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Francisco Goya y Lucientes is a remarkable figure in the history of art. Rarely has an artist arisen from such a cultural vacuum; rarely has an artist done so much to establish a cultural reputation for his country; rarely has an artist reflected so accurately the spirit of his time; and rare is the artist who has such an important influence on all the significant art of the future.

Goya was born in 1746, at a time when Spain was at a low ebb. She had passed long ago from the Golden Age of the 16th century, and from that time until the middle of the 18th century, it was a steady decline. In painting, literature, and music; in science, philosophy, and politics there was produced nothing of consequence. The Bourbon Dynasty was decrepit; the social situation in the country was two hundred years retarded. For the arts and all the humanities there was virtually no inspiration, and certainly no official backing. And from this came Goya.

The question is: How?

This thesis, then, is the story of how Goya came to be the artist he was, and of the times which made him what he was, and which he so well mirrored.
In 1720, the Spanish crown, as part of an enlightened effort to reestablish a cultural reputation for the city of Madrid, set up the Royal Tapestry Factory of Sta. Barbara. Its original administration was headed by the Flemish expert J. Van der Goten and later by his son Cornelius, who, in fact, was still in charge when Francisco Goya began working for it years later.

The early history of the factory is rather interesting for it parallels in certain respects the operation of Spanish industry at that time. This industry was far inferior to that of the rest of Europe, a fact which is not due to unsound economic theory but rather is profoundly anchored to the psychology of the people. That is, there simply was no desire to make money, no initiative, on the part of the upper classes. There was, they felt, too much risk involved. And it is a state of mind that had permeated out of the upper class right down through to the lowest levels of the peasantry. Other countries at this time were beginning to set up closed, paternalistic economies in order to protect themselves from imports. This was not the case with Spain. She was entirely dependent upon foreign countries for everything from the commonest manufactured article to the most
precious luxury item, and all efforts to create national industries were doomed to failure.

It was in this same spirit that the factories of Sta. Barbara came into being. There seemed to be no initiative and no originality—no new ideas, although it must be admitted that the idea of a factory itself was a step in the right direction. But nothing about the factories was Spanish—even its director had to be imported. One would think that somewhere in Spain there would have been someone who had the ability to direct this undertaking, but such was not the case, or, if it was, the King wasn’t interested. Van der Gotten was invited to accept the position as director. He did just that, and he went to Spain from Flanders, taking with him all the Flemish ideas and traditions which he knew so well. And so Major Dalrymple, one of many Englishmen who visited the establishment, was moved to comment: “These workshops have been set up in sheer imitation, through a puerile vanity. . . . They are maintained by Royal generosity, at considerable expense, and their products could be bought only by the opulent.”¹ As I say, there was nothing Spanish about the factories. The first works were no more than copies of ancient tapestries. Following this, there was a predilection for cartoons by French and

¹Antonia Valentin, This I Saw, p. 33.
Italian artists. Teniers and Wouwerman also produced some rather conventional "peasant" scenes. And finally, there was a series of paintings illustrating the story of Don Quixote after the Italian Baroque painter Andrea Procaccini.2

Then in 1761 a fortunate change, at least for the life of the Sta. Barbara establishment, took place. Anton Raphael Mengs was appointed "Primer Pintor de Cámara" (First Court Painter), and one of the things he set about to do was to set the tapestry undertaking moving in the right direction. He understood that the most successful work done so far by the factories were the Flemish genre subjects, and he decided to exploit this same vein, only infusing into the work a bit of local color.3

This was not an entirely new situation in the realm of Spanish art, something which is pointed out by many authors. In 1717, Philip V, the first of the Spanish Bourbons, had brought the French painter Michel Ange Houasse to the court of Spain. Houasse did a certain amount of work with genre subjects, and in the 1700's did a small series of paintings for the Royal Palace at Granada with subjects such as "Blind Man's Buff," "The Game of Pelota," "The Washerwoman" and "The Swing."4

2 F. D. Klingender, Goya in the Democratic Tradition, p. 55.
3 Valentín, p. 33.
4 Folke Nordström, Goya, Saturn and Melancholy, p. 11.
There was a pervading boredom with the French decorative art and the mythological scene painting that had been so popular at the end of the seventeenth century. This was what made people like Pietro Longhi and Crespi so popular in Italy as the century progressed. It contributed to the popularity of Chardin in France, and it is also what determined the success of the genre tapestries which had already been produced at Sta. Barbara when Menys took over.

In spite of the fact that there had already been done some genre painting in Spain, Mengs' decision was a decisive and important one. The repertoire which he prescribed consisted of scenes from Flemish genre paintings. There is here a desire to bring the Spanish artistic program into line with the taste of the people. The typical mythological, literary and "peasant" models were replaced under the supervision of Mengs by popular scenes in contemporary and definitely Spanish "milieu."

