reestablishment of Spain that would eventually be more fully seen and brought to pass by Isabel and Ferdinand. In other words, Lafuente had subsumed King Jaime’s story into the larger story of Spanish nationalism.

During the tumultuous Sexenio Revolucionario (see chapter six), several regional governments, such as Valencia, were able to establish a measure of independence and stability. Economically and politically, Valencia was resurgent in the 1870s and 1880s. Valencian artists, politicians, businessmen, and writers became figures on the national stage. In 1876, the poet Miguel Amat y Maestre wrote an historical romance titled Don Jaime el Conquistador, extolling not only the historical king but the unique and independent nature of the region. The book was published in Castellaño, the national language, and Valencian, the regional language.


Its introduction was written by the mayor of the city of Alicante.\textsuperscript{595}

Pinazo’s regional subject is calculated to outdo Rosales’s national work in nearly every way. It is almost twice the size of \textit{Testamento}, containing three times the number of figures. Whereas Rosales’s technique was frequently compared to that of Velázquez and other Spanish old masters (see chapter five), Pinazo’s is thoroughly modern, a result of his studies with a radical new group of Italian impressionists called the \textit{Macchiaioli} (see chapter eight for more). Pinazo used pure, out-of-the-tube colors. There a strong \textit{chiaroscuro} effects, entire sections — like the end of the sword — are lost in darkness, next to garish clothing and chainmail. These are heightened by a deliberately uneven application of paint. Some areas are built up with heavy \textit{impasto}, while others — even the central figure of Don Jaime in his bed — appear unfinished. These contrasts in light and dark, finished and unfinished produce a perspective and depth that make Pradilla’s and Rosales’s seem relatively flat and serene (see Figures 2 and 3). In every way, Pinazo’s work is more extreme and sensational. It deliberately plays on the audience’s familiarity with Rosales, while substituting its academic idealism with a deliberate lack of balance or restraint.

Reviews of the work as it showed in the \textit{Exposición Nacional} were mixed, but not in the sense that some critics appreciated it and others did not. Nearly every review was of two minds. Eusebio Martínez de Velasco’s review in the \textit{Ilustración Española y Americana} was typical. He wrote that there was “not a rigorous exactness” in the historical accuracy of the piece. It was “poorly drawn” and “uneven color.” He ended by saying “... But have in mind that this work is the first presented by Mr. Pinazo, and it announces itself as the work of great heights, promising to quickly conquer a chosen place among History painters.”\textsuperscript{596}

\textsuperscript{595}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{596} “Exposición de Bellas Artes de 1881, En Madrid." \textit{La Ilustración Española y Americana}, Year XXV, No. XXII (Madrid: 15 June 1881), 390-391.
Unlike Gisbert, Casado, Rosales, and Pradilla, who had used their newfound fame to receive positions and commissions on the national
stage, after receiving a medal at the 1881 *Exposición Nacional*, Pinazo returned to Valencia. He took a position at the *Academia de San Carlos* and helped foment a significant artistic environment that would become known as the “Valencian Renaissance” or, in Valencian, as the *Renaixença*. Eventually, his Valencian colleagues and students, such as Antonio Muñoz Degrain (1840-1924), Emilio Sala Francés (1850-1910), Aureliano de Beruete y Moret (1845-1912), and Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923) would dominate the Spanish Academy’s administration, education, contests, and style (see chapter eight.)

---

Figure 4: José Casado del Alisal (1832-1886) *La leyenda del rey Monje, o La campana de Huesca* (1880) Oil on canvas. 356 x 474 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid. [Click here for high-resolution image.]

Figure 5: José Casado del Alisal (1832-1886) *La leyenda del rey Monje, o La campana de Huesca*, Detail (1880) Oil on canvas. 356 x 474 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid.
The same year as Pinazo’s awarded-winning work, José Casado del Alisal painted a violent and obscure subject: The Legend of the Monk King (see Figure 6). The copious amounts of blood, exaggerated reactions of the men, and elaborateness of the costume are almost cartoonish (see Figures 5 and 6). At the time, Casado had been director of the Real Academia in Rome for more than five years. His students, Francisco Pradilla, Alejandro Ferrant, and Casto Plasencia, had become famous in their own right (see chapter six). But, unlike them, Casado’s work was a critical failure. Augusto Comas said that, following Rosales’s success with Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento, Casado had “difficulty entering the good road of direct study of nature.” He was “under the prism of falsity and mannerism” despite having “first-rate figures.” The work was also little esteemed by the contest’s jury. Casado, who had been a perennial award winner at previous contests and was then serving as director of the Royal Academy in Rome, received only an embarrassing “honorable mention” for the painting.

But, it seems that Casado was not solely interested in academic or critical fortune. The subject for the painting was taken from a book written in 1851 by Antonio Cánovas del Castillo. In 1880, Cánovas, who will be discussed at greater length later in this chapter, was prime minister of Spain. Perhaps because of this and despite a poor critical reception, The Legend of the Monk King was acquired by the government for a significant sum. Two year later, Casado was commissioned to paint Cánovas’s

598 Augusto Comas y Blanco. La Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes de Madrid 1890. (Madrid: Sucesores de Rivadenevra, 1890), 20.


600 Antonio Cánovas del Castillo. La Campana de Huesca, crónica del siglo XII. (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1854).

portrait.\textsuperscript{602} It seems unlikely that Casado was simply aiming for a cozy relationship with a powerful political figure. But, that someone of his stature would be so out of touch with the sensibilities of his contemporaries indicates that he was operating in a time of uncertainty and experimentation.

Three years later, the trend toward larger, more dramatic paintings continued. The winner of the only other medal of honor given besides Pradilla was Juan Luna y Novicio (1857-1899) for \textit{Spoliarium} (1884; see Figure 7). Luna was an unlikely winner, whose was arguably awarded as much for his personal circumstances as for his painting. He was Filipino, born and raised in Manila. The Philippines had been under Spanish rule for more than 400 years. In Manila, Luna had been a vocal supporter of the Philippine revolution while studying at the local \textit{Escuela Nautica de Manila} — now the Philippine Merchant Marine Academy. Through Spanish contacts, he was awarded a place at the \textit{Real Academia} in Rome as a student of merit. For his final year’s work, he submitted a scene depicting the brutal treatment of gladiators and slaves in the prison, known anciently as the spoliarium, below the Roman colosseum.

\textsuperscript{602} Martin Almagro-Gorbea, Ed. \textit{El Gabinete de Antigüedades de la Real Academia de la Historia.} (Madrid: Real Academia de Historia, 1999), 97.
Even before being awarded the medal of honor, banquets were held in his honor by members of the Academia de San Fernando. Shortly before the opening of the Exposición Nacional, José Rizal (1861-1896), considered by many to be the greatest Filipino revolutionary, gathered with other Filipinos then living in Madrid to hold a dinner for Luna. In a toast, Rizal said the following:

Luna’s Spoliarium, with its bloody carcasses of slave gladiators being dragged away from the arena where they had entertained their Roman oppressors with their lives ... stripped to satisfy the lewd contempt of their Roman persecutors with their honor … [the painting] embodied the essense [sic] of our social, moral and political life: humanity in severe ordeal, humanity unredeemed, reason and idealism in open struggle with prejudice, fanaticism and justice ...

Ironically, Luna would shortly return to the Philippines and be jailed for revolutionary activities. His painting now hangs in the national museum of the Philippines, where it is considered his country’s “most valuable painting.”\textsuperscript{604} The contemporary scholar Diego Gonzalez says the work is

\textsuperscript{603} Maria Stella S. Valdéz. Dr. José Rizal and the Writing of His Story. (New York: Rex Bookstore, 337), 287. ORIGINAL TEXT?

\textsuperscript{604} Aguilar Cruz. Luna. (Manila: Department of Public Information, 1975), 9-35.
still revered today, as a “... noli me tangere depicting the Philippines to be redeemed from bondage.”

The violence and darkness of the subject are fully realized in the work: bloodied bodies, starved forms, and scarred faces. Contemporaries described it as gruesome, dark, and ugly, even as they praised the work for its moral message and craftsmanship. The dark-lined figures and uneven application of strokes heighten the feeling of violence and drama. Luna’s approach differs greatly from his main competitors at that year’s contest.

José Moreno Carbonero’s (1860-1942) Conversión del duque de Gandía (1884) and Antonio Muñoz Degrain’s (1840-1924) Los Amantes de Teruel (1884) both won first-place medals at the Exposición Nacional (see Figures 8 and 9). Both paintings are Spanish historical scenes with death as a central theme. In content, composition, and borrowed motifs (e.g., coffin, royal crest, candles), each work makes direct reference to Doña Juana la Loca. Also, like Juana, these works returned to non-violent content. The was based on communicating the personal tragedy represented by the principal figures in each painting. In this way, the works seem to hearken back to the Romantic historical works of Delaroche.

---


606 Isidoro Fernandez Florez. “Exposición de bellas artes, Artículo primero.” La ilustración española y americana, Year XXVIII, No. XX. (Madrid: 30 May 1884), 331-333.
Figure 8: José Moreno Carbonero (1860-1942) *Conversión del duque de Gandía* (1884) Oil on canvas. 315 x 500 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid. [Click here for high-resolution image.]

Figure 9: Antonio Muñoz Degrain (1840-1924) *Los amantes de Teruel* (1884) Oil on canvas. 330 x 516 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid. [Click here for high-resolution image.]
Seeing these two works by Carbonero and Muñoz, the writer Benito Pérez Galdós spoke glowingly of Spanish art and artists in his widelyread review of the *Exposición Nacional*. He also used the opportunity to bring attention to what he considered to be the looming problem of Spanish history painting, if it were to continue on its trajectory. Galdós wondered about how the current system could sustain itself. There were more graduates than ever from an increasing number of Spanish academies. These artists were being trained to paint large-scale, Spanish-themed works for a largely bankrupt government.

Since 1856, when the very happy renaissance of Spanish painting began, it can be said that each one of our Fine Arts Contests has demonstrated glorious leaps forward. In each one, distinguished personalities have shown forth ... Today the number of good Spanish painters is so great that, if all exhibited their works, there would not be sufficient space to contain them. The disproportionate abundance of Spanish artists is such that not all can live in our Patria, they are scattered throughout the world. They are a good number in Rome, Paris, and London. Spanish earth, richly fecund to produce these artists, is insufficient for maintaining them ... the painting of history prevails. Genre painting, which is most agreeable to the tendencies of modern art, does not merit the absolute preferences of our artists, and for more time will be besieged by coats of arms, velvety dalmatics, robes, and mantels of ermine, vestments regaled in gold and silver ....

To combat this preoccupation, we do not tire in repeating: Paint the present time. Paint your era; what you see, what surrounds you, what you feel. Do not the examples of your illustrious predecessors and Masters not speak to you, who always painted what they saw — and when they painted history, that is the Bible or mythology, modernized it by bringing into the vulgarity of their time? Until now, it appears that these admonishments do not capture the enthusiasm of our artists. But, some follow this path and, I suspect, that within time the irresistible tendency in literature will note these
things in the art of Velázquez and Raphael.⁶⁰⁷

Galdós’s comments came at a time when his own oeuvre was taking a significant shift from historical Spanish drama to contemporary social issues. From 1873 to 1879, he had written twenty volumes of his *Episodios Nacionales* (National Episodes), exploring key moments in Spanish history through fictionalized contemporary figures that participated in the events. But, in 1884, at the time of the above comments, Galdós was writing *Fortunata y Jacinta* (1886), considered by many Spaniards — then and now — as second only to *Don Quijote* in the history of Spanish literature.⁶⁰⁸ Galdós is often compared to Honoré de Balzac (1799-1850), Charles Dickens (1812-1870), and Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910) for drawing

⁶⁰⁷ Cited in Bernardino de Pantorba. *Historia y crítica de las Exposiciones Nacionales de Bellas Artes Celebradas en España*. (Madrid: Jesús Ramón García-Rama, 1980), 122-123. Full quote: “Desde 1856, en que pareció iniciarse el felicísimo renacimiento de la pintura española, puede decirse que cada uno de nuestros Certámenes de Bellas Artes ha sido una gloriosa muestra de adelanto. En todos ellos han aparecido distinguidas personalidades ... Hoy el número de buenos pintores españoles es tan grande, que, si todos expusieran, no habría local bastante para contener sus obras. La desproporcionada abundancia de artistas españoles es tal que, no pudiendo todos vivir en nuestra patria, se han desviado por el mundo, y en Roma, París, y Londres hay buen número de ellos. El suelo español, harto fecundo para producirlos, es insuficiente para mantenerlos. Aunque las condiciones del mercado de cuadros en España fueran mejores de lo que son, la existencia de tantos artistas sería precaria, si todos vivieran aquí ... Cuatro centros de gran progreso artístico tenemos, a saber: Valencia, Madrid, Barcelona y Sevilla. En las demás regiones el movimiento en escaso, aunque no faltan jóvenes distinguidísimos que siguen con provecho las huellas los meridionales y levantinos ...

“... la pintura histórica prevalece. La de género, que es la que más acomoda a las tendencias del arte moderno, no merece aún de nuestros artistas una preferencia absoluta, y es probable que por mucho tiempo sigamos asediados por las cotas de malla, las dalmáticas de terciopelo, las ropillas, los mantos de armiño, las vestiduras recamadas de oro y plata, y por los ya desacreditados casacas del de época goyesca. La superioridad de nuestros artistas consiste, justo es decirlo, en la habilidad pictórica, en la gracia y la libertad del toque, en el sentimiento colorista llevado hasta la magia: pero hay que convenir en que la gan mayoría ...

“... Para combatir esta preocupación no nos cansamos de repetirles: “Pintad la época presente; pintad vuestra época; lo que veís, lo que os rodea, lo que sentís. ¿No os dice nada el ejemplo de vuestros ilustres predecesores y maestros, que siempre pintaron lo que veían, y que cuando pintaban historia, es decir, Biblia o mitología, la modernizaban, trayéndola a la vulgaridad de su tiempo? Hasta ahora no parece que estas amonestaciones ejerzan en el ánimo de nuestros artistas decisiva influencia; pero algunos van entrando y a por este camino, y sospecho que dentro de algún tiempo la tendencia irresistiblemente marcada en literature literatura se ha de notar en el arte de Velázquez y de Rafael.”

attention of popular audiences to social, moral, and political issues of the time. His work *Fortunata y Jacinta* (1886) frankly depicted the private lives of middle-class Spaniards. Its descriptions of adultery, hypocrisy by Catholic priests, and dysfunction of government shocked readers.

Galdós's call for a change in Spanish art came only two years after José Casado del Alisal gave his glowing speech, extolling the contemporary Spanish renaissance to fellow academicians. (See chapter three.) Unlike Casado, who paints a picture of a thriving school inspired by God and Greco-Roman classics, Galdós describes a talented group of artists out of touch.