Mengs turned not to other countries, but rather to already established Spanish artists for cartoons. The first to be summoned was Francisco Bayeu, whose sister, Josefa, Goya had married in July of 1773. Bayeu exerted his influence on Mengs, and subsequently in 1774 Goya was called to Madrid to begin work on the tapestries. The work he did in the following year, 1775, for the

---

5 Klingender, p. 56. The preceding account is taken from three authors, Klingender, Valentin, and Nordtröm, all of whom carefully describe the situation of the Sta. Barbara Factories at the time Goya stepped in.
establishment was of such a mediocre quality, and demonstrated such a submissive style, that prior to the investigations of Valentín de Sambricio (who, incidentally, has written the authoritative study of Goya's tapestries), they weren't even attributed to Goya. It wasn't until 1776, then, that Goya really got started. At this time there was ordered a series of tapestries for the residence of the Prince of Asturias at the Pardo Palace just outside Madrid, and Mengs, who seemed to have no objection to trying out a relatively unknown painter, handed the assignment to Goya, which brought with it a "tentative" salary of 8,000 reales. The implication here is that Goya was being tested, and that the outcome was uncertain. Goya was thirty years old. It was his first real chance to escape the narrow world of provincial, ecclesiastical commissions with which he had been entangled until that time, "and he was employed on a program of work which identified him with the reform party not only by conviction, but also professionally. The course was set for one of the most heroic careers in the history of art." This is a somewhat stuffy and rather annoying statement, but at the same time it has a ring of truth. The desire

---

6Valentín, p. 34.

7Klingender, p. 56.
to bring Spanish art back to the Spaniards, to in fact create a Spanish art, probably can be considered at least enlightened, although I'm not sure it associates Goya with any reform movement; and Goya's career certainly was very dramatic, and probably quite heroic. The important point, though, is that this is where the career starts. This is the jumping off point. This is the place where people begin to take notice of Goya's work.

This was in the early summer of 1776. Goya didn't deliver his first cartoon until the 30th of October of that year. It was entitled "Picnic on the banks of the Manzanares" ("La Merienda"), and it was far superior to the work he had done for tapestries prior to this commission. It was, in fact, a hopeful indication "that Goya would begin working in accordance with his capability." It is here that he seems to hit upon an individual style. It isn't completely real—the figures are more manikins than humans with distended calves and stuffed arms, but a quality emerges "which, it if is not yet altogether life, has in it something of the joy of life." And just as importantly, we are dealing here with Goya as Goya. It isn't Goya imitating Luzán or other painters of the day as he had done in the very early years of his career. There is here an inkling of something that is Goya and only

---

8 Jose Guidol, Goya, p. 18.
9 Valentin, p. 34.
Goya. It is at the moment very subdued by the ideology of Winklemann and the 
canons of Mengs, but we shall see that it 
very soon bursts forth and becomes a prominent part of 
his art, until he finally arrived with the last cartoons 
done fifteen years later at "a new conception of realism 
derived from a study of the older Spanish painters."\textsuperscript{10}

The cartoons themselves are, for the most part, just 
the type of genre subject Mengs had in mind. But they go 
further than that—they are an accurate reflection of the 
life and times and manners of Madrid at that time. In 
fact, this is one of their primary values. Arthur Hamilton 
notes in his brief study of Spanish manners that Altamira, 
in his definitive work on the eighteenth century, "Historia de España y de la Civilización Española," "relies 
largely for his information concerning manners and customs 
of the epoch... on the laws and royal decrees promul-
gated at that time, and on the paintings of Goya."\textsuperscript{11} The 
subjects are the middle and lower class people, not while 
they are struggling and working, but while they are care-
free and playing. Goya is picking out the people as they 
really were. We see what they liked to do, the games they 
played, the way they dressed and acted, the customs they

\textsuperscript{10}Klingender, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{11}Arthur Hamilton, \textit{A Study of Spanish Manners}, 
p. 9.
believed in; in short, we have presented before us the heart of the people, the essence of what they were really like, of what the times were really like.

Goya actually did two series of cartoons; the first from 1776 to 1780, in which he completed 30 paintings, and the second from 1786 to 1788, in which he completed 10 paintings. The first series has a great deal more of the gaiety and carefree attitude than does the second, something which is not only due to a change in Goya's own life, but also to an important change in the society and politics of Spain. We will discuss these changes a bit later when we look specifically at the painting themselves.

The most prevalent characters in the cartoons are, of course, the "Majos" and "Majas." They reappear again and again, and Goya treats them with both wit and affection. The Majo is a rather special individual. Goya felt a great deal towards him, I think probably because he fancied himself as somewhat of a Majo, or at least had fancied himself as such when he was a younger man. The Majo was a boastful individual. He was ready for an argument or a fight any time, anywhere. The slightest provocation was enough to set him off. He took pride in his dress, and he was far better dressed than the other

12I take the following from the best description I could find of the "Majo"—Arthur Hamilton's in the study referred to in footnote #11. This in turn was derived from the "sainetes" of Ramón de la Cruz—something which I shall discuss a bit later on.
members of the proletariat. On his head he wore a wig and an elegant hat; over his shoulders a braided cape. His undercoat was trimmed with lace, and he wore an embroidered vest, usually of velvet. To finish off he wore a brilliant sash, silk stockings, of course, and his shoes and belt had buckles of hammered silver. He made way for no one; he swaggered down the middle of the street and smoked a big, black cigar. He was the elegant man of fashion of the proletariat, exhibiting an equally strong distaste for the middle class dandy and for the upper class nobleman. The thought of work was nauseating to him, and he did it only when he could find no one to support him, which brings us to his female counterpart, the "Maja."

The Maja, too, prided herself on her dress, but only on gala occasions. Normally she wore the simple skirt and blouse of the other women of her class. The change was due to her having to work, both to support herself and her particular Majo. She could have a Majo whether she was married or not, and her husband was not necessarily a Majo. In character, the Maja was identical to the Majo; she was quarrelsome and always ready for a fight, either with a Majo or another Maja. Her gala dress consisted of an overskirt of velvet or mohair, and a longer underskirt, whose lower portions were visible. She wore a coif with various colored ribbons, a black waist and a "mantilla" (which carries over to the present day), and it was not
unusual for her to add a brilliant sash like the ones the men wore.

This is a brief description. The relationship between the Majo and Maja is rigid, but very complicated and filled with subtle nuances and intrigues. We don't need to pursue it any further here, for it isn't something we can learn from Goya, but rather is to be found in the plays of Ramón de la Cruz.

The spirit of the cartoons and, in fact, of the general feeling in Spain during the third quarter of the eighteenth century is perhaps best manifested in the change from what the Majo had been a hundred years previously and what he was then. Actually, the Majo comes from the "pícaro." The pícaro was usually a grubby little urchin who stayed alive by begging, stealing and cunning. He moved from one master to another, selfishly getting as much out of everything for himself as he possibly could. He would cheat, rob, lie and sometimes even murder to further his own ends. His problem was that he did everything on such a petty scale that he was almost always caught, and he rarely got anywhere. He was the lowest of the low—the cast-off of even the peasantry. He was filthy, badly clothed, and almost always in danger of starvation. The prototype of this pícaro was Lazarillo de Tormes, the young protagonist of a novel by the same name, probably the most important and popular Spanish novel
of the sixteenth century. What, though, is the similarity between this rogue and Goya's Majo? Essentially, it is his independence. They both represent the independent Spanish spirit; they both fend for themselves in a world turned against them. But how different they are as well! We need only compare the two descriptions to see that. The one is decayed and depressing, the other proud and optimistic. Klingender expresses the change well:

The picaro of the Golden Age became the majo of Goya's time. What better proof for the change in the temper of Spanish life than this transmutation of its representative figure? The "picaro" with his low cunning, degraded and cynical, striving with all his wits to secure the crumbs of beggary in an age of decay—the majo with his carefree gaiety, proud of his national heritage, and the hero of the people in an age of awakening.13

Hamilton shows us that we can find out a great deal about the manners of Madrid by looking at the "sainetes" of Ramón de la Cruz. A sainete is a short one-act sketch on contemporary manners and customs, lasting not more than half an hour, and performed either as a curtain raiser or between the acts of the regular drama.14 Cruz's "sainetes" are precisely to Spanish literature what Goya's cartoons are to Spanish art. They are "slices" of Madrilenian life, and give us a detailed pictures of the habits and actions of the people. They contain no plot but

13Klingender, p. 23.
14Hamilton, p. 7.
rather are a "tableau of contemporary society." Cruz began writing these around 1760, and it is impossible not to think that Goya had them in mind when he worked out the schemes for his own snatches of life. They were extremely popular at the time, and there is no reason for us to believe that Goya was not just as amused and impressed by them as anyone else.

There is, however, a difference in the outlook of the two men. Goya shows us that this type of people existed; he shows us how they dressed and acted—his paintings show the enlightened times. He "achieved a true synthesis between new ideas and old traditions." This is not true of Cruz. Don Ramón was perhaps the first Spanish writer to produce a play entirely about the proletariat and he becomes no more than a "mouthpiece of the 'majos' naive conservatism." His plays are far from expressing the liberal, enlightened attitude so prevalent in the cartoons. This is particularly true when he writes of the middle class.

A thorough reactionary, he believed that in the past, and only in the past, lay the greatness of Spain, and therefore, that all the customs of that past were excellent, and all changes and innovations of his own day were, ipso facto, to be condemned.

15Ibid.
16Klingender, p. 48.
17Ibid.
18Hamilton, p. 10.
We find a prevailing sarcasm or cynicism throughout, as I say, especially in his plays about the middle class. How different this is from Goya's optimistic, liberal outlook! He was still young at this time, and very much in favor of the great awakening through which Spain was going. There was the feeling everywhere that the country might once again attain the heights of two hundred years before, and young Francisco was right in the middle of it, his optimism spilling over into his carefree canvases.

It is interesting to look directly at the tapestry, cartoons, and see exactly what was going on in the lower echelons of Spanish society at that time. They're all there—the washerwomen, the pottery sellers, and the middle class young ladies; the musicians, the children, the vendors and the customs officials; the priests, the mayors, the bull fighters and the woodcutters. We see the relations between the societies; we see the difference between city and country life; we see the children at play and the adults at play; we see the men and the women, young and old, and what they do with their time. And for the most part we see all this in idyllic settings—well-dressed couples under soft blue skies with long rolling hills in the background engulfed in a glowing haze.