These comments by Galdós were made within the context of significant changes in the Spanish state, a period known as the “Pax Cánovas,” which saw Spaniards increasingly looking away from the past and toward a future. Arguably this change was a result of the first period of peace in Spain in more than a century. The tumultuous years from 1868 to 1874 saw the dethroning of Queen Isabel I, chaotic revolutionary rule, and the failure of the first Spanish republic. In 1874, the republic was dissolved by General Antonio Serrano, who rightly believed ineffectiveness of the central government during the previous six years had led to the resurgence of Carlist armed forces. Serrano, a key figure in the Revolution of 1868, welcomed Alfonso XII de Borbón (1857-1885 | Reign, 1874-1885), son of Isabel II, to the throne, then spent the next two years forcing the surrender of Carlist forces. During that same time, perhaps the most important figure Spanish politics of the period returned to Spain and helped form what would become the basis for the modern Spanish state. Antonio Cánovas del Castillo (1828-1897) was an historian and politician who had been exiled to England in 1865. Using the British system as a

---


model of stable governance, Cánovas returned to Spain, oversaw the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, and authored the Constitution of 1876. From 1876 to 1898, Cánovas served six consecutive terms as prime minister to the king, and arguably had more power and influence than the monarchy.

The Constitution of 1876 straddled the line between the historical monarchy and the recently failed attempts at a democratic republic. Many of the freedoms (e.g., press, religion, speech) were retained. But the several democratic reforms, especially in terms of voting rights, were diminished. The executive branch, effectively controlled by Cánovas as prime minister, oversaw every aspect of government, including members of the legislature, legislation, and implementation of the law. The historian Mary Vincent described it succinctly:

Spain’s Restoration system assumed a more oligarchic form than its Victorian counterpart. The highly privileged position of the Crown within the new system inevitably made for a pyramidal power structure, but this was then reinforced by the overweening presence of the executive [led by Cánovas] in the governing system ... At a symbolic level, the person of the monarch symbolized a class as well as a nation, and the enormous importance given to the royal prerogative in the Restoration system only emphasized the role of the elites. In other words of one scholar, the role of the monarch was not only emblematic of the exercise of power and of the emotional integration of the community, but it also legitimated the political elites’ monopoly of power.

Despite the façade of democracy, many liberals, including Galdós welcomed the Pax Cánovas for the stability it projected. By the mid-1880s, this sense of government stability led many, like José Casado del Alisal, to

611 See Appendix IV, Nineteenth-Century Spanish Constitutional Reforms.


talk about a Spanish renaissance, comparing Spain under the restored monarchy to “Florence of the Medicis” and the “Roman Republic.” This metaphor was to show up again and again in Spanish historical works, which featured Roman subjects.

The *Exposición Nacional* of 1887 was, according to one historian, the apex of Spanish history painting. This is at least true in terms numbers and size. It was the contest to which the largest number of history paintings ever had been submitted. Overall, they were the largest paintings ever submitted. The contest also saw the largest single work ever submitted in the contest’s history: *A Vision of the Coliseum* by José Benlliure (1858-1937), which measured 5.4 by 7.3 meters. With top awards going to paintings titled *The Invasion of the Barbarians, The Sacking of Rome* (see Figure 10), *A Vision of the Coliseum, and Nero before the cadaver of Agripina*, the trend toward classical scenes of graphic violence and death continued. As has been the case in previous exposiciones, the current and former scholarship students at the Real Academia in Rome dominated the contest.

---


The critic José Ortega Munilla (1856-1922) echoed Galdós’s commentary four years earlier, praising the artists for their artistry but criticizing their inability to move beyond historical scenes:

Passing through the salons of the Exposición, one can see much canvas, much study and much talent ... but very scarce are the works inspired by modern life. Everything is helmets and tunics. If a horrible catastrophe were to entomb Spain in the abyss and all that remained as a historical monument to our civilization in the palace built to memorialize us, it would be difficult to know how we Spaniards were dressed in 1887.

... A man dressed in a frock coat of jacket does not inspire Spanish painters and the multiple problems of reality, full of drama and idylls, never appear on canvas. This is the pernicious influence of academicism, a specious odium in the arts, that saps genius. Prizes, thanks, hangings in Museum and in the buildings of State, scholarships: All are rewards for the painter that cultivates the genre
of history.\footnote{José Ortega Munilla. \textit{El Imparcial} (Madrid: 23 May 1887), 1. Original Text: “Paseando por las salas de la Exposición, se ve que hay en ellas muchas varas de lienzo, mucho talento, mucho estudio y mucho trabajo ... escasísimas son las obras inspiradas en la vida moderna. Todo son cascos y túnicas. Si una catástrofe repentina sepultara a España en el abismo y sólo quedará como monumento histórico de nuestra civilización el palacio que acaba de inaugurarse, difícilmente se sabría cómo vestíamos los españoles del año 87 ... El hombre vestido de levita o chaqueta no inspira a los pintores españoles, y los múltiples problemas de la realidad, llenos de dramas y de idílios, no aparecen nunca en el lienzo. Esta es la perniciosa influencia del academicismo, especie de odiunm de las artes, que seca el ingenio. Premios y mercedes, lugar en los Museos y en los edificios del Estado, pensiones y recompensas: todos es para el pintor que cultiva el género histórico.”}

The incredulity of Ortega at the continued painting of historical scenes is remarkable, perhaps most of all for its late timing. Similar criticism of the Academy was common in France and other parts of Europe at the time. These criticisms centered on the systematic patronage of work of interest to the Academy, and only the Academy. But, what alternative was Ortega suggesting? Spain had been in recession since the eighteenth century. As mentioned in chapter three, Spain had virtually no private market for art until the early twentieth century. This was in stark contrast to the French Salons, which had the dichotomy of being both government-sponsored and juried contests, while also serving as vibrant marketplaces for the selling and buying of art between artists and private buyers. In her seminal work, \textit{The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic}, Patricia Mainardi argues that by the 1880s, the collision of state and private interest became unsustainable.\footnote{Patricia Mainardi. \textit{The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic}. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 9-37.} French artists decoupled the event from the government and established a new annual \textit{Salon des Artistes Françaises}, essentially collectively running the event along the same principles, but in such a way that artists had more freedom to present a greater variety of works aligned with the broader and often more \textit{avant-garde} tastes of the private market.\footnote{Ibid.}
By contrast, in Spain there was little to no private market. Spain’s artists were nearly entirely dependent upon the government for their education, exhibition and purchase of works, and careers. The works submitted and awarded in Spanish Exposiciones Nacionales were made almost exclusively for public and government spaces. The size alone of most works would have precluded their being hung in a private residence (see chapter three).

But, there may have been more to the continued production of history paintings than market forces — or the lack of market forces encouraging more “modern” art in Spain. Ortega’s comments are evidence that historical imagination in painting, literature, and, even, political speech, was going through a dramatic shift. A central premise of this study has been that history paintings had often been thinly veiled commentaries on contemporary issues; whether they were about revolutionaries, kings, queens, and slaves the paintings were tools, regardless of the painters’ intentions. For Spanish politicians, Gisbert’s Los Comuneros was clearly a rallying cry against the encroachment of royal power. Filipinos like Rizal and Luna, along with revolutionaries in Latin America, considered themselves to be enslaved by the Spaniards, just like those brutalized by the Romans. Luna’s historical comparison dignified their own struggle; arguably articulating the relationship between the contemporary relationship between Spain and Philippines that was illuminating to both. So, for Ortega, Galdós, and other critics, when did history paintings cease to be useful tools for exploring contemporary issues?

In Metahistory, a study of historical imagination in the nineteenth century, Hayden White proposes that, during the last half of the century, a Hegelian belief in the usefulness of history for explaining the present was seriously challenged by Nietzsche’s theories, which relied on scientific reason alone. Georg Hegel (1770-1831) believed that history was a continual struggle

toward perfection; humanity was progressing with each generation. Therefore, understanding the progressive development of the past was considered essential for determining the trajectory toward a better future. This is practiced by what has come to be called idealistic historians who “bind together the fleeting elements of story, and lay them up as treasures in a temple ... ”622 According to White, Nietzsche believed historians should “bring the past to the bar of judgement, interrogate it remorselessly and finally condemn it.”623 This anti-historical turn in European philosophy and epistemology was almost fully overthrown at the turn of the century as theories of time were rewritten by Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) and Albert Einstein (1879-1955).624 In terms of aesthetics, this anti-historical view changed the taste for and usefulness of historical painting. It would treat history separate — rendering it useless and, even, a hindrance to understanding the present.

If Ortega had undergone this Hegelian to Nietzschean transition, he believed the Spanish Academy was responsible for keeping others from experiencing a similar transition: “This is the pernicious influence of academicism, a specious odium in the arts, that saps genius.” This and similar statements of anti-academism became the war cry of modernists, in Spain and elsewhere. Pablo Picasso (1881-1973), speaking of his training at the Spanish Academy, said:

> Academic training in beauty is a sham. We have been deceived, but so well deceived that we can scarcely get back even a shadow of the truth. The beauties of the Parthenon, Venuses, Nymphs, Narcissuses, are so many lies. Art is not the application of a canon of beauty but what the instinct and the brain can conceive beyond any canon. When we love a woman we don’t start measuring her limbs. We love with our desires — although everything has been

---


done to try and apply a canon even to love.\textsuperscript{625}

Since the turn of the century, this characterization of the “academism” has been dominated by modernist artists and their sympatico critics and scholars who have been successful at propagating theories, sympathetic to modernism. Modernism was often defined in opposition to academic painting rather than as a theory of its own. It is important to note that Picasso’s solution to the old system is no system, no standard; only the subjective personal. From this perspective, artists like Gisbert, Rosales, Fortuny, Pradilla, and other so-called “academic painters” had no personal insights to offer in their art. At worst, they were slaves to the system. At best, they were out-of-touch craftsmen, more interested in precision than in ideas. This characterization completely ignores the remarkable ability these artists had to capture the imagination of contemporaries. These are old arguments; the central question here is not whether or not the Spanish history painting fell out of favor, but when.

The evidence supports a sea change in the production of Spanish history painting following the Paris \textit{Exposition Universelle} of 1889. As had been in 1864 and 1874, the \textit{Exposición Nacional} of 1887 was scheduled in anticipation of an upcoming Universal Exposition in Paris.\textsuperscript{626} The \textit{Exposición Nacional} of 1887 saw the largest number of history paintings and largest history paintings ever submitted to the contest. In 1890, one year after the Paris \textit{Exposition Universelle} of 1889, another \textit{Exposición Nacional} was held, but this time the number of history paintings had fallen by more than half, and the size of canvases by more than 40 percent. As discussed in chapters five and six, the previous two Universal Expositions had done wonders for the domestic careers of Eduardo Rosales and Francisco Pradilla, and for the proliferation of history paintings inspired by


\textsuperscript{626} Ana Belén Lasheras Peña. \textit{España en Paris. La imagen nacional en las Exposiciones Universales, 1855-1900}. Doctoral Thesis. (Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, Departamento de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea, 2009), 440-448.
their winning works, *El Último Testamento de Isabel la Católica* and *Doña Juana la Loca*.

Artists submitting works for the *Exposición Nacional* of 1887 were fully expecting that the contest’s winning works would be sent to Paris, where they had a chance to receive even greater attention. But, when the first-medal paintings were sent to Paris to be hung, artists were embarrassed to learn that the French were unwilling to show their works, both for being too large to fit in the exhibition space and, apparently, for lack of quality. According to the artist and historian Aureliano Beruete: “... a number of historical paintings of enormous proportions, full of inspiration of the past, were not admitted, nor, indeed, were some of them worthy to hang in the exhibition.” A key phrase in Beruete’s statement is “full of inspiration of the past.” Where Spanish artists were romanticizing their glorious past, the French intended to show the world the future. This was shown in stark contrast during the *Exposition Universelle* of 1889.

---

The Paris *Exposition Universelle* of 1889 coincided with the 100-year anniversary of the storming of the Bastille, the event credited with sparking the French Revolution. Organizers chose the theme of “human evolution and the progress of man” to demonstrate France’s role and dominance in the advance of arts, science, and engineering. Standing at the center of the 240-acre exhibition grounds was the most revolutionary and tallest manmade structure in the world, the newly built Eiffel Tower, illuminated by electric lights. Spanish reporters were astounded. The premier journal for the arts in Spain, the *Ilustración Española y Americana*, published a full-page re-creation of the exposition’s opening night (see Figure 11).

Say what you will, to this point the public at this Exposition [Universelle] can scarcely see anything else ... As a result of the enthusiasm produced by the originality of the Eiffel tower, by its three hundred meters of height, not for its artistic conception,

---

nothing in this novel world reaches it ...  

More than 28 million people visited hundreds of salons that were lit up by night with the same electricity used on the Eiffel Tower, with the help of a system designed by Thomas Edison. There was a special exhibition space dedicated to the “History of Human Habitations” and another to the “History of Humanity from Primitive Times.” The purpose was to show how advanced modern man — and modern France in particular — was in comparison to ages past.

For its section of the Exposition Universelle, the Spanish delegation had chosen to create a Renaissance-themed series of presentations, including reproductions of Hispano-moresque architecture. Spanish history painting, illustrating genre-appropriate scenes, were intended to be hung among casts taken from the transept of the cathedral in Toledo and carved archways in Cordoba’s Alhambra. But, due to poor coordination between the French architects hired to quickly construct the Spanish salons and those making arrangements for the paintings, there was not enough room to hang the enormous Spanish canvases. According to Aureliano de Beruete, who served as a member of the Spanish committee

629 IOB. “Crónica de la Exposición de París,” Ilustración Española y Americana, Vol. 22 (1889), 299-303. Original text: “Dígase, lo que se quiera, el público de la Exposición hasta ahora, casi no aspira á otra cosa. En toda esta parte geográfica y colonial de la Explanada de los Inválidos, la multitud se agrupa alrededor de las tiendas, ávida de devorar al vivo las impresiones preparadas en los últimos tiempos por las novelas pseudos-científicas y las narraciones de viajes muchas veces imaginarios. Después del entusiasmo producido por la originalidad de la torre Eiffel, por sus trescientos metros de altura, no por su concepción artística, nada alcanza en la generalidad de este mundo novelesco, ni aun la Galería de las máquinas, el efecto de los salvajes de la Exposición colonial.”


633 Ibid.
responsible for organizing the Fine Arts section, when Spanish officials petitioned for more spacious accommodations, French officials refused.\textsuperscript{634} In the end, the Spanish salons drew no awards, as in years past.\textsuperscript{635}

The \textit{Exposition Universelle} appears to have had direct consequences on the production of Spanish artists. \textit{Exposiciones Nacionales} after 1889 increasingly moved away from historical subjects. Instead, artists applied their academic training to depicting contemporary subjects. The sizes of canvases submitted to the next national contest were, on average, 40 percent smaller. Within a few years, the artists seeking scholarships to study in Paris would outnumber those at the \textit{Real Academia} in Rome.\textsuperscript{636}

The Eiffel Tower and the future it represented would become more compelling for artists than ancient Roman. The bubble of one-upmanship that led to more and more outlandish history paintings had popped. Critics like Ortega and Galdós, who for years had been calling for Spanish artists to apply their rigorous training to modern life, were vindicated.