So the women went to the streams to do the washing in groups. While one or two worked, the others would play, it seems. They wore long skirts, a blouse and a vest, although not as elegant as we see here, and their
hair was wrapped in cloth, hanging from the back of the neck like a sack. They'd wash the clothes, hang them on a line between two trees, wait for them to dry, and then take them home where they'd "have to worry about the day's stew." In this cartoon, "The Washerwomen," Goya has painted a scene which is still enacted thousand of times a day throughout Spain. The costumes have changed, although not so radically as one might think, but everything else is the same.

And coming home to eat the day's stew is the husband, poignantly portrayed in a much later cartoon, "The Wounded Mason." Here Goya is pointing out to us very clearly the poor working conditions then existing, and the rather deplorable condition of the laborer. But, according to Edith Helman, his reason wasn't to try to stimulate reform, but rather to recognize reform already put into action. Charles III had at about this time declared that all injured workers and their families must receive, from the masters of the work, compensation for all the time the worker was out. The King had apparently recognized the miserable conditions, the neglected scaffoldings, etc. Goya, in his enthusiasm, was moved to paint a picture "paying homage to His Majesty, praising

---


20 Nordstrom, p. 56.
his humane concern for the lot of the working man." As Nordström points out, this is a very plausible explanation for the importance of the scaffolding and the overall monumentality of the scene.

The following cartoon, "The Poor Family at the Well," was delivered only a couple of months later. Perhaps Goya didn't intend it this way, but here we have a wonderful example of the plight of the family whose head wasn't fortunate enough to have been wounded or killed after, rather than before, Charles' decree. It, too, is a monumental scene. The attractive young mother brings her two suffering children to the well for water. They are dressed shabbily, and the younger one in particular is miserable from the cold. The painting is interesting though, even if we don't think of the motif of the decree. It is a simple description of how water was fetched and stored for the family. It seems to have been heavy work—and yet it is the women and children who must do it. The husband spends his whole day laboring at his job and has no time for this type of thing.

"The Pottery Stall" is a particularly interesting painting, because it provides for us a look at the strong contrast that existed between the lower and the upper

---

21 Ibid. Actually, this quotation comes from Edith Helman's "Why Did Goya Paint the Injured Mason?" in the "Tenth Anniversary of the Simmons Review," Boston, 1957, and I use it here in the same capacity that Nordström does.
classes. We have a glimpse here, in fact of all three classes, in what many consider to be one of the very best of the first series of cartoons. The peasants sit, rather self-consciously, it seems, selling their wares. They are apparently oblivious to the coach which goes by, but I think actually they are taking careful notice, and are paying attention to trying to look as dignified as possible. The exception is the foremost figure, a young man who doesn't seem to be at all interested, and continues calmly with his conversation. Just behind this group sit two middle class "petimetres," the young dandies of that social stratum, the counterparts of the "majo." They yell "piropos" at the lady within the coach and derive a great deal of amusement from it. A "piropo" is a clever compliment of some kind, sometimes having the quality of being a bit "off-color," which young Spanish men have evidently been passing on to Spanish women for at least two hundred years, for it is still one of the most popular games in Spain. These men frequently stand on a street corner for hours and make comments about every girl who happens to pass by—and they are sometimes given to following the poor girl all the way home, not ceasing in their chatter. The social position of the woman, as we see here, makes no difference, and the game

\[22\text{Derwent, p. 23.}\]
is always amusing.

The coach itself is very elegant. Two splendidly attired footmen cling to the steps and a beautiful woman is inside. Her head is held high in an aristocratic posture, and she seems to be thinking about something far, far away. She is unconcerned by the fact that her coach has narrowly missed shattering a poor peasant's livelihood. She is disdainful of this portion of the drive which must bring her into contact with these people. And she has developed, as have millions of Spanish girls and women since that time, a steel-like immunity to the "piropo."

This is a scene which must have been re-enacted a thousand times a day, and how well Goya captures the various attitudes of the people—some uncaring and oblivious, some self-conscious, and others doing the same thing they have been day after day for years, and still getting the same thrill. It is a masterpiece of recording. The relationship between the classes is perhaps better expressed here than in any other place in the cartoons, and possibly in all of Goya's work.

In the "Majo and Majas" cartoon of 1777 we have the purest glimpse of these people that Goya endeavored to show us. They are here abstracted from the rigor and routine and pressure of the city, and we see them in as
idyllic a setting as we can imagine. The young "Maja" invites the "Majo" to go for a walk with her, while two other young men look on with the most irresponsibly dishonorable intentions obvious in their attitudes."23 They are dressed exactly as Hamilton tells us they dressed, and their overall demeanor conforms precisely to the way they were portrayed by Cruz. Everything about the scene is ideal; the men are solid, powerful, and mysterious, and the young woman is beautiful. We are actually invading their privacy, it seems. We have caught an instant in their lives. So this is the famous Majo—the epitome of Romanticism in Spain. Well, certainly the setting is romantic, and it is very obvious that at this early date Goya looked upon these people with a great deal of affection.

The number of things we can find out about the people from these cartoons is almost limitless. Blindman's buff and kite flying were two of the favorite pastimes. Kids blew up bladders to use for balloons before the days of synthetic rubber, and, just as now, they liked to climb trees, pluck fruit, and play at giants. Walking on stilts was popular with young men at the fair and playgrounds, and beautiful young peasant girls married

23Charles Poore, Goya, p. 48.
the village rich man, no matter how ugly he may have been. Priests were hypocritical and fathers were self-righteous. Vendors were obsequious, and blind guitar players were very much a mouthpiece of the people. The Sunday open market "the Bastro" was as popular then with the people as it is now with the tourists. Secret meetings took place in the woods, and girls and boys were jilted then as now. Women shaded themselves with parasols, and travellers warmed their hands over hot coals in a big bowl. That same bowl, incidentally, was placed under the dining room table and under the tables in restaurants, to keep the feet of the clientele warm. And we could go on and on.

It is important to remember that these paintings are not exactly true to life. They are idealizations, a point which was made earlier. The peasants certainly didn't dress as well as they do in the cartoons, and life wasn't all gay parties. At the end of the second series Goya makes this amply clear with the cartoons "Winter," "Poor Family at the Well," and "The Wounded Mason." On the other hand, and here is perhaps the true greatness of the tapestry cartoons, behind the idyllic scenes and happy people "it was in spite of everything the life of Spain that entered into these pictures, with its own characteristic traits: the fruit-dealer; the water carrier;
a figure the Madrid people knew well; the blind man playing a guitar. Goya has given us an unforgettable picture of a country unaware of the great social and political upheavals about to take place, of a country having one last, merry, superficial fling before lapsing into total chaos and despair.

* * *

From what did Goya derive his artistic inspiration as he painted the tapestry cartoons? Can we read the style and form of other artists in the works? Yes, we can. We see Mengs in the early works particularly, and Watteau, and we see Velazquez and Tiepolo (and his son Domenico) and probably as much as anything else we see the influence of the Venetian genre painters who were so popular in Venice around the middle of the eighteenth century. It is not strange that we should find Goya to have been influenced by such a wide range of artists, for he arose in a veritable vacuum of culture, and must necessarily have turned to other countries and foreign artists for inspiration. And, of course, we are not surprised to find Mengs' naturalness so prevalent in the early works, for Mengs was as much a dictator of the arts, of form and style, in Spain as any man ever has been; and at the time

24Valentín, p. 39.
Goya started the cartoons Mengs was his boss. To see this influence we need only look at a couple of the very early cartoons such as "Maja and Majo" of 1777. The naturalism which Mengs preached is here very evident, in style anyway, as the subject matter is, in fact, actually Romantic. But the bright, clear contrasts, the broad well defined areas of color, the rather self-conscious subdued composition all adhere to the Mengs philosophy of painting. Goya has here idealized nature totally by selection and simplification. It is what Mengs called the "sublime style," and is distinguishable from the "natural style" in that the natural style aims to imitate nature with all its faults and blemishes. In other words, to attain perfection, we must edit nature. However, Goya no sooner gets into this rather strict development than he begins to move through and out of it towards a more pleasing, freer naturalism and we see this particularly well in a painting executed late in 1777, "The Parasol." Here Goya has extracted himself from the restrictions of both Mengs and his brother-in-law Francisco Bayeu, and he is bending the theme to his will. There is no point in going into detail here, as this painting will be discussed thoroughly later on.

All of the foregoing sources were instrumental in the development of the tapestry cartoons, as well as Goya's
entire career, and we will consider them all here in as much detail as possible. Because the paintings are genre in scope, I think it appropriate to start with the genre painters of Italy, particularly some of the more famous such as Crespi, Pietro Longhi, Piazzeta and Domenico Tiepolo, the master of the lot.

The exact date of the young Goya's departure for Italy is not known. It is assumed that he left sometime around the middle of 1769. This would give him exactly two years there, for he returned to Spain in June of 1771. There is almost no evidence whatsoever concerning his actions and life in Italy. About the only thing that is known for sure is that he was given honorable mention in a contest in Rome sponsored by the Royal Academy of Parma for a painting with the subject of Hannibal crossing the Alps. This was in April of the year he came home. His whereabouts the rest of his time in Italy must be a matter of conjecture, and I think that we can guess with a certain amount of assuredness that he spent time in Venice. We see the influence of this trip very powerfully in the first important series of paintings he was commissioned to do upon his return to Spain—that is, the cartoons.

Giuseppe Maria Crespi was one of the foremost of the Italian genre group, although he did not concentrate
exclusively on genre subjects. His compositions are confused and somewhat intimate, but they are in a lot of respects very similar to the type of thing Goya was to do later in the cartoons. Look specifically at his "The Painter and his Family," which can be found on page 107 of Michael Levey's *Painting in 18th Century Venice.*

What strikes us here is the overall soft atmosphere and the quickness with which it appears to have been done. The interest is on the figures, the background being almost completely obliterated, and taking on no importance. All of this is much like Goya, especially the soft lighting and atmosphere, with bright areas showing up here and there. We jump from the baby to the mother to the child in the middle to the painter himself, and the rest is quite subdued. The unclear lines, rather fuzzy in fact, give the impression of a soft, glowing air. The whole scene becomes rather idyllic and happy, and it seems to have caught one instant in the life of the family. There is no artificial posing—there is nothing timeless about it. This in particular must have influenced Goya, for we see it in a great many of the cartoons. In fact, it is there in virtually all of them—at least all the ones in the first series. There is nothing lasting or permanent about what the figures are doing. They are in a state of