The following chapter will explore how the Spanish Academy’s systematic encouragement of history painting was supplanted within a few years by the painting of modern life, and how the skills of history painters were integrated into an entirely different scale and genre.

\textsuperscript{634} Aureliano de Beruete y Moret. \textit{Historia de la pintura española en el siglo XIX: Elementos nacionales y extranjeros que han influido en ella}. (Madrid: Blass, 1926), 116.


\textsuperscript{636} Carlos Reyero. “Pintores españoles del siglo XIX en la Esquela de Bellas Artes de París: entre el aprendizaje cosmopolita y el mérito curricular.” \textit{Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando}, No. 72. (Madrid: 1991), 377-395.
CHAPTER EIGHT

The End of History Painting
The Spanish Academy’s transition from history painting to “modern” painting took place in a relatively short period of time. Six years passed between a Spanish history painting winning a medal of honor at the Exposición Nacional and a modern work receiving the same award. There had always been painters — such as Darío de Regoyos (1857-1913) — who rejected the official art of the Spanish Academy, but these artists had little effect on the transition from history painting to modern painting, as they were disenfranchised. Instead, it was regional artists who were able to live double lives, simultaneously making historical paintings for competitions in Madrid while experimenting with radically different values in their private art and teaching in regional academies. When Spanish history painting suffered humiliation at the Paris Exposition Universelle in 1889, there was a precipitous drop in the production of Spanish history paintings (see chapter 7). It was regional artists, coming from Valencia and Seville, who then dominated at the Exposiciones Nacionales of 1890, 1892, and 1895, with paintings that applied the figurative skills of history painting to contemporary subjects. At first, the Academy and the ancien régime predictably went on the defensive, issuing aesthetic criticisms and lines in the sand. But, when Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923), the leading figure of the modernist movement, triumphed at the Paris Universelle of 1900 — another instance where international tastes changed domestic attitudes — the Spanish Academy, from national contests all the way down to classroom practice of art, largely gave up historical painting in favor of contemporary subjects. This chapter will use the training and career of Joaquín Sorolla to explore the systematic changes in the Spanish Academy. It will show that, before 1889, there had been extensive experimentation with different kinds of aesthetics — more international and diverse in nature than those de rigueur in Madrid. When the crisis of 1889 took place, it opened the door for diversity and experimentation.

From the first Exposición Nacional (1856) and centralization of the
Academy in the 1860s, there were those who rebelled against official art in Spain (i.e., aesthetic taught in the academy, awarded at national contests, and purchased by the State). Unlike Paris, where public and private patronage of art competed side by side, no Salon de Refusés existed in Spain, no manifesto or private art shows held in protest of the Exposición Nacional. Artists who grew disenchanted with the system often looked to foreign audiences, who they believed were more sophisticated and therefore receptive to their work. This was true of Eduardo Rosales who, facing the heavy initial criticism of Testamento, swore never to participate again in the national exhibition and instead submit works only to the Paris Salon (see chapter five). Several Spanish Academy-trained artists left Madrid for Paris, with similar complaints.637

Perhaps the most outspoken Spanish artist of the period was Darío de Regoyos y Valdés. Born in Madrid, he was accepted by the Academia de San Fernando in 1878 and became a star pupil of the landscape artist Carlos de Haes (1826-1898). Haes, a Belgian-born landscapist, used his connections to secure Regoyos a scholarship at the École des Beaux Arts in Brussels. Regoyos eventually became friends with a host of influential experimental artists, including Paul Signac, James Ensor, Camille Pisarro, Georges Seurat, and James McNeill Whistler. As can be seen in his work Vista de Alhambra (c. 1885; see Figure 1), Regoyos experimented with color, composition, and subjects in ways that were clearly opposed to the classical and naturalistic approaches taught by Carlos de Haes.638

---


Although he spent most of his time abroad, Regoyos frequently sent landscape works to the *Exposición Nacional*. The contests’ jurors regularly rejected his work. After being rejected for the *Exposición* of 1887, Regoyos wrote his friend and fellow painter Manuel Losada Pérez de Nenin (1865-1949):

We should be happy to be rejected by these gentlemen ... all of Spain is an immensely backward, therefore, we should take all the good it has: types, people, mountains; but never surrender our works to be judged by a jury of hillbillies.

Lacking a public platform for his paintings, Regoyos published on

---


640 Ignacio Tellechea Idigoras. *Darío de Regoyos. Cartas a Manuel Losada, Ignacio y Daniel Zuloaga, Adolfo Guiard y Miguel de Unamuno*. (San Sebastián: Fundación Social y Cultural Kutxa, 2004), 43. Original text: “Debemos felicitarnos de ser rechazados por estos señores ... toda España es una inmensa batueca y por eso debemos tomar todo lo bueno de ella, los tipos, los pueblos, los montes, pero nunca entregar nuestras obras a ser juzgadas por un jurado de batuecos.”
aesthetics in his book España Negra (1900). By the early 1900s, he gained a small number of devotees who, to varying degrees, applied his theories to their own work. These artists included Ignacio Zuloaga y Zabaleta (1870-1945), Hermenegildo Anglada Camarasa (1871-1959), and Francisco Gonzales de Iturrino (1864-1924). But, these artists were also working largely outside of the academy, at a time when Spanish history painting was in decline.

Those who were most influential in displacing Spanish history painting were regional academic artists who had been critically acclaimed for award-winning history paintings, but who were experimenting with the genre in less subversive ways and privately painting with sometimes radically modern approaches. Three Spanish history painters in particular — José Jiménez Aranda (1837-1903), Emilio Sala (1850-1910), and Ignacio Pinazo (1849-1916) — had a remarkable modernizing influence on the Spanish Academy. All three were able to participate in the national Academy while maintaining a freeing independence from it.

---

José Jiménez Aranda was able to merge modern sensibilities from France with Spanish history painting in a non-threatening way. He was educated at the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de Santa Isabel de Hungría in Seville. In 1871, he was awarded a scholarship to study in Rome, where he was hugely influenced by Mariano Fortuny. Both Fortuny and Raimundo de Madrazo — son of Federico de Madrazo — encouraged Jiménez Aranda to move to Paris. Over nine years, he worked in the studios of a number of teachers at the Paris Ecole des Beaux-Arts.

Jiménez Aranda had participated in several Exposiciones Nacionales (i.e., 1864, 1866, 1871, 1878, 1900). Each time, he won a significant award and high praise from critics. But unlike his contemporaries, whose works were often large and historical in nature, Jiménez painted contemporary or near contemporary scenes that appeared to be historical in nature. For example, at first glance his work Penitentes en la Basílica Inferior de Asís (see Figure 2) bears all the hallmarks of a typical Spanish history painting: multiple figures, extreme attention to detail, historical costume, religious symbols. In coloring and tone, it is not far removed from Pradilla’s Doña Juana la Loca, painted the same year. But the work is not about any particular historical moment. If not for the dress of the wigged figures on the peripheries of the scene, it could be a contemporary depiction of a ritual that has taken place in Perugia since the fourteenth century. There is no historical figure at its center; no clear allegory or metaphor. In fact, the central figure has his back turned away from the view. But in composition, scale, and subject, Jiménez’s work would not have been out of place alongside works by the French painters Jehan-George Vibert (1840-1902) and George Croegaert (1848-1923), whose satirical paintings of Catholic cardinals were popular in the Paris Salon.642

Like Jiménez, Emilio Sala Francés and Ignacio Pinazo Camarlench were

regional painters who had won multiple, major awards at the Exposición Nacional. Both were from Valencia, and had studied at the Academia de San Carlos. The Valencian Academy was long respected for excellent painters. It was the home of José de Ribera (1591-1652) and the court painter Vicente López y Portaña (1772-1850). Valencia was also known for its vibrant textile and ceramic industries. Artists were not as dependent on the central government for their incomes as artists elsewhere, because they worked both as fine artists and artisans. Also, Valencia, as a result of its commercial industries, had a large middle class with means and appetite for paintings, particularly portraiture. This meant that artists like Sala and Pinazo could turn national reputations won in Madrid into regional careers as portraitists and professors. (This was deeply in contrast to artists like Federico de Madrazo, Antonio Gisbert, José Casado, and Francisco Pradilla, who all eschewed commercial production of art in favor of central government positions and projects.)

After studying at the local Academy in Valencia, Sala followed a familiar pattern: He moved to Rome, where he became close friends with Federico de Madrazo and Francisco Pradilla. In 1871, he won a first-place medal for his depiction of Prince Charles de Viana (1421-1461), also known as Carlos de Aragon (see Figure 3), who was remembered for authoring a Chronicle of the Kings of Navarre (1509) and not for his leadership. (The subject was also taken up seven years later by another painter from the south of Spain, José Moreno Carbonero.) Later, Sala won an award at the Paris Exposition Universelle for his work The Expulsion of the Jews

---


from Spain (see Figure 4).\(^{646}\) Both paintings, separated by sixteen years, are remarkably similar in size, tone, coloring, and, even, depicted period, but they are radically different than the portraits Sala was painting for the private market. For instance, the work *María Guerrero, niña* (see Figure 5), with its loose brushwork, bright colors, black outlining, and informal pose, appears more like a work that would be purchased by a collector of paintings by Edouard Manet (1832-1883) than someone interested in a Spanish-trained history painter.

---

Figure 4: Emilio Sala y Francés (1850-1910) *Expulsión de los judíos de España (año de 1492)* (1889) Oil on canvas. 313 x 281 cm. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid.

[Click here for high-resolution image]
Sala’s classmate, Ignacio Pinazo, was even more experimental, both in history paintings submitted to the *Exposición Nacional* and in his private
work. Pinazo was one of the first regional artists to attend the *Real Academia* in Rome, albeit with a scholarship from the Municipality of Valencia. While in Italy, he became enamored with a group of Italian artists — known as the *Macchiaoli* — who were experimenting with bright color and rapid painting. Pinazo’s award-winning work *Últimos momentos del rey Jaime el conquistador en el acto de entregar su espada a su hijo Pedro* (see chapter seven), reflects both his admiration for Rosales’s *Testamento de Isabel la Católica* and the influence of the Italian modernists.

After his big win at the *Exposición Nacional* of 1881, rather than seek out a position in Madrid, Rome, or Paris — where his mentors and predecessors had used their national fame to establish themselves — Pinazo returned to Valencia. He took a position at the *Academia de San Carlos*, where he became even more experimental in his use of color and composition. The painting *Desnudo de Mujer* (see Figure 6) is one example of the radical turn Pinazo’s work took. It demonstrates his command of the human figure, gained through years of training in the Academy, but it makes no attempt toward classical *disegno*. It is *colore* at its most vibrant, sexual, and violent.

---


Pinazo did not choose to place paintings like *Desnuda de mujer* (1895) in national contests. But, he did make experimentation central to his role as professor of color at the Academia de San Carlos, where he taught Joaquín Sorolla. Like his mentors, Sala and Pinazo, the young Sorolla would create large-scale Spanish history paintings early in his career, while experimenting with modernism. But, unlike them, Sorolla used his reputation as a history painter to submit modern works to national and international contests, forcing a divisive discussion within the Spanish Academy.

Sorolla, like Francisco Pradilla, was the beneficiary of a nationalized fine arts system; but he was also fortunate to be born in a place where the line between art and artisan was fuzzy. Sorolla was five when his parents died during the Spanish cholera epidemic of 1865. (That year an estimated 120,000 Spaniards died of the disease.\(^{649}\)) He was taken in by his maternal aunt and uncle, a blacksmith. According to his granddaughter, one day Sorolla neglected his duties stoking the kiln to draw a family

\(^{649}\) *El cólera en Valencia en 1885.* (Valencia: Manual Alufre, 1886), 72. NO AUTHOR? SUBTITLE?
portrait with a lump of coal. His aunt and uncle enrolled eight-year-old Sorolla into the newly founded *Escuela de Artesanos* (Artisans’ School).

The Artisans’ School was a remarkable venture, unique to Valencia. The region had, since Medieval times been a center for the production of fine ceramics and textiles. During the last half of the nineteenth century, these Valencian industries were among the few that grew. The result was a demand for workers trained in the design and decoration of ceramics. In an effort to meet this demand, the local municipality of Valencia, the local business community, and the *Academia de San Carlos* combined resources to create a night school where aspiring children and adults could receive arts education from professors at the Fine Arts Academy and, eventually, be placed in a profession. Sorolla noted this:

> Valencia ... possesses greater energies than before, but its ideal is different. Agriculture and industry have invaded everything. And the [fine] arts, without abdicating its ideals, should adapt itself to the times, making art industrial before confronting an ephemeral life ... from the manual studios of [Artisans’ School] came great artists ...  

When Sorolla attended the Artisans’ School, it was most likely in hopes that he would find a practical trade application for his bourgeoning artistic interests. Sorolla excelled in his painting and drawing classes at the school. He entered and won a contest among students and was written up in the local paper. His work gained the attention of Salustiano Asenjo (1834-1897), director of the *Academia de San Carlos*, who offered Sorolla a scholarship. Around the same time, Sorolla also found work as a touch-up artist in the studio of Antonio García Peris (1841-1918), a well-

---


651 Joaquin Sorolla. *Homenaje a la memoria de Joaquín Sorolla*. (Madrid: Madrid: Mateu, 1924), 20. Original text: “Valencia ... posee mayores energías que antes, pero su ideal es diferente. La agricultura y la industria lo han invadido todo, y las artes, sin abdicar de su idealidad, deben adaptarse al medio ambiente haciendo arte industrial antes que arrostrar una vida efímera ... De los talleres manuales surgieron grandes artistas, y el que tenga alas se elevará como el águila...”

regarded and pioneering portrait photographer, and Sorolla’s future father-in-law.\textsuperscript{653}

Sorolla fell in with a remarkable group of teachers and students during an era that was regularly referred to both in and out of the city as the “Valencian Renaissance.” Years later, he would recount the freedom that existed in the school, atypical for academic practice of the time:

There were men of great worth, such as Salustiano Asenjo, Ricardo Franch [engraver], Felipe Farinós [sculptor], and Gonzalo Salvá [landscape]; opposed but enthusiastic souls. Mr. Ansejo, the Director [of the Academy], possessed a wondrous artistic instinct. He was an enthusiast of art in all its manifestations, regardless of their occasional opposition to one another. He perceived the needs of each student, and empowered them forward and rabidly protected them as if they were his own children ... perhaps he wasn’t a teacher of modernism, but, even supposing this, he replaced the imperfections of a didactic approach with enthusiastic and intense feeling, which often are of more value than academic and regulatory rigor.\textsuperscript{654}

Despite this sense of freedom and experimentation, Sorolla was encouraged to participate in rituals of the National Academy. Under supervision of Ignacio Pinazo, he prepared seascapes for submission to the \textit{Exposición Nacional} of 1881. The works themselves were unremarkable — part of a traditional genre from a port city — and did not gain significant attention. But, placing his works in the contest gave the 17-year-old Sorolla an excuse to leave Valencia to accompany his works. It was the first time he had been away from home, the first time he saw

\textsuperscript{653} José Ramón Cancer Matinero. “Fotografía de A. García.” \textit{Archivo de Arte Valenciano}, No. 88. (Valencia: Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Carlos, 2007), 113-124.

\textsuperscript{654} Joaquin Sorolla. \textit{Homenaje a la memoria de Joaquín Sorolla}. (Madrid: Madrid: Mateu, 1924), 10-11. Original text: “Había hombres de positivo valer, tales como D. Salustiano Asenjo, D. Ricardo Franch (grabador), D. Felipe Farinós (escultor) y D. Gonzalvo Salvá (paisajista), almas muy opuestas pero entusiastas. El Sr. Asenjo, director, poseía un instinto artístico asombroso; era entusiasta de todas las manifestaciones de arte por opuestas que fuesen. Percibía la condiciones de cada alumno y al pulsarlas las adelantaba y protegía como si radicasen en sus propios hijos ... Quizá no fuese un pedagogo a la moderna; pero aun en este supuesto, sustituir a la falta de orientación didáctica con entusiasmos y vehemencias que frecuentemente valen más que el rigor académico y ordenancista.”
Madrid, visited the Prado, attended the *Exposición Nacional*, and viewed the works of Spanish painters working outside of Valencia. That same year, Emilio Sala and José Moreno Carbonero won first place at the *Exposición Nacional*. Sorolla would later consider them to be among his artistic heroes.\(^655\)

Sorolla would return to Madrid a year later, expressly to copy works by Diego Velázquez at the Prado Museum.\(^656\) Velázquez would become a lifelong obsession, a measuring stick. Decades later, aged 63, Sorolla told a fellow artist: “... I don’t have the spitfire Velázquez did; perhaps that is where his perfection came from and why I lack mine.”\(^657\)

Three years after his first visit to Madrid, Sorolla was in his final year at the *Academia de San Carlos*, during which he completed a major history painting. The work, titled *El Dos de Mayo 1808* (see Figure 7), depicted the Spanish forces defending the French invasion of Madrid in 1808. It bears a striking compositional resemblance to Manuel Castellano’s (1826-1880) *La Muerte de Dioaz y Velarde* (1862) (see Figure 8), which was inspired by the same historical events and won a third-class medal two decades earlier.\(^658\) Standard art historical wisdom could read a great deal into this reversal. Painted on the cusp of the Revolution of 1868 and with the action moving from right to left in his work, one could infer that Castellano was pointing to the past. By reversing the scene, Sorolla was looking toward the future shortly after the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy. Castellano’s depiction of the Madrid uprising against the French occupation includes many ordinary, non-uniformed citizens. The

---


combatants are nearly all members of the armed forces. The spectrum of deliberate contrasts Sorolla was attempting to infer between the two works is speculative. But, it is almost certain that the Exposición Nacional jury, composed of many who had been present for Castellano’s original exhibition of the work, likely would have made similar comparisons.
Figure 7: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) *El Segundo de Mayo 1808* (1883) Oil on canvas. 387 x 580. *Museo Nacional del Prado*, Madrid.

Figure 8: Manuel Castellano (1826-1880) *La Muerte de Dioaz y Velarde* (1862) Oil on canvas. 299 x 390 cm. *Museo Municipal*, Madrid.
The painting won a second-place medal at the *Exposición Nacional* of 1883. Castellano did his work at the age of 36, Sorolla was 20 years old. Competing against a host of older artists, Sorolla was the youngest artist in the history of the *Exposición Nacional* to win a medal. As a result, he gained the attention of the Academy in Madrid and, by winning a medal, qualified to attend the *Real Academia* in Rome as a student of merit.659

Students of merit were not eligible for scholarships from the federal government. As the orphaned son of a blacksmith working as a part-time touch-up artist, Sorolla could hardly afford to live abroad as a student, so, he applied to the local municipality of Valencia for funding. It was not unheard of for local municipalities to fund student artists.

![Figure 9: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) El grito del palleter (1884) Oil on canvas. 154 x 205 cm. Palau de la Generalitat, Valencia.](image)

funding from local Valencian authorities. He was required to paint a new multi-figural history painting that would be judged by the newly formed scholarship committee. For the task, Sorolla played to the crowd. He invited any Valencian who wished, to come to the local bull ring and be in his painting. Dozens came to pose as turn-of-the-century Valencians receiving the news that Napoleon had invaded Spain. The painting was titled *El grito del palleter* (see Figure 9). Sorolla provided costumes, but some came in the military uniforms of their grandfathers to pose as he painted *en plein air*. Sorolla crammed the painting with almost fifty figures. It was as much theater as painting. The finished work was put on display at the local municipality, where people could point out themselves or relatives in the work. In retrospect, painting for the local municipality and community of Madrid was a remarkable experiment in making popular art. While some academic standards would have been considered by the members of the ad-hoc jury, these juror members, Salustiano Ansejo and Ignacio Pinazo, had been Sorolla’s professors at the *Academia de San Carlos*. They had given him high marks in their courses and mentored Sorolla as he submitted the much more ambitious *El segundo de mayo* to the *Exposición Nacional*. Therefore, the members of the jury who were in need of the greatest persuasion were the non-academics: politicians, bureaucrats, and the local public. While these local politicians would, unsurprisingly, vote to pay for his study in Rome, their involvement would create serious complications in Sorolla’s oversight at the school.660

Two categories of artists worked at the Academy: students of merit and students of number. As discussed in chapter three, they attended the same classes, were under the authority of the same local director, and had the same yearly painting tasks. But, the yearly tasks of students of number were reviewed by leaders at the *Academia de San Fernando* in Madrid, who themselves had almost all been scholarship holders in Rome as young men and, therefore, were rigorous in maintaining academic standards. As a student of merit, Sorolla’s yearly works were subject to the

opinions of a jury from Valencia; a mix of local politicians, bureaucrats, and professors from the Academia de San Carlos. Effectively, this meant that his work was judged by different standards from others at the Real Academia.

Sorolla immediately fell in well with the leaders in Rome, especially Francisco Pradilla, with whom he had a life-long friendship:

Ever since I began to paint, my obsession has been to destroy all conventionality. How difficult it has been for me to do this on many occasions! ... When I arrived in Rome, Pradilla received me and took me in; I had to learn to master his unquestioning love for the beauty of line, and he knew just how to teach me. This truly helped me a lot. Because inside me there was a restless, revolutionary, and impetuous spirit, I needed a governor, a concept of quietude, a way of reasoning that would give me a sense of equilibrium. All of this I found in Pradilla, who tempered and confronted my rebellious impetuosity in those days.

His first-year task, a classical nude (see Figure 10), included the same position of the model, couch, and props that had been used by students at the Academy since 1874. When painting the work, Sorolla was under the supervision of Pradilla and measured against current and former students in Rome. But, when the work was sent to Valencia, it was denounced and rejected for indecency.

\[661\] Ibid.

In its official report, the jury responsible for reviewing Sorolla’s work stated:

[Bacchante en reposo] cannot be approved by the Academy ...
because there is a very powerful tendency toward realism. The fully nude figure opposes decency of Christian morals ...

These few words reveal a great deal about the jury and Sorolla. First, the 1880s saw a resurgence of Catholic fervor in public life. It was a counter-reaction to the liberal regimes of the revolution and republic, which put forward a number of laws and programs intended to secularize education and government in forming a centralized national government. The Carlist friar Pío Baroja — nicknamed Padre Puñal — famously said: "Long live religion, long live the king, and down with the nation!"

Following the end of the Carlist wars and the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, Catholicism was resurgent. The church positioned itself as against modernism, which threatened to unwind the social and moral fabric of society. An oft-repeated phrase in political journals at the time was: "Behind every political issue there is always a religious issue."

All students at Real Academia Española in Rome were required to paint a nude female figure. But, as mentioned before, whereas students of number (i.e., those funded by the central government) were judged by arts administrators at the Academia de San Fernando in Madrid, students of merit (i.e., those funded by municipal governments) submitted their works.

663 Comisión Provincial de Valencia. Antecedentes: Sobre el primer envío del pensionado Sorolla, 1886 Doc. 82/4/AB. Original text: "'Una mujer desnuda' no lo puede aprobar la Academia por que no se revelan en esta otra que han pretedicas pruebas ha dado que autor, y porque se nota en él bien potente la tendencia a un realismo, que aumenta los opuestos por la decencia a la completa desnudez de la figura ... Los opuestos la decencia a la completa desnudez de la figura humana dijera que los opuestos por la moral cristiana y la decencia a la completa desnudez de la figura humana."


667 It was oft quoted in liberal publications during the 1880s and 1890s, who saw religion as a hindrance to modernism. Source: José Álvarez-Junco. Spanish Identity in the Age of Nations. (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2011), 238-239.

to the local municipalities. Sorolla’s position as a student of merit, meant that rather than submitting his *Bacchante en reposo* (See figure 10), was subject to the opinions of a Valencian jury made up of professors from the *Academia de San Carlos* and politicians from the Municipality of Valencia. Although Sorolla’s works were very similar in content and approach to his contemporaries, the Valencian jury did not accept his first year’s task. The negative reaction of the Valencian review board may have been a result of provincial, non-artist members unaccustomed to nudity in art during a Catholic revival. (In this light, perhaps they would have reacted equally negatively to Plasencia’s work.) But, there are several contemporary examples of both male and female nude figures by other scholarship holders accepted without controversy that now hang in the *Museo de Bellas Artes de San Carlos* in Valencia, including by a few by Ignacio Pinazo, who served on the committee.

A survey of works by Sorolla’s fellow students in Rome — both those of number and merit — shows that Sorolla was using the same props (e.g., bed, laurel crown, censer, drapery, tambourine) as the others — they were props that had been in use since at least 1874, with the first group sent to the *Real Academia*. Comparing Sorolla’s work to one nearly identical in composition and content by Casto Plasencia (see Figure 11), which was also painting in Rome, is enlightening. Sorolla and Plasencia’s works are separated by nine years. Plasencia’s work is much more idealized. The title of the painting — *Nymph of the Butterflies* — has a great deal in common with the kind of *Dolce far niente* paintings by James Tissot (1836-1902), John William Waterhouse (1849-1917), and artists like John William Godward (1861-1922), popular among English aesthetes during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The focus on the butterfly or another object, like a tambourine or feather, has the effect of creating a contemplative scene, rather than one charged with sexual tension. By comparison to Casto Plasencia’s figure (see Figure 11), Sorolla’s is less
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clothed and remarkably more frank about the effects of gravity. Sorolla also turns the model’s head toward the wall, drawing the viewer’s attention away from her face and to her breasts. While the difference between the two works may not be as clear as that between Alexandre Cabanel’s Birth of Venus (1863) and Edouard Manet’s Olympia (1863), the reception of Sorolla’s painting seems to concern the same problem: Namely, an overt, realistic treatment of the female figure — either by taking it out of a classical contest, as did Manet, or by treating the figure with accuracy — changes the interpretation of the subject, moving it outside of the confines of the classical tradition.

This is well illustrated by an incident recorded by Claude Monet (1840-1926) while studying at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris under the famed Swiss painter Charles Gleyre (1808-1874). Monet had been working on a drawing, and Gleyre stopped to comment:

“It is not bad,” he said, “but the breast is heavy, the shoulder too powerful and the foot too big.”
“I can only draw what I see,” I replied timidly.
“Praxiteles borrowed the best parts from a hundred imperfect models, to create a masterpiece,” Gleyre replied dryly. “When you make something you must think of the antique!”

That same evening, I took [Alfred] Sisley, [Auguste] Renoir, and [Frédéric] Bazille to one side: “Let’s get out of here,” I said, “This place is unhealthy. It is lacking in sincerity.”

Through the many examples of international exhibitions, reproductions of French works in nationally distributed arts journals, and institutional ties between Spanish and French artists, Spanish artists were aware of the realist movements that had taken place in France during the 1860s. They would have known about Jean Léon Gérôme (1824-1904) and Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836-1912), whose work popularized exotic and erotic beauties in classical environments, although with a classicised


treatment of the nude, during the 1870s.\textsuperscript{672}

Figure 12: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) \textit{Estudio de tres cabezas} (c. 1885) Oil on canvas. 47 x 98 cm. \textit{Museo de Bellas Artes de San Carlos}, Valencia.

In order to assuage the regional jury, Sorolla sent a study of three heads (see Figure 12). It was judged as “very notable,” of “good coloring” and “good proportions.” But, like \textit{Bacchante en reposo}, it was deemed “too realistic” and, in addition, “unkempt” and “too natural.”\textsuperscript{673} Apparently, Sorolla was willing to make an effort to appease the jury; however, not enough to change his ways entirely. It is an indication that Sorolla was stubbornly moving away from the teachings of those who had mentored him in Valencia. Some of this change was attributed, by Sorolla himself, to new influences he encountered in Paris.

Students at the \textit{Real Academia} in Rome were required to spend at least six months of their three-year studies traveling.\textsuperscript{674} When fellow scholarship holder Pedro Gil Moreno de Mora (1860-1930) went to Paris, Sorolla


\textsuperscript{673} Comisión Provincial de Valencia. “Antecedentes: Sobre el primer envío del pensionado Sorolla, 1886.” Doc. 82/4/AB.

\textsuperscript{674} Ministerio de Estado. “Reglamento de la Real Academia Española en Roma.” \textit{Gaceta de Madrid}, No. 338. (Madrid: 4 December 1877), 673-676.
tagged along. Both were in their first year in Rome and neither had been to France. They visited the Louvre, the *Salon des artistes français* of 1885 and, most important to Sorolla, an exhibition of the German artist Adolf Von Menzel (1815-1945) and retrospective of the recently deceased artist Jules Bastien-Lepage (1848-1884). According to Pedro Gil Moreno, it was the “first time Sorolla had seen modern painting.” The influence of these on Sorolla would become apparent after his scholarship study in Rome.

After returning from Paris, Sorolla began work on his final task: a multi-figural painting that would meet the requirements of his scholarship and could be submitted to the *Exposición Nacional* of 1887 as well. Titled *El entierro de Cristo* (See figure 13), it depicted the apostles, Joseph of Arimathea, and Mary taking the dead Christ to his tomb. The work was enormous, nearly twice the size of anything Sorolla had ever painted. It was also hotly anticipated, partly because of Sorolla’s earlier success and also because of critical reports coming from Rome, where all of the scholarship holders had put their works on display before packaging them for Rome. But, when the painting arrived in Madrid, *El entierro de Cristo* was dismissed by the jury, who only gave it an honorable mention. (All of the other scholarship holders received first- or second-place medals.) Critics became petty. One said: “He has not painted the burial of Christ,
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but the hour that he was buried." In the introduction of a satirical account of the *Exposición Nacional*, Juan de Zabala wrote:

So I say this frankly,
The Jury does not know what it does
It did not award Sorolla for his work
even though it is, for us, a marvel
of drawing, color, and creation ...

I deplore the failure
and it truly pains me that it happened;
but friends, painters, endure it
you will feel better.