---

transition. We need only pick a few at random to see this: "The Sunshade," "The Kite," "Playing at Giants," etc. In the first of these we invade the privacy of an intimate moment. Goya here is recreating an incident rather than painting a picture of it, just as Crespi was doing in his family group. And see how similar the lighting and color are here. The light flows through the canvases—dancing from one area to another, leaving strong light-dark contrasts, and the color areas are big and well defined. There is no attention paid in either case to intricate details or to frills and lace. The outlook of the artists seems to have been the same. That is, it was the moment itself that was important. The inspiration was that particular instant in both cases. Technically, they were both concerned with a hazy, soft atmosphere, a broad, soft treatment of surface, and this perhaps more than anything is what correlates the two paintings—or almost any of the cartoons with Crespi's genre scenes. It is not difficult for us to imagine Goya thinking back to the Italian artist as he commenced work for Mengs on this most important commission, and thinking of the pleasure these paintings had given the Italian populace, and the popularity they had brought Crespi.

One of Crespi's most famous pupils was Pietro Longhi. A man who was endowed with neither the imagination nor the technical skills of a great artist, he was an
immediate failure with his paintings done in the grand manner of the huge religious frescoes so popular in the early part of the century. Realizing that his future was not there, he began studying under Crespi, and it is at this point that he begins to move towards a successful career. The Encyclopedia of World Art tells us that "The determining factor in Longhi's change in artistic direction was his familiarity with the art of Crespi and its wealth of human interest—a familiarity clearly reflected in some pastoral... and other scenes of peasant life." If we look at fig. 49 in Levey's book on Venetian painting in the eighteenth century, we notice just how far this change of style went. Although a bit more awkward, this girl reminds us very much of the Crespi figures in his family group. Certainly the soft lighting and chiaroscuro are derived directly from there, as well as the total insignificance of the background. This is exactly the type of thing Goya was doing in the early cartoons as well. I am reminded perhaps more than anything of the girl who is waiting for her lover in "The Rendezvous." Here too we have the broad areas of color and the soft, hazy brushwork. And most important of all, once again we invade the privacy of a personal moment, we are catching a glimpse—a fragment of time. And finally, we must note that the treatment of the young

26 Encyclopedia of World Art, IX, 319.
women is basically the same in the two. There is a certain idealization of both type and dress in the Goya, and of type alone in the Longhi. In reality, this is a dirty peasant girl, but she doesn't appear as such at all in either case. How different these paintings are from the works of a Giacomo Ceruti, whose peasants are diseased scavengers. They are painted entirely without sympathy (see fig. 48 in Levey). They are, in fact, "a sharp reminder of how uncivilized the supposedly civilized Italian 18th century could be."\(^{27}\) Longhi's girl is not only civilized, she is refined and gentle. If we compare Longhi and Ceruti it is not difficult to figure out that of the two the one on which Goya might have relied for inspiration is the former. I don't mean that this particular painting specifically inspired Goya, but rather that this is the general type of thing he saw and liked in Italy, and which appears in his tapestry cartoons.

But this young girl isn't the typical Longhi. He was not really at home with single figures, and that for which he was most famous are his indoor scenes. Here he is seeking a more immediate reality. With a certain, subtle irony he captures the low key almost bourgeois character of the eighteenth century Venetian aristocracy. His pictures are, according to Levey, "lazy little pic-

\(^{27}\)Levey, p. 108.
tures, just as the society he pictures is lazy."\textsuperscript{28} We see in "The Concert"\textsuperscript{29} an awkward composition involving some card players and a group of three musicians intently trying to produce some kind of music. It is, in fact, clumsy. But what Longhi did have, and this is something equally evident in Goya, was remarkable power of observation. There is a lively spontaneity in this and other Longhi interiors that makes it seem worthwhile after all. Goya may easily have learned the importance of shrewd or witty observation from just such a person as Longhi, who obviously had no technical skill, but who was an admired artist anyway. I think particularly of the cartoon of "The Wedding Procession" which, aside from the fact that it is a masterpiece of composition, done when Goya had progressed a great deal from the very first tapestries, is also a masterpiece of observation and wit. See the whole range of expressions and attitudes which begin to tell us a great deal about the people of the time. The hypocritically pious father and the smug assured curate are particularly revealing and humorous.

There are many other Longhi paintings we can turn to and find a direct correlation to the work of Goya—again, not so much in style as in idea. The main similarity in all of them is that we have genre scenes dealing with

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 111.
the people. They are all showing us the habits and the customs of the times. A rhinoceros was brought to Italy, the first to come to Europe since Durer's time, and Longhi recorded the event on at least two separate occasions. We have in the more famous of these two paintings the same feeling found in all of his interior scenes, that is, the aimless sort of life this dying aristocracy lead. There is an ever-present depressing aura of vacuity. We see it certainly in paintings such as "The Visit," "The Family Concert," or "The Dancing Master," and we find this sense of aimlessness in the spectators in the rhinoceros painting. By the time Longhi paints the people they seem to have lost all element of surprise or awe. They have extracted all the entertainment out of the poor creature which they possibly can. But once again, notice the minute detail with which the artist records the scene.