Sorolla was humiliated. Following the contest, he destroyed the painting. It was not until 2007 that the remnants of the painting were discovered in the *Museo Sorolla*, where it has yet to be pieced together. The only remains of what it looked like are from photogravures.

---


681 Juan de Zabala. “Catalogo Completo de la Exposición de Bellas Artes con la crítica en verso de todos los cuadros.” (Madrid: Manuel Ginés Hernandez, 1887), 6. Original text: “...pues digo con franqueza,/que no sabe el Jurado lo que hizo/no premiando á Sorolla su pintura/que es para inter nos mágico hechizo/en dibujo, colora y factura .../El fracaso deploro/y me duele en verdad lo sucedido;/pero amigos pintores, aguantarse,/ tener mejor sentido.”
Thirty years later, regarded as a national treasure, Sorolla recounted his version of events:

Unconsciously, I would say, involuntarily, in Rome I felt the influence of the times. At that moment Ulpiano Checa sent *La entrada de los bárbaros* to Madrid, Francisco Amérigo presented *El saqueo de Roma*, my master, Pradilla, *La rendición de Granada*, and I, *El entierro de Cristo*. I yielded to the environment, I went along with the rest, but my work did not follow the dictates of a healthy emotion; I could not explain myself, neither did my conscience approve, the painting of things or subjects from a particular place, in different places ... And it is natural that what happened did happen, given my way of understanding art: My poor *Burial of Christ* was a failure! No one liked it, not a soul ... much less Cánovas, who reserved one of his usual sharp remarks for me and my painting ...!\(^\text{682}\)

Sorolla clearly felt that the Spanish Academy, at least for himself, had perpetuated a set of values that were incompatible with his own instincts. Rather than return to Valencia or Rome, where he had several friends, including Pradilla, Sorolla moved to Assisi, Italy. About 200 kilometers north of Rome, it had been a stop on Sorolla’s way to and from Paris three

years earlier. According to Sorolla, it was there that he began to work out a new approach to his craft:

The triumph of Pradilla, Checa, and Amérigo was enormous, immense. I was the only one who took the blows, which were cruel, so cruel and insistent that they put me to shame and sent me into isolation. Better to say, I isolated myself. Terrified by all this, I took refuge ... I had seen a lot of [Bastien] Lepage, and his manner of working was similar to my own: It was a mainstay that showed me and reminded me of the path I began to take ... I studied in Paris; and the motley tones of the colors of the boulevard left me to paint just such a picture which, frankly, was already naturalistic and I tried to capture the feeling of liveliness that I saw there.\textsuperscript{683}

During the following two years, Sorolla’s works were far from anything that he had done while in Valencia, Madrid, or Rome. Nearly everything he created was small in scale and kept private until his death. They include small-scale Paris street scenes that bear similarities to works by Adolf von Menzel (see Figure 14) in that they attempt to capture a moment full of figures and action. Menzel dazzled contemporaries with his ability to make these scenes seem free, rather than staged or stiff.\textsuperscript{684} Sorolla’s attempt to do likewise stands in contrast to the posed, historical subjects favored by the Spanish Academy. In fact, during this self-imposed exile from Spain, Sorolla experimented with a variety of styles, including \textit{Praying Saint} (see Figure 15), done in a style that, with its flat perspective and gold leafing, would have been more in line with the early works of Gustav Klimt (1862-1918). Another work, \textit{Danza Valenciana} (see Figure 16), while titled as a Spanish scene, shares more in common with popular Italian painting by artists like Eugenio Zampighi (1859-1944) and Federico Andreotti (1847-1930).\textsuperscript{685}

\textsuperscript{683} \textit{Ibid.}


\textsuperscript{685} José Luis Diez and Javier Barón. \textit{Joaquin Sorolla}. (Madrid: Museo del Prado, 2011), 210-213.
Figure 14: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) Las afueras de París (1889) Oil on canvas. 13.8 x 19.6 cm. Museo Sorolla, Madrid.

Figure 15: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) Santa en oración (1888) Oil on canvas. 78 x 61 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.

[Click here for high-resolution image]
After three years in Italy, Sorolla reemerged with ten paintings for the Exposición Nacional of 1892. The works were a radical departure in subject, execution, and size from his previous work and for the Exposición Nacional. Two, in particular, proved controversial enough to cause prominent Academy members to take public stances for and against the approach. By submitting these works, Sorolla was using his name recognition to challenge the status quo of paintings that were typically considered worthy for the contest. It is important to note that such a challenge was more effective in Spain than in a more diverse artistic field, like France, for instance. Edouard Manet’s submissions to the Paris Salon were routinely rejected, along with thousands of others.686 But in Spain, very few works were submitted and works were rarely rejected, especially if submitted by a professional artist like Sorolla.687


687 This is a conclusion based on circumstantial evidence. While we know, from his own records, that Dario de Regoyos had been rejected, it is not until after the turn of the century that we see public discussions and reactions against jury decisions to reject works of art. Source: Jaime Brihuega Sierra and Isabel García Garcia. *Orígenes de las vanguardias artísticas en Madrid*. (Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Facultad de Geografía e Historia Departamento Historia del Arte Contemporáneo, Marzo 1998), 21-30.
Figure 17: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) *Un día feliz* (1892) Oil on canvas. 83 x 116 cm. *Galeria de Arte Moderno*, Udine, Italy.

Figure 18: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) *Otra Marguerita!* (1892) Oil on canvas. 129.5 x 198.1 cm. Mildred Lane Kemper Art Museum, Washington University of St. Louis, Missouri.

The two works submitted by Sorolla that drew the greatest attention were
Un día feliz (see Figure 17) and Otra Margarita! (see Figure 18). Both are significantly smaller than the average Spanish history painting usually considered for top prizes at the Exposición Nacional. Had these been submitted in 1887, which had the largest number of history paintings both in number and size (see chapter seven), it is likely that the diminutive dimensions of Sorolla’s works alone would have preempted any serious consideration of them. Several of these winning works from the 1887 contest were sent to the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1889 to represent the Spanish nation. But, as discussed in the previous chapter, the extremely large dimensions of Spanish paintings caused French organizers to refuse to hang works (see chapter seven). This may number among the reasons why several artists, including Sorolla, submitted significantly smaller works to the Exposición Nacional of 1892.

Both of Sorolla’s work depict anonymous contemporary figures. The first, Un día feliz (A Happy Day), shows a young girl in her clean, white communion dress. Rather than place her in the ritualized, grandiose environs of a church kneeling before a priest, Sorolla shows her in the shack of a blind fisherman. Instead of stained glass, light streams through the gaps in the walls. And the elderly man, no longer able to work, sits on a simple chair in front of his now useless boat. Unlike history paintings, featuring readily identifiable figures from the past and accompanied by lengthy, contextualizing texts, Un día feliz requires no overt explanation. The characters in the story do not need names. Without the aid of a clear narrative or dramatic gesture, Sorolla makes a serious commentary on the solemnity and dignity of Spain’s working classes.

Considered the lesser of the two paintings Sorolla submitted to the contest, the work, nonetheless, drew the attention of the respected art critic Augusto Comas y Blanco (1834-1900), who called the painting “...
the first work of the Spanish Contemporary School [of art].” Whether he meant it was the first instance of contemporary painting or the first among contemporary works is unclear, but it is clear that Comas was impressed. But of the two works Sorolla submitted, it was Otra Margarita! that drew the greatest attention.

The painting’s title, Another Marguerite!, refers both to a character in composer Charles Gounod’s (1818-1893) opera Faust (1859) and a woman Sorolla encountered on a train shortly before the Exposición Nacional. In Gounod’s opera — an adaptation of Johann von Goethe’s (1749-1832) work by the same title — satan tempts Faust to seduce and then abandon a young woman named Marguerite. She becomes pregnant out of wedlock. When Faust does not return, Marguerite is driven mad by abandonment and guilt. She drowns her child and is condemned to death for the murder.

According to Augusto Comas, who talked with Sorolla about the work, Sorolla was inspired by an encounter while traveling:

One day, Sorolla was leaving Valencia for Madrid ... In one of the carriages of his train he witnessed a scene very much like the one that led him to paint Another Marguerite! A young woman, unable to overcome the passion that was driving her out of her mind, stood accused of killing the fruit of her love to conceal her dishonour and was being taken by two Civil Guards to the court where she was to be tried ...

Shortly after, Sorolla sought permission from local authorities in Valencia to set up his easel on the train tracks near a local station and hired three
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models. From start to finish the painting took him less than fourteen days to paint. Today, it is difficult to look at *Otra Margarita!* without thinking of *The Third-class Railway Carriage* (*Un wagon de troisième classe*, c. 1862-64) by Honoré Daumier (1808-1879). Daumier’s painting — of which there are several versions — shows the cramped quarters of those who cannot afford better seats on the then-new French railway system. The work was a biting social commentary on the poor state of the French lower classes, despite — or perhaps because of — French industrialization and modernization.

While Sorolla’s painting is populated with different characters, the setting is similar. The carriage in *Otra Margarita!* is also a third-class car. Spain had been behind France in establishing a national rail network. It was not until the last quarter of the nineteenth-century that one could travel from Valencia to Madrid. Daumier’s work was seen as a commentary on the working classes and industrialization in France. Sorolla’s could be seen as a statement on the way the central government used the national rail system to get involved in issues that were previously dealt with by provincial law enforcement.

Unlike *Un día feliz!*, this painting borrowed from the kind of narrative that history paintings depended on for meaning — but it flipped the equation. Whereas history paintings often relied on audiences to read contemporary events into known historical or legendary figures, *Otra Marguerita!* mapped anonymous, contemporary figures onto well-known literary figures. More intimate, more human and more ordinary in nature — though when I say ordinary I do not mean it as a criticism, but as a ratification of the former affirmation — is the subject matter of Sorolla’s *Another Marguerite!* No explanation is needed: The picture

---


and its title say it all. The cheated young woman; the shame of condition that leads her to commit a crime, thinking she can wash away the stain; human justice in the name of a society that not only rejects the criminal of love but punishes her if she is unable to bear the results of her mistake and, unrelenting, seizes the unnatural mother, handcuffs her with hard iron and puts her between Civil Guards who take her to jail. There she travels alone, in a police van, in mourning, her head bowed over one shoulder, her face pale with an expression of astonishment and pain that numbs all her physical and moral faculties.

This is the drama; the scene played out in Sorolla’s picture. It provokes a deep and bitter feeling; the work demonstrates a mental bravery that cannot be denied."

Both it and *Un día feliz* break several academic conventions. Some of the rules that governed correct principles of painting taught in the Spanish Academy had been standard practice from the Renaissance to the late nineteenth century: grouping figures in threes, placing the most important figure of the narrative in center and in the brightest light, containing the subject within a well-defined space with clear endpoints, creating symmetry both in the overall work and individual figures. All of these rules were broken by Sorolla. The figures are placed in their natural environments and poses. They overlap in unpredictable and sometimes confusing ways. In *Otra Marguerita!* the central figure is clothed in black; the brightest colors and light are reserved for seemingly inconsequential portions of the painting. The break with these and other conventions incensed the typically mild-mannered Pedro de Madrazo y Kuntz (1816-1898).

---

695 Rafael Balsa de Vega. “Verdades y mentiras.” *La Ilustración Artística.* (Barcelona: 7 November 1892), 722. Original text, translation by José Luis Díez: “Más íntimo, más humano y por ser también más vulgar — y conste que no digo lo de vulgar en tono de censura, sino como ratificación de la afirmación primera — es el asunto del cuadro de Sorolla ¡Otra Margarita! No necesito explicar el motivo; lo dicen el cuadro y el título. La joven engañada; la vergüenza de un estado que la impulsa á cometer un crimen, creyendo borrar así una mancha; la justicia humana en nombre de una sociedad que, si rechaza á la delincuente del amor, la castiga también si no sabe soportar con resignación aquel desvío, prendiendo inexorable á la madre desnaturalizada, esposándola con duros hierros y entre guardias civiles trasladando á la cárcel. Allí va en un coche celular, sola, enlutada, caída sobre un hombro la cabeza, pálido el rostro, el estupor en la mirada, el dolor alcanzando el grado del embotamiento de todas las facultades morales y físicas. Este es el drama; esto es lo que representa el cuadro de Sorolla. La impresión que causa es honda amarga; el valor psíquico de la obra innegable.”
The brother of the famous painter and administrator Federico de Madrazo, Pedro had been made a member of the Academia de Bellas Artes for his work as an art historian and critic. He was the senior writer for the prestigious publication Ilustración Española y Americana and would later serve as the director of the Museo de Arte Moderno. In his review of the Exposición Nacional of 1892, Madrazo made the unusual decision to spread his comments over two issues. And, rather than review a particular work, he dedicated his columns to distinguishing between the shallow modernist approach to painting and the traditions of the Spanish Academy. Like José Casado had in 1882 (see chapter three), Madrazo wrote an unusually clear, contemporary expression of his perspective that, because of his position and the publication, can reasonably be extrapolated to represent the views of the Academy at large. Therefore, it is worth quoting his column at length:

What tendencies dominate our painters today? Two principal schools do battle in the field of art: the modern academy, composed of the professors, who from the beginning of this century introduced the study of naturalism into the classrooms of the Real Academia de San Fernando; and the realists, formed from a reminiscence of Neapolitan, Spanish, and Dutch naturalism of the seventeenth century, who work under the influence of a few exceptional talents who work with greater natural talent than study. The best paintings from this Exposición [Nacional] come from these two schools .... It appears that those who suppose the modern school owe nothing to the Academy greatly err, and, rather, it is an eloquent argument to

---


697 Ibid.
the contrary. I will explain what I mean with great clarity ...

Pedro de Madrazo then explains that his brother Federico de Madrazo, José Casado, Antonio Gisbert, Francisco Pradilla, and other history painters are descended from a long tradition of those who have always been students of “classical naturalism.” This classical naturalism was brought to Spain by his father, José de Madrazo, who studied with Jacques-Louis David. David’s influence produced throughout Europe and in Spain “a school to which all artist submitted to the same code, which allowed for great freedom of personal expression” through the study and application of “universal principles of art.” Madrazo uses several examples, both Spanish and non-Spanish, to argue that within the Academy there had always been a remarkable diversity of approaches, not just despite the rigorous and uniform education, but because of it. In other words, Madrazo is arguing against the notion that the academic approach has limited artistic production to a particular style.