And this brings us to what is basically the great difference between Goya and Longhi. That is, Longhi recorded and did nothing more. He painted exactly what he saw, and what he saw was a decaying, bored aristocracy. Goya did more. He interpreted; he idealized; he ridiculed; or he praised. He did something more than just record in every single instance. In the case of the rhinoceros scene he would have seized like a bird of prey upon the very vacuity of the people he had to depict, enjoying their emptiness as a child enjoys the emptiness of a balloon; he
would have blown it out to monstrous, swollen proportions."\textsuperscript{30} Longhi held a mirror up to the people—he showed them to themselves just as they were. The mirror in Goya's hands was curved—intellectually distorted by the artist himself. He showed the people to themselves not exactly as they were, but perhaps idealized or satirized, or mocked. There was always, in every single cartoon, something more than just the image. A bit further on Levey comments that for "painters like . . . Goya, their art is a trenchant comment on their age; not content with seeing with their own eyes, they also utilize their brains. Longhi didn't risk this commentary,"\textsuperscript{31} or perhaps he simply lacked the imagination to consider it.

In any case, this is the basic difference in the ideals of the young Goya and Longhi. Technically, of course, they can't even be mentioned in the same breath. The one reaches the point in painting such as "The Wedding Procession" where he has become a master of clarity and design; the other remains clumsy and awkward throughout, apparently never even learning the very basics, such as the application of the paint to the canvas. It's funny, then, that Longhi should have had an important influence on Goya. Well, perhaps we'd go too far to say that he did.

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., p. 114.
\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., p. 116.
It might be better to say that Longhi was an important part of a genre movement which very definitely had a significant influence on Goya. There were others who were also part of this genre movement, and perhaps we should move on to them now.

Giambattista Piazetta is a lesser known artist than Longhi, but in certain cases his similarity with Goya is no less striking. He, too, painted genre scenes after studying with Crespi, but they are far more melancholic and dour than the works of either Longhi, Crespi, or, in fact, Goya. The Spanish master certainly did not derive his gay, idealized pictures from Piazetta; but what he could have remembered in the Italian was the solid figures and tightly packed compositions, and certainly the very prevalent chiaroscuro. In a great many cases Goya's paintings contain one large group of figures, organized so that they form a triangle and are held together by some sort of a diagonal. We will go into this in more detail a bit further on when we discuss Giambattista Tiepòlo, but here let's consider briefly a painting such as "The Drinker" and compare it to Piazetta's "An Idyll on the Sea-Shore." In both works we have a solid triangle, and in both cases it is held together by a powerful diagonal. In the Goya it is the walking stick and the general outline of the silhouette, and in the Piazetta it is the highlights from the girl's face right down through to the man's feet. In both
cases we have bold, powerful areas of color, and strong light and dark contrasts. Piazetta's peasants are hardly peasants. They are picturesque in the way gypsies are, which is, of course, very close to the type of romanticizing Goya does with his peasants. The "Idyll" is also remarkably similar to "The Drinker" in that we find this feeling of trying to preserve a single moment in time in both of them. The boy gesticulates, trying to draw our attention; the drinker can keep that jug up only a second or two longer. In neither case is there an insistence on background. We shall see presently that there never is in the tapestry cartoons, and it is something Goya derived from artists other than Piazetta. Once again, I must emphasize that Goya was probably not thinking specifically of this painting of Piazetta's when he did "The Drinker" or any other cartoon, any more than he had any specific Longhi's or Crespi's in mind at that time. But he very well may have seen it and many other Piazetta paintings, and I feel sure that he was influenced in one way or another. The similarities between "The Idyll" and many Goya paintings, regarding the figure grouping and composition, is too remarkable for us not to believe that there was probably some influence somewhere along the line.

Turning to Domenico Tieplo, we find the leading genre painter of the eighteenth century in Italy. It is
unfortunate that most of his career he was bound to his father Giambattista and wasted a great many years as an assistant to him. The similarity between him and Goya is not so much technical as it is from a point of view of ideas. They both take a genre scene and "balance it on a razor's edge"\textsuperscript{32} between naturalism and idealization. Take "The Peasant's Meal" or "Peasants Reposing" and a cartoon of Goya's such as "The Vintage or "Maja and Majo." We have already described the idealization in the latter, but look at "The Vintage." This is a perfectly delightful "timeless" moment, and one of the best of the cartoons. The flowing, golden light and the hazy atmosphere make us think of a rather melifluous Eden. Tiepolo's paintings on the walls of the Villa Valmarana in Vicenza are a little sharper, but the overall harmony is very evident. More than any other of the Italian genre paintings, these correspond to Goya's idealized reproductions of Spanish life. The peasants are painstakingly and wittily observed, and although they are dressed as peasants, they appear clean, happy, and satisfied, as well as very much at ease. We are reminded of the pastoral scenes and novels which had become so popular in both Spain and Italy a hundred and fifty years earlier. And most important of all, these frescoes are brilliantly flooded with light air, something which

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., p. 129.
Domenico learned from his father, and something which Goya also did marvelously and learned from the same source, as well as from Velazquez. After the death of Giamattista in 1776, Domenico frescoed very little, turning his attention to oil paintings and drawings. It is here that his similarity with Goya reaches its peak. The acute observation of the people in idealized locations and scenes that we find here is like Goya in almost every respect, except technically, where they differed in composition, color and backgrounds. The philosophy is the same. Paint the people as ideally as possible, but don't leave out the humorous detail (see Tiepolo's "Two Peasant Women" and Goya's "Wedding Procession" or "The Pottery Stall"). Nor should you skip any sarcastic or satiric comment which might be applicable, if it can be done in a light manner. But most important of all, paint the people and record their customs and habits.