---

698 Pedro de Madrazo. “Exposición Internacional de Bellas Artes de 1892.” Ilustración Española y Americana, No. XLIII. (22 November 1892), 350-351. Original text: “¿Que tendencias domina hoy entre nuestros pintores? Dos escuelas principales se disputan el campo del arte: la académica moderna, formada por los profesores que á principios del presente siglo introdujeron el estudio del natural en las clases de la Real Academia de San Fernando; y la realista, creada como reminiscencia del naturalismo napolitano, español y holandés del siglo XVII, bajo las influencias de algunos genios excepcionales á quienes con más facilidad se remeda que se estudia. A ambas escuelas pertenecen los mejores cuadros de nuestra Exposición ... Parécese que se equivocan grandemente los que suponen que la moderna escuela española de pintura nada debe á la Academia, y antes bien es una eloquente protesta contra ella: y voy á explicarme con claridad. Don Federico de Madrazo, D. Darios L. de Ribera, y después de ellos Casado, Palmaroli, Vera, Rosales, Sans Montaños, Madrazo (D. Luis), Gisbert, Pradilla, Raimundo de Madrazo, Ferrant, Dominques, Plasencia, cuantos han contribuido á la envidiable reputación de que hoy goza nuestra moderna pintura, lo deben casi todo á esa benemérita y calumniada Academia de San Fernando ... Que era nuestra pintura antes que el culto del naturalismo clásico, profesado en Francia por Luis David y su escuela, arraigase en la patria de Velázquez y Murillo ... Sin el gran sacudimiento que la Revolución francesa, con su personificación artística Luis Davis, produjo en la esfera social, política y estética de toda Europa, la pintura española se hubiera atrofiado y extinguido. Adolecía de un defecto la escuela de David introducida en la Academia de Madrid por sus discípulos Madrazo y Ribera, que fué exagerado demasiado la imitación del antiguo; pero es completamente errónea la creencia, propagada entre el vulgo de los amantes de las artes, de que esta escuela sujetaba a todos los artistas á un mismo código, prohibía la libre expansión del sentimiento individual y atrofia la más privilegiadas personalidades. Si no fuera suficiente prueba de lo contrario la existencia de afamados discípulos de David, diferentes ...”

After this defense of the Academy, he goes on the offensive, belittling the modernist approach to art not for its choice of subject matter, but for its poor execution:

The realist school, which is shown in many paintings in the current exhibition, draws its ancestry from antique Neapolitan, Dutch and Spanish naturalism, and offers characters in a way that is contrary to its own models. As to the execution, this modern realism is far away from Caravaggio, Ribera, and Rembrandt, which built up and finished off flesh with such care and awareness; at times it even appears malleable and sculptural in its origin.

Fewer still are influenced in their style by the theories of Ruskin, the famous apostle of the Pre-Raphaelite realism, who demands a painter devotes himself to the study of nature with the full observational power of their faculties, even to the smallest blade of meadow grass.

Our modern realists purport to follow the easy and short style of Velázquez and Goya, and do not consider that only the he who had become absolute possessor of the form through tireless study and drawing can obtain this concise style. Such is the case as the environment and distance become factors the works of those two great masters to give the appearance of all being formed and finished when, in reality, it is no more than indicated. In the painting that makes up our new and daring artistic phalanx, sections that are sketched and unfinished with great pretentions, at a certain distance, in play of taking body and form, are nothing more than a few colorless blotches and strokes. Thus we said at the beginning of this article to those exceptional geniuses: The more you copy, the more you understand. Velázquez in the seventeenth century, Goya at the end of the eighteenth and nineteenth, Fortuny in our days; they were exceptional geniuses who are very dangerous to imitate, because only to them was given the intuition to know what mercurial effect on the eye could be placed in an artist’s work, among the chaotic strokes of his canvas, and result in natural and lively work ...

No one would conclude, not without seeing it, that modern painting would go backward to the infancy of art in such a deplorable way. Yet, men of talent ... fill immense canvases with insignificant things which, instead of people, display meaningless shadows that distract the eye of viewers, giving them the impression that something strange, grey, yellow, and blue, appears to be a painting but, in
Despite this well-articulated attack, the arguments and justifications for one theory or another had little effect on the audience of the *Exposición Nacional*. Sorolla’s *Otra Margarita!* received several offers of purchase from prominent members of the Spanish aristocracy and glowing endorsements from many critics unaffiliated with the Academy. The jury, perhaps acknowledging this schism between the traditionalists and “modern realists,” awarded *Otra Margarita!* a first-place medal — the only painting of contemporary figures to ever receive such a high honor — but declined to purchase the painting for the state museum — the only work to receive a first-place medal that year that was not purchased by the

---

700 Ibid.Original text: “La escuela realista, que también se revela en no pocos cuadros de la actual Exposición, trae su abolengo del antiguo naturalismo napolitano, holandés y español, y ofrece caracteres en cierto modo contrarios á los de sus propios models. En cuanto á la ejecución, este moderno realismo se aparta mucho del Caravaggio, de Ribera y de Rembrandt, los cuales empastaban y concluían las carnes con tal esmero y conciencia, que á veces hasta parece plástico y escultórico su procedimiento. Menos aún influyen en su modo de hacer, las teorías de Ruskin, el célebre apóstol del realismo prerrafaelita, quien exige del pintor consagrado al estudio de la naturaleza la potencia máxima de sus facultades imitativas hasta para la más insignificante hierbecilla del prado. Propónense nuestros modernos realistas seguir el estilo fácil y abreviado de Velázquez y de Goya, y no consideran que sólo el que ha logrado hacerse dueño absoluto de la forma á fuerza de estudiarla y dibujarla, puede adoptar ese estilo conciso: por lo cual acontece que mientras el ambiente y la distancia entran como factores en las obras de aquellos dos grandes maestros para que aparezca todo acusado y concluido, cuando en realidad no está más que indicado, en los cuadros de los que forman nuestra nueva y arrojada falange artística, las partes abocetadas y con grandes pretensiones desatendidas, á cierta distancia, en vez de tomar cuerpo y forma, sólo son como de cerca borrones y brochazos dados sin tino. Por esto dijimos al comenzar el presente artículo, que á los genios excepcionales con más facilidad se les remeda que se les comprende. Velázquez en el siglo XVII, Goya á fines del XVIII y principio del XIX, fortuny en nuestros dás, fueron genios excepcionales á quienes es muy peligroso imitar, porque sólo á ellos fué dada la intuición de lo que la caprichosa óptica hace por s´en la obra del pintor para que resulte el natural acabado y lleno de vida de los caóticos brochazos de su lienzo ... Nadie se figuraría, no viéndolo, que podía la pintura moderna retroceder á la infancia del arte de una manera tan deplorable, y sin embargo, hombres de talento v... llenan inmensos lienzos con asuntos insignificantes en que intervienen, en vez de personas, sombras chinescas, que dejan en la retina del que los contempla la impresión de algo raro, gris, amarillo y azul, que parece cuadro y que realmente no lo es.”

However, the Academy’s decision to not purchase *Otra Margarita* would be remembered as a lapse of judgment by the regime, just as Rosales’s *Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* had been rejected by the Academy only to be lauded abroad as a masterpiece (see chapter five). After the close of the *Exposición Nacional* of 1892, Sorolla sent the painting to the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago (the first *Exposition Universelle* or World’s Fair held in the Americas). It was the first such event hosted in the Americas and was held in honor of the 400th anniversary of Columbus’s discovery of America. Sorolla’s painting was an enormous popular hit and was purchased by Charles Nagel (1849-1940), a wealthy American politician from St. Louis, for 10,800 pesetas. (The purchase price of Sorolla’s painting represented more than sixteen times the average yearly income for a worker in Madrid.) It was the most money paid for a Spanish contemporary work of art in the nineteenth century — more than three times the price of Gisbert’s *Comuneros* (see chapter four), five times Rosales’s *Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento* (see chapter five), and almost seven times the price of *Juana la Loca* by Pradilla (see chapter six).

It was, by all measures — institutionally and commercially — a triumph. The turnaround from self-isolation five years earlier to public accolades

---


was dramatic. In a letter to a friend about the success of *Otra Margarita!* in Madrid and abroad, Sorolla displayed the kind of nonchalant attitude that would typify his continued relationship with the Spanish Academy:

Many prizes are awarded, though that is worth nothing, as prizes do not make good painters (indeed the contrary is true). Personally, as I had already set my heart on winning this, actually receiving the accolade made little impression on me.⁷⁰⁷

As successful as his showing in 1892 was, Sorolla would outdo his achievements three years later both nationally and internationally with the paintings ¡Y aún dicen que el pescado es caro! (see Figure 19) and *Retour de la pêche: halage de la barque* (see Figure 20).

Whereas Sorolla’s mentors Pradilla and Pinazo often took months or years to complete large-scale paintings, Sorolla was capable of working on multiple multi-figural, large-scale works simultaneously. Shortly after his dramatic success at the *Exposición Nacional* and Columbian World’s Fair, he began work on about two dozen paintings. All of the works depicted rural life in his native Valencia. Like Pinazo before him, rather than establish himself abroad or in the nation’s capital, Sorolla returned to his hometown. There he became the center of a group of writers, artists, and businessmen who would encourage his interest in painting contemporary subjects. Among them was the famous Benito Pérez Galdós, who a decade earlier had called for the kind of art Sorolla was now creating (see chapter seven). But perhaps the most formative relationship Sorolla had was with the novelist Vicente Vlasco Ibáñez (1867-1928), who would inspire two of Sorolla’s most famous works. Looking back on the period, Ibáñez wrote:

> The Mayflower conjures up another emotional memory for me. Often, as I wandered the beach preparing my novel in my mind, I encountered a young painter — barely five years older than me —
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working in the blazing sunlight, magically reproducing on his canvas
the gold of the light ...

The painter and I had met as children then lost contact. He had
come from Italy and had just achieved his first successes.
Converted to realism in art and abhoring the painting taught in
schools, his only teacher was the Valencian sea, whose luminous
splendor he fervently admired.

We worked together: he on his canvases, I on my novel, with the
same model before us both. Thus we rekindled our friendship and
became brothers until death separated us a short while ago.

The painter was Joaquín Sorolla.708

In 1894, Ibáñez was working on his novel *Flor de Mayo*, which depicted
the difficult life of poor fishermen along the Mediterranean coast. The
novel would become an international success, and was made into a
Hollywood film in 1921. Ibáñez’s work paralleled a larger movement in
Spanish literature that saw writers like Benito Pérez Galdós, Emilia Pardo
Bazán (1851-1921), Luis Coloma (1851-1914), Leopoldo Alas Clarín
(1852-1901), and Armando Palacio Valdésas (1853-1938) to abandon their
writing of historical fiction in favor of dramatizing the daily lives of
contemporaries.709 Ibáñez described his work as “novels of naturalism.”710
It is therefore little surprise that both he and Sorolla were simpatico.

The book *Flor de Mayo* ends with the tragic death of a young,
inexperienced fisherman. His dead body was recovered and brought to the
belly of the ship, where the older sailors attempted to bring him back to
life.711 Inspired by this scene, Sorolla painted ¡Y aún dicen que el pescado
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709 Joan Oleza. “Galdós frente al discurso modernista de la modernidad. Por una lectura
compleja del realismo.” *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo*. Year 83. (Madrid:
2007), 177-200.

*Liebrales, agitadores y conspiradores: Biografías heterodoxas del siglo XIX*. (Madrid:
Espasa Calpe, 2000), 336-337.

Fisher Unwin, 1922), 253-256.
es caro! (And They Still Say Fish Is Expensive!, see Figure 19). Thematically, the work was undoubtedly in the same vein as his submissions to the 1892 Exposición Nacional. But, whereas Un día feliz and Otra Margarita! were overt aesthetical challenges to classical academism, this painting owes a great deal to Sorolla’s traditional education in terms of composition, symbolic content, linear quality, and overall academic rigor.

Figure 19: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1927) ¡Y aún dicen que el pescado es caro! (1894) Oil on canvas. 151.5 x 204 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid. [Click here for high-resolution image]
Sorolla himself noted that he was interested in creating a work that was baroque in composition, with the figures filling up the canvas “almost to the edges.” Many aspects of the painting conjure readily recognizable religious symbolism: the bloodied fish, the bowl of water, the wound in the side of the young man, and the dead body of the boy at the base of a pole, which could be seen as a reference to the lamentation of Christ. The boy begs comparison to the fallen Christ, crucified for the sins of commission and omission of Spaniards who ignore the plight of their countrymen. The conservative art critic Alfonso Pérez Nieva wrote:

The suffering face of the injured man and the deep concern of those caring for him speak volumes. The scene pulsates. The pain reaches out to the observer of the picture. The execution is delightful, and in particular the restraint the author has exercised with his brush, seeking sober colors without detracting from the intensity of the stains. This gives the picture a technical beauty of the very highest quality, traditional and in classical taste, though without any indication that its author has dispensed with the modernism for which he has gained his reputation.

The painting was universally hailed by the contest jury, who awarded it a first-place medal and purchased the work for the Museo de Arte Moderno. That year, only three first-class medals were awarded — all of them for contemporary, rather than historical scenes.

---


Even as the jury came to its decision, Sorolla was in Paris, overseeing the installation of his monumental work *Retour de la pêche: halage de la barque* (Return from fishing: bringing in the boat, see Figure 20). It was the largest painting Sorolla had painting since *El entierro de Cristo*. And, remarkably, although it was painted at the same time as ¡Aún dicen que el pescado es caro!, it was not submitted to the same Exposición Nacional. Instead, Sorolla submitted it to the Paris Salon des Artistes Français of 1895. When it was presented in Paris, the renown French critic Charles Yriarte wrote:

> Once again, it is a foreigner — Joaquín Sorolla from Valencia — who sounds the most resonant note and produces the strongest impression. *Return from Fishing* is one of the finest works at the *Salon*. It is redolent of the taste of green seaweed and the sound of the sea at calm. The boat moves slowly forward, pushed by a wind-filled sail and helped by two oxen in the water up to their chests. The characteristic Valencian seamen are stunningly natural. The entire painting has an intimate placidity and a captivating grandeur. The sun rains down in a silver shower from the heights of a blue

---

sky. Sorolla’s canvas is an impressive masterpiece.\textsuperscript{716}

The painting represented a sea change in Sorolla’s oeuvre, one that would define him for the rest of his career. Unlike the paintings he had submitted to the previous two Spanish \textit{Exposiciones Nacionales}, \textit{Retour de la pêche: halage de la barque} was not meant to elicit feelings of pity, nor comment on injustice or poverty. Instead, it was an overwhelmingly positive depiction of a place and lifestyle that stood in stark contrast to modernity.

Contextually, the work was presented in Paris only four years after the \textit{Exposition Universelle} of 1889, where an illuminated Eiffel Tower was on view for visitors (see chapter seven). Like the work of Jules Breton (1827-1906) painting the peasants of Brittany, or Stanhope Forbes (1857-1947) and his scenes of Newlyn, Sorolla had left the city to romanticize regional contemporaries. His muscular men and animals were painted in the same scale as mythical or historical subjects. By traditionalists, this could be considered the bastardization of a higher form of painting (i.e., historical narrative) with a lower (i.e., genre scenes).\textsuperscript{717}

Awarded the \textit{Salon}'s highest honor, the work was acquired by the French state and Sorolla was inducted into the Legion of Honor.\textsuperscript{718} That he presented the work to the \textit{Salon} without help from the Spanish state is a remarkable commentary on the change that Sorolla represented to the Academy. Gisbert, Rosales, and Pradilla had all received national and international accolades for their work. Pradilla had also been awarded the Legion of Honor. But these artists had created their work within the Academy and for the Spanish state with the goal of using their success to secure state patronage for their work. Sorolla had leapfrogged the

\textsuperscript{716} Charles Yriarte. “Un cuadro de Sorolla.” \textit{La Iberia}. (Madrid: 2 May 1895).

\textsuperscript{717} This is a reference to an essay written by André Félibien (1619-1695), who recorded what is believed to have been a widely accepted hierarchy of art from its most worthy genre (i.e., historical/allegorical/mythological) to its least (i.e., decorative). Source: Anna Brzyski, Ed. \textit{Partisan Canons}. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 96.

Academy to transport his own painting to Paris and win the world’s most prestigious art contest without the funding or preapproval of the Spanish Academy.

Sorolla soon became an internationally regarded artist. He held major exhibitions in Paris, Munich, London, and New York. In 1942, the Argentine writer José León Pagano (1875-1964) recalled how Parisians reacted to seeing Sorolla’s works in 1900:

One day, fate brought three very different painters such as Giovanni Boldini, Albert Besnard, and Claude Monet together in front of Sorolla’s prize-winning picture. Boldini, a dazzling technician himself, was fascinated by le superbe maîtrise de ce diable d’espagnol; Besnard commented: Il n’y a pas de doute, nous sommes en face d’un grand maître; Monet: D’un joyeux de la lumière.719

He became close friends with Anders Zorn (1860-1920), John Singer Sargent (1856-1925), and Louis Comfort Tiffany (1848-1933). After securing a major commission from the American industrialist Archer Huntington, Sorolla settled in Madrid and accepted a teaching position at the Academia de San Fernando as professor of the live model class. That same year he was inducted into the Spanish Academy as a full member, which only happened by invitation.

It was 1914, well after Sorolla’s successes at the Exposiciones Nacionales, but only shortly after the last remaining members of the Spanish Academy’s ancien régime had either retired or passed on. In his acceptance speech, Sorolla — Spain’s most commercially successful artist of the time — began talking to his fellow academicians as if it were 1887, just after he had been humiliated at the Exposición Nacional:

This educational defect concerns us Spaniards, who begin our art studies very young; understanding that drawing, as grammar, is for

more mature men. It is notoriously shown in foreign schools where they abuse this scholastic rigor; cooling the newborn flames of young souls. I feel this is a thousand times worse than the impetuous, passionate ignorance of a hurricane of color. Art makes itself felt and, once the soul perceives his touch, the happy [artist] studies it and grows in all its extremes.\footnote{Joaquín Sorolla. \textit{Homenaje a la memoria de Joaquín Sorolla.} (Madrid: Madrid: Mateu, 1924), 11. Original text: “Este defecto educativo nos interesa a los españoles que empezamos muy jóvenes el estudio del arte, entendiendo que el dibujo, como la gramática, con para hombres más formados. Caso bien notorio en las escuelas extranjeras, donde abusan de ese rigor escolástico, enfriando al nacer el fuego de las almas juveniles. En mi sentir, esto es mil veces peor que la ignorancia impetuosa, apasionada, del huracán colorista. El arte se siente, y, una vez que el alma percibe sus caricias, el feliz agraciado lo estudia y profundiza en todos sus extremos.”}

Read with an understanding of the narrative of Sorolla’s life, this statement could be seen as the core of his philosophy of his art and a thoroughly modern, damning condemnation of the Academy model. The Spanish Academy, just as the French Academy on which it was based (see chapter three), followed a centuries-old formula of teaching students through a series of stages. Young students began by copying old master drawings in order to understand composition. Then, students copied Greco-Roman statues — first isolated parts and, then, whole statues — in graphite or crayon. Finally, artists were allowed to copy live models, who were almost always posed in the stances of classical statues. Before the mid-nineteenth-century, graduates of academies in France and Spain were not taught to use paints until after their graduation, when they were expected to work in the studio of an experienced artist. This philosophy was neatly summed up by the Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres (1780-1867) when he said:

\begin{quote}
Over three quarters of what constitutes painting is composed of drawing. If I had to put a sign above my door I would write: “School of Drawing,” and I am sure that I would produce painters.\footnote{Henri Delaborde. \textit{Ingres: sa vie, ses travaux, sa doctrine.} (Paris: Henri Plon, 1870), 123. Text translated by Christine Lindey.}
\end{quote}

The emphasis on drawing, sometimes referred to as line or \textit{disegno} by nineteenth-century painters, was often opposed by artists whose work exhibited a preference \textit{colore} (color) in strong color and, often, loose
painting. Artists like Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863) favored the use of bold colors applied directly to the canvas, often without making several preparatory drawings. In France, this emphasis on color over drawing was regarded with deep suspicion early in the century. Jacques-Louis David referred to line as melody and color as harmony, saying that painting before drawing was like putting the cart before the horse. In the 1860s, the influential theorist and teacher Charles Blanc was critical of artists like Courbet and Manet for their emphasis on strong colors, saying that color played on a viewer’s emotions, thereby distracting from the content and platonic idea of the work.

These arguments between disegno and colore had been taking place in France for decades. They had taken place in Spain, too. Notably, Dario de Regoyos, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, and perhaps Spain’s most famous early proponent of impressionism, had left Spain for France in order to pursue an alternative to the Academy. But, whereas Regoyos, a student at the Academia de San Fernando, was soundly rejected by his time, Sorolla, some thirty years later, was embraced. In fact, at the time of his 1914 speech, Sorolla was not only being inducted into the Academia de San Fernando in Madrid. Four years later, he was made a professor of the human figure at the school, overseeing the copying of live models. While Sorolla’s 1914 call for artists to be left to explore color as youth, only to learn drawing as “mature men,” was long after the heyday of impressionism and divisionism in France, it was also a

---


direct contradiction of his own experience.

Figure 21: Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923) Penitents, Holy Week, Seville, 1914 (1914) Oil on canvas. 351 x 300 cm. Hispanic Society of America.
Sorolla was himself a result of the Academy model; the opposite of what he was proposing. By 1914, his paintings had become increasingly impressionistic. Rarely using preparatory drawings, Sorolla worked with small-scale color studies *en plein air*, then finishing works — some including multiple figures — in his studio. Without the rigorous education, based in drawing, he had received as a young man — first at the *Escuela de Artesanos*, then at the *Academia de San Carlos*, and, finally at the *Real Academia Española* in Rome — Sorolla would not have had foundation to do the kinds of multi-figural works for which he is now known. For example, his work *Penitents, Holy Week, Seville, 1914* (see Figure 21) is a virtuosic demonstration of the skills taught in the Academy (i.e., composition, color, tone, drapery). Without the date, the subject would not have been much out of place beside works by Francisco Pradilla or José Moreno Carbonero during the *Exposiciones Nacionales* of the 1870s and 1880s. But Sorolla’s antipathy toward the academic approach seems to be less about the skills involved than the changed context in which he and other Spaniards were making art.

Sorolla had been an enormous commercial success abroad first, then at home. Following his 1894 award-winning victory at the Paris Salon, Sorolla submitted works to a number of international competitions, in Austria, France, Italy, Germany, and the United States. His works were often awarded at the contests and lauded by critics. Sorolla followed these successes with an ambitious series of international traveling one-man shows: Paris (1906), Berlin (1907), and London (1908). It was this last show in London that, although not a critical success, introduced the artist to the industrialist Archer Huntington. From 1908, Sorolla was paid an enormous sum by Huntington to create a series of large, multi-figure paintings depicting the regions of Spain. Known as the *Vision de España*,


it occupied the artist until 1919.\footnote{James Huneker. *Eight essays on Joaquín Sorolla y Bastida.* (New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1909), 432.}

Sorolla’s international critical reputation and commercial success had eclipsed that of any Spanish artist of his generation. He was able to afford a mansion in Madrid — now the *Museo Sorolla* — and became the most sought-after portraitist in Spain since Federico de Madrazo.\footnote{José Luis Diez. *Joaquín Sorolla.* (Madrid: Museo del Prado, 2011), 80-96.} His beach paintings became a much-imitated genre of art until the mid-twentieth century. This success was both admired and ridiculed by contemporaries. The Mexican artist Diego Rivera (1886-1957), now known for his epic murals, studied at the *Academia de San Fernando* in Madrid, where he had an encounter with Sorolla. At the time, Rivera was working in the studio of Eduardo Chicharro y Agüera (1873-1959), himself a student of Sorolla:  

> “Rivera, the Master Sorolla is coming this afternoon. I’ve told him that you’re one of my most outstanding students and he wants to see what you have done.” ... Obeying instructions, [Rivera] selected three canvases suggested by his teacher. That afternoon, Sorolla examined them in detail. Pleased, he asked to see more paintings. Doing the best he could, [Rivera] brought out more. After going over most of them with a critical eye, Don Joaquín surprised Rivera himself.

> “Your hands will earn you millions. Your paintings are excellent. I am certain that you’ll be very successful in your profession.”\footnote{Guadalupe Rivera Marín. *Diego Rivera the Red.* (Mexico: Arte Público Press, 2004), 116-117.}

The story was shared many times by Rivera to illustrate, from his perspective as a dedicated Communist, the evils of capitalism in art.\footnote{*Ibid.*}
Sorolla’s success would not have been possible without a major shift in the patronage and audiences for Spanish art. Whether or not he was the agent or the subject of this change is a matter of argument. Yet, it is clear that, in retrospect, the key moment in the transition from history painting to contemporary subject was the poor reception of Sorolla’s *El entierro de Cristo* at the *Exposición Nacional* of 1887. It happened at a time when Sorolla was neither dependent on the Spanish government for commissions, nor on the Spanish academy’s *imprimatur* for credibility. This stood in enormous contrast to his predecessors, Madrazo, Gisbert, Casado, and Pinazo. Arguably, Sorolla was the first artist trained in the Spanish academy who became independent of the Academy.

In 1906, Ignacio Pinazo was elected a member of the *Real Academia de San Carlos* in Valencia. In his remarks to fellow artists he lamented what he called the “ignorance of art”:

> One of the things that most influences the course of art are [sic.] the demands of society ... art molds itself to its tyrannies, and falls to its vices.\(^{735}\)

Regardless of whether or not Pinazo was talking cynically about the state of art, he was saying something that has been fundamental to the argument of this thesis: Spanish artists, their artwork, and the Spanish Academy itself are the products of a remarkably transient period of time and the audiences of their art. In an astonishingly brief period of time, the Spanish government, principally using French-trained artists like the Madrazos, acquired all of the major institutions found in other, centuries-old national academies: a centralized, professional academy of art, a national contest, and a graduate academy in Rome. Artists who

---

\(^{735}\) Ignacio Pinazo y Camarlench. “De la ignorancia en el arte.” *Discurso de ingreso en la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Carlos Valencia: Ledido en la sesión inaugural del curso de 1896 a 1897, celebrada el 4 de octubre de 1896.* (Valencia: Archivo de Arte Valenciano, 1915), 2-5. Original text: “Una de las cosas que más influye en el curso del arte son las exigencias de la sociedad ... aquél se amolde a las tiranías de ésta, cae muchas veces también sus vicios.”
participated in this system were trained and patronized by the state. For thirty-one years — from 1856 to 1887 — their large-scale, multi-figural history paintings reflected the tastes of a revolving door of governments (i.e., Queen Isabel II, supporters of the Revolution of 1868, leaders of the First Republic, the Bourbon Restoration). These artists became so accomplished that their works became increasingly successful in international markets. The international successes of Rosales, Pradilla, and Sorolla had a remarkable influence on Spanish artists, leading to imitators in subsequent national contests. But, by the time Sorolla came to prominence, the Spanish government’s role as patron to the arts had been eclipsed by the private market, resulting in the end of the instruction, exhibition, and purchasing of Spanish history painting.
APPENDIX I

A Timeline of Key Events, Works, and People Discussed
APPENDIX II

Award-Winning Paintings of the
Exposiciones Nacionales
Held from 1856 to 1897

The establishment of the Exposición Nacional de Bellas Artes is described
in chapter three, with discussion on key contest in all subsequent chapters. Between the first Exposición Nacional in 1856 and 1899 there were sixteen contests, each with hundreds of submissions from Spanish painters, sculptors, and architects. (The overwhelming majority of works submitted to the Exposición Nacional were paintings.) A jury consisting of academics, government leaders, and appointees voted on five kinds of awards: first-class, second-class, and third-class medals, which were given to works in each discipline (i.e. painting, sculpture, architecture), honorable mentions, and, the Medal of Honor, the contest's top prize. The Medal of Honor was only awarded three times between 1856 and 1899. Only one painting, Doña Juana la Loca (1878) by Francisco Pradilla y Ortiz.

Below is a list of all the paintings awarded first-class medals between 1856 and 1899. Ordered by contest year, it includes the name of the painter, where the painter was born, the title of the work, dimensions, the work’s genre, and its current location. Even a brief review of this list, including only first-class-medal winners — shows a number of trends. For example, one can see that, until the lat 1880s, works continue to increase in size, only to become smaller in the 1890s. Looking at the regions of origin, it is clear that over time, a more geographically diverse group of artists begins to dominate the contest. In regards to genre, during the Bourbon Restoration, subjects featuring Spanish history are replaced with themes of ancient rome, followed by contemporary scenes. The location of the works is evidence of the predominant patronage of the Spanish central government over private. With the exception of only a few works, paintings were purchased and kept in State
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PAINTER</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>PAINTING TITLE</th>
<th>SIZE (CM)</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>CURRENT LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Cano de la Peña, Eduardo</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Cristóbal Colón en el convento de la Rábida</td>
<td>228 by 257</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado, on deposit in the Palacio del Senado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Madrazo y Kunt, Luis de</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Don Pelayo en Covadonga</td>
<td>358.5 by 280</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado, on deposit in the Basílica de Covadonga, Asturias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Cano de la Peña, Eduardo</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Entierro de don Alvaro de Luna</td>
<td>243 by 295</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Gisbert Perez, Antonio</td>
<td>Alcoy (Alicant e)</td>
<td>Últimos momentos del Príncipe Don Carlos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Palacio Real de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Haes, Carlos de</td>
<td>Brusel s</td>
<td>Vista de las cercanias del monasterio de Piedra</td>
<td>25.5 by 37</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado, on deposit in Cuartel General de la Marina, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Gonzalvo Perez, Pablo</td>
<td>Zaragoza (Zaragoza)</td>
<td>Crucero de la catedral de Toledo</td>
<td>125 by 205</td>
<td>Architectural /Religious</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Museo de Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Gisbert Pérez, Antonio</td>
<td>Alcoy (Alicant e)</td>
<td>Los comuneros Padilla, Bravo y Maldonado, en el patíbulo</td>
<td>255 by 365</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Casado del Alisal, José</td>
<td>Villada (Palencia)</td>
<td>Últimos momentos de Fernando IV el Emplazado</td>
<td>318 by 248</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Palacio del Senado, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Haes, Carlos de</td>
<td>Bruselas</td>
<td>Un país. Recuerdos de Andalucia, costa del Mediterráneo, junto a Torremolinos</td>
<td>114 by 165</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Fierros Alvarez, Dionisio</td>
<td>La Ballota (Asturias)</td>
<td>Una romería en las cercanias de Santiago</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious/ Genre</td>
<td>Fundación Caixa, Galicia a Coruña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Gonzalvo Perez, Pablo</td>
<td>Zaragoza (Zaragoza)</td>
<td>Capilla del condestable en la catedral de Toledo</td>
<td>175 by 127</td>
<td>Architectural /Religious</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Vera y Estaca, Alejo</td>
<td>Viñuelas (Guadalajara)</td>
<td>Entierro de San Lorenzo</td>
<td>233 by 224</td>
<td>Religious/ Historical</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Ayuntamiento de Huesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Haes, Carlos de</td>
<td>Brusel s</td>
<td>Vista de Lozoya</td>
<td>97 by 165</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Puebla Tolín, Dióscoro</td>
<td>Melgar de Férnamental (Burgos)</td>
<td>Primer desembarco de Colón en América</td>
<td>330 by 545</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Ayuntamiento de La Coruña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Suárez Llanos, Ignacio</td>
<td>Gijón</td>
<td>Sor Marcela de San Félix viendo pasar el entierro de Lope de Vega, su padre</td>
<td>200 by 307</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Museo Municipal de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Palmaroli Gonzalez, Vicente</td>
<td>Zarzalejo (Madrid)</td>
<td>Una campesina de Nápoles llamada Pascuccia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Hernández y Amores, Germán</td>
<td>Murcia</td>
<td>Viaje de la Virgen y San Juan a Efeso</td>
<td>240 by 390</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Gisbert Perez, Antonio</td>
<td>Alcay (Alicant e)</td>
<td>Desembarque de los puritanos en América del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Palacio del Senado, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Rosales Gallina, Eudardo</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Doña Isabel la Católica dictando su testamento</td>
<td>290 by 400</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Casado del Alisal, José</td>
<td>Villada (Palenci a)</td>
<td>La rendición de Bailén</td>
<td>338 by 500</td>
<td>Spanish History</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Palmaroli Gonzalez, Vicente</td>
<td>Zarzalejo (Madrid)</td>
<td>Sermón en la Capilla Sixtina</td>
<td>160 by 257</td>
<td>Religious/Historical</td>
<td>Colección de Caja Salamanca y Soria, Salamanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Mercadé y Fabrega, Benito</td>
<td>La Bisbal (Gerona)</td>
<td>Traslación de San Francisco de Asís</td>
<td>306 by 446</td>
<td>Religious/Historical</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Vera y Estaca, Alejo</td>
<td>Víñuela s (Guadalajara)</td>
<td>Un coro de monjas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Palmaroli Gonzalez, Vicente</td>
<td>Zarzalejo (Madrid)</td>
<td>El 3 de mayo de 1808, Entrerramientos de Moncloa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Ayuntamiento de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Rosales Gallina, Eudardo</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Muerte de Lucrecia</td>
<td>258 by 347</td>
<td>Roman history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Dominguez Sanchez, Manuel</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Muerte de Séneca</td>
<td>270 by 450</td>
<td>Roman/Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Museo de Jaén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Domingo Marqués, Francisco</td>
<td>Valenci a</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Museo de Bellas Artes de San Carlos, Valencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Vera y Estaca, Alejo</td>
<td>Víñuela s (Guadalajara)</td>
<td>Una señora pompeyana en el tocador</td>
<td></td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Martinez Cubells, Salvador</td>
<td>Valenci a</td>
<td>Educación del príncipe don Juan</td>
<td>328 by 487</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Palacio del Senado, Madrid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Ferrant Fisherman s, Alejandro</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>El entierro de San Sebastián</td>
<td>305 by 430</td>
<td>Religious/Roman history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Sala y Frances, Emilio</td>
<td>Alcoy (Alicante)</td>
<td>Guillén de Vinatea, delante de Alfonso IV, haciéndole revocar un contrafuero</td>
<td>428 by 690</td>
<td>Roman history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Plasencia y Maestre, Casto</td>
<td>Carrión (Guadalajara)</td>
<td>Origen de la República romana</td>
<td>310 by 242</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Moreno Carbonero</td>
<td>Málaga</td>
<td>El príncipe don Carlos de Viana</td>
<td>272 by 367</td>
<td>Literary</td>
<td>Museo do Chiado, Lisboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Sala y Frances, Emilio</td>
<td>Alcoy (Alicante)</td>
<td>Novus Ortu, alegoría del Renacimiento</td>
<td>315 by 500</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Moreno Carbonero, José</td>
<td>Málaga</td>
<td>Conversión del duque de Gandía</td>
<td>330 by 516</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Luna y Novicio, Juan</td>
<td>Bardoc (Philippines)</td>
<td>Los amantes de Teruel</td>
<td>400 by 700</td>
<td>Roman history</td>
<td>National Museum of the Philippines, Manila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Martínez Cubells, Salvador</td>
<td>Pajares (Lena, Asturias)</td>
<td>Doña Inés Castro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Amérgio y Aparici, Francisco Javier</td>
<td>Valenci (a)</td>
<td>El saqueo de Roma</td>
<td>380 by 550</td>
<td>Roman history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Museo de Bellas Artes de Valencia de San Pío, Valencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Viniegra, Salvador</td>
<td>Viñuelas (Guadalajara)</td>
<td>La bendición del campo en 1800</td>
<td>345 by 596</td>
<td>Religious/Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Museo Municipal de Málaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Checa y Sanz, Ulpiano</td>
<td>Colmenar de Oreja (Madrid)</td>
<td>La invasión de los bárbaros</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman history</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Benlliure y Gil, José</td>
<td>Cañamuel de Valenci</td>
<td>La visión de Colosseo</td>
<td>540 by 730</td>
<td>Roman history</td>
<td>Museo de Bellas Artes de San Carlos, Valencia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Villodas de la Torre, Ricardo de</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Victoribus gloria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman history</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Ruiz Luna, Justo</td>
<td>Cádiz</td>
<td>Combate naval de Trafalgar</td>
<td>230 by 700</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Ayuntamiento de Cádiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Alvarez Catalá, Luis</td>
<td>Monasterio de Horno</td>
<td>La silla de Felipe II en el Escorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts, Berlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Jiménez Aranda, José</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Una desgracia</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>Museo de Bellas Artes, Sevilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Ferrant Fischerman s, Alejandro</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Cisneros, Fundador del hospital de Illescas</td>
<td>Spanish history</td>
<td>Fundación de la Hospital de Nuestra Señora de la Caridad, Toledo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Garnelo y Aida, José</td>
<td>Enguera (Valencia)</td>
<td>Cornelia, madre de los Graco</td>
<td>Roman history/ mythology</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Morera, Jaime</td>
<td>San Esteban de Bas (Gerona)</td>
<td>Paisaje de Normandía</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Diputación Provincial de Zamora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Amérgio y Aparicik Francisco Javier</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>El derecho de asilo</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in el Colegio Cervantes, Jerez de la Frontera, Cádiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Simonet Lombardo, Enrique</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Flevit super illam</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Museo Municipal de Málaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Menéndez Pidal, Luis</td>
<td>Pajares (Lena, Asturias)</td>
<td>La cuña vacía</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Sorolla y Bastida, Joaquín</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Otra margarita!</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>Washington University Gallery of Art, St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Nogales y Sevilla, José</td>
<td>Málaga</td>
<td>Santa Casilada</td>
<td>Religious/ Spanish history</td>
<td>Museo Municipal de Málaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Cutanda y Toraya, Vicente</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Una huelga de obreros en Vizcaya</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in el Ministerio de Trabajo, Madrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Jiménez Aranda, Himenez</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Una sala de hospital durante la visita del médico</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Plá y Rubio, Alberto</td>
<td>Villanueva de Castellón</td>
<td>¡A la guerra!</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado on deposit in the Ayuntamiento de Alcalá de Henares, Madrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Sorolla y Bastida, Joaquín</td>
<td>Valenca</td>
<td>¡Aún dicen que el pescado es caro!</td>
<td>Contempora</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Urgell i Ingla, Modesto</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>El Pedregal</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Gessa y Arias, Sebastián</td>
<td>Chilca (Cádiz)</td>
<td>Flores y frutas</td>
<td>61 by 41</td>
<td>Still Life</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado (en dep. en el Museo de Castrelos, Vigo, Pontevedra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Pinazo y Carmarlenc, Ignacio</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Retrato de Don José María Mellado</td>
<td>Portrait</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Pinazo y Carmarlenc, Ignacio</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>La lección de memoria</td>
<td>143 by 143</td>
<td>Contemporaneous</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Bilbao Martínez, Gonzalo</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Mar de Levante</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Menéndez Pidal, Luis</td>
<td>Pajares (Lena, Asturias)</td>
<td>Salus infirmorum</td>
<td>80 by 101</td>
<td>Contemporary/Religious</td>
<td>Museo Nacional del Prado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A list of academies and schools of fine art — by region and with year of royal investiture — that constituted the Spanish Academy from its centralization in 1862, as described in Chapter 3. (This does not include the many artisanal schools of art societies that coexisted alongside or supplied students to academies of fine art.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY or REGION</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>YEAR FOUNDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviles</td>
<td>Escuela de Artes y Oficios</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badajoz</td>
<td>Academia de Dibujo y Pintura</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>Academia Provincial de Dibujo de Burgos</td>
<td>1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>Año</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cádiz</td>
<td>Real Academia Provincial de Bellas Artes</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartagena</td>
<td>Real Academia Canaria de Bellas Artes de San Miguel Arcángel</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Córdoba</td>
<td>Real Academia de Ciencias, Bellas Letras y Nobles Artes</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>Real Academia de Nuestra Señora de las Angustias</td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Coruña</td>
<td>Real Academia de Bellas Artes de Nuestra Señora del Rosario</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Palmas (Islas Canarias)</td>
<td>Escuela de Artes y Oficios</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Real Academia de San Fernando</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Málaga</td>
<td>Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Telmo</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Málaga</td>
<td>Real Academia de Nobles Artes de Antequera</td>
<td>1789/1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murcia</td>
<td>Real Academia de Bellas Artes de Santa María de la Arrixaca</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oviedo</td>
<td>Academia de Bellas Artes de San Salvador</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamplona</td>
<td>Escuela de Artes y Oficios</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Real Academia Española en Roma</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Real Academia de Bellas Artes de Santa Isabel de Hungría</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Academia de San Carlos</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Carlos</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valladolid</td>
<td>Real Academia de Bellas Artes de la Purísima Concepción</td>
<td>1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
<td>Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Luis</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of key constitutional reforms, in sequential order and by document.

CONSTITUTION OF BAYONNE or STATUTE OF BAYONNE (1808)
Written in France for the rule of Joseph Bonaparte (1768 - 1844 | Rule, 1808 - 1813) during the French occupation (1808 - 1814)
- King retains executive and legislative powers
- Cortes (i.e. Spanish legislature) divided into three branches: nobility, clerics, and people
-Equality between Spanish and Americans declared
-Private property rights created for non-nobility
-Abolition of torture
-Liberty of business and manufacturing established

CONSTITUTION OF 1812 (Never implemented)
Written by the Spanish government in exile, without support of the King, during the French occupation of Iberia (1808 - 1814)
- National sovereignty (i.e. citizens named as source of nation’s power, not royalty)
- Division of powers between executive, legislative, and judiciary
- Unicameral Cortes (i.e. legislature) as most powerful branch of government
- Limitation of monarchy’s powers
- Recognition of individual rights and liberties
- Unrestricted liberty of the press
- Universal, indirect male suffrage
- Property rights and liberty of commerce

ROYAL STATUTE OF 1834
Issued by Regent Maria Cristina (1806 - 1878 | Regency, 1833 - 1840)
following the death of her husband, King Ferdinand VII (1874 - 1833 | Reign, 1808, 1813 - 1833)
- Restricted voting rights, limited to male property owners (i.e. about 16,000 Spaniards, or .15 percent of the population.
- Creation of bicameral legislature
- Upper house appointed by King
- Lower house chosen by restricted voting

CONSTITUTION OF 1837
The document was meant to show a break from the contentious and conservative reign of Ferdinand VII; and meant to attract moderate and progressive support during the Carlist wars.
- Power shared by King and the Cortes (i.e. bicameral legislature)
- Independent judiciary
- Less-restricted voting rights
- Liberty of the press for scientific, engineering, and arts with publication subject to government review
- Recognition of individual rights and liberties
- Recognition of private property
- Rights granted to those detained by government
- Recognition of Catholic Church as “religion of State”
CONSTITUTION OF 1845
The first constitutional reforms by Queen Isabel II (1830 - 1904 | Reign, 1833 - 1868), after assuming the throne from her mother, the Regent; considered a reaction against progressive and moderate elements in the government seeking to limit Royal power.
- Power shared by King and the Cortes (i.e. Senado and Congreso de Diputados)
- Elimination of freedom of press, freedom of speech, and rights of detention
- Greater restriction of voting rights
- Restriction of regional government powers
- Catholic church again declared “religion of State”

CONSTITUTION OF 1856 (Never implemented)
Written following the Revolution of 1854, which forced Queen Isabel II to give more power to progressive elements within the government.
- National sovereignty declared (i.e. citizens named as source of nation’s power, not royalty)
- Division of powers into executive, legislative, and judicial.
- Liberty of the press
- Recognition of Catholicism as religion of State, with protection for “liberty of consciousness”
- Proposed election of upper legislative house by restricted voting, as opposed to royal appointment

CONSTITUTION OF 1869
Written by the Provisional Revolutionary Government after the coup d’etat of 1868, dethroning Queen Isabel II (DATES). The document was based on the Constitution of 1812.
- National sovereignty declared
- Division of powers into executive, legislative, and judicial
- Independent judiciary
- Bicameral legislation (i.e. Senado and Congreso de Diputados) elected by direct voting
- Universal, direct suffrage for men 25 years and older
- Establishment of individual rights
- Catholic Church declared religion of State
- Liberty of religion for individuals
CONSTITUTION OF 1876
Written by Antonio Cánovas del Castillo (DATES) for the restoration of the Spanish Bourbon monarchy of Alfonso XII (1857 - 1885 | Reign, 1874 - 1885) and based on the British Constitution. It was in force until the Spanish Constitution of 1978.

- Power shared between the Monarchy and the Cortes (i.e. Senado and Congreso de Diputados)
- Law originate from Monarchy or Cortes, with final review by King, who also has ability to dismiss the legislatures
- Monarchy has executive power, with ability to name Prime Minister and ministers of State
- Members of Senado appointed by Monarchy and Congreso de Diputados elected by direct vote by men over the age of 25.
- Catholicism made Church of State, given special rights.
- Regional governments centralized under government in Madrid
- Liberty of press

Sources:
La Parra, Emilio and María José Millán, eds. Ciudadanos, El nacimiento de la política en España (1808 - 1869), exhibition catalogue (Madrid: Fundación Pablo Iglesias, 2009)
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