It is interesting to note that in the last years of the century Domenico's work gets even closer to Goya's, in technique as well. He was very concerned still with genre (by this time Goya was well out of it), and Goya was the acknowledged master of it in Spain. Tiepolo had returned to Spain now and then after the completion of the tapestry cartoons, and I think that in a couple of his paintings in the 1790's it is Goya who is influencing him rather than vice versa, as it surely was when Goya painted the cartoons.
See Tiepolo's "A Trio Walking" to see what I mean. Here is a painting which is remarkably similar to Goya's work with the tapestries, in both technique and ideology. In fact, if the figures were a bit shorter and somewhat heavier, or more stocky, it would be easy to think that it was by the hand of the Spaniard. The figures form the margin. The middle distance is cut out, and the group is fairly solid. All of these are things we find very often in Goya, and perhaps it would be a good idea here to go into detail about the actual compositions of the tapestry cartoons, along with a discussion of one of Goya's greatest influences at that time, Domenico's father, Giambattista Tiepolo.

Naturally, the compositional possibilities within some forty paintings are many and varied, and the compositions of the cartoons by Goya are, of course, diverse and different. A picture which has for a subject only one or two people, as is the case with a good many of the cartoons, such as "The Rendezvous" or "The Parasol" or "The Doctor," cannot be composed in the same manner in which a picture with a large crowd, such as "The Wedding Procession" or "The Stilted Walkers" or "The Crockery Stall", is composed. And there is just about equal division of these two types of pictures among the cartoons. There is, however, very clear consistency of composition within the
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two groups. That is, the simpler pictures are all composed in about the same way, and so are the more complicated pictures. (Naturally, there are certain changes as Goya's art becomes a bit more sophisticated, and we'll see this later as we talk about the paintings.) The former hold the interest of the spectator because of the powerful figure grouping; the latter have that in common with the simpler pictures, but offer more because we now find intricate and interesting relationships between the various groups.

Let's see some examples.

The first really outstanding tapestry cartoon was "The Parasol," done in 1777. It is a simple, but boldly conceived composition. A young man holds a parasol over a seated woman. That is all there is to it. The central block that they form is basically a rectangle, and very enclosed. Were it not for a whimsical tree shooting out diagonally from behind the man, the picture would be in danger of becoming static. The group itself is vibrant because within it there is a scattering about of the triangle shape, which keeps our eye moving. This is all formula, and any artist wanting to compose a powerful group of, say, two figures could be at least partially successful by following it. But there are some things to this that enhance the effect and make it very particularly Goya's.

We see upon closer inspection that the bottom of the
group is a saucer shape, and that the group itself could almost be a cone. This tends to separate the couple from the edge of the canvas and makes it rather independent. We find that Goya uses this saucer shape in a great many of the cartoons, particularly as a base for the figure groups. Furthermore, the sumptuous color and rather original use of light are very much a part of the composition. We have broad areas of dazzling rich colors; detail is forsaken for boldness, and our eye jumps from one big shape to another. The light source is below the sitters, and we feel the presence of an enveloping space moving upward and forward. This is interesting; it probably derived from the baroque and the unusual lighting of Caravaggio or Rembrandt, and it continues in Goya's art for the rest of his life (sometimes giving us a decidedly macabre effect) and seems to have affected a few rather important later artists, Degas in particular.

And finally, we find something which derives directly from Velazquez. That is, the figures themselves form the horizon. This occurs again and again in the cartoons. And further, the background is very hazy and unclear, and there is no middle ground at all. From the foreground, we go straight to the background, and this, too, is rather typical of the series.

In contrast to "The Parasol," we have such a work as "Maja and Mamos" which consists of several small groups of
figures. It is interesting because it shows us Goya playing with assorted figure groups very early. In this painting we have three groups, five figures. They are placed in what seems to me to be a fairly self-conscious manner. Actually, the individual groups—the two men, the man and woman, and the solitary man—are quite complete and convincing by themselves, just as in "The Parasol," but the overall thing seems uneasy. Here, Goya uses his saucer to establish a relationship among the groups. It is rather obvious and awkward, just as is the powerful diagonal he uses to separate the background from the foreground, once again dispensing with the middle ground. We don't feel free and at ease. Perhaps this is because the characters themselves are of such a self-conscious nature, and because we feel we are invading their privacy. Maybe this is exactly how Goya intended us to feel. This is a possibility, but I don't think it's so. Goya was still learning. Had he known what he knew even two years later when the painted "The Pottery Stall," or ten years later, at the time of "The Wedding Procession," I think he would have been able to make us feel more at ease, more comfortable in the presence of these people whom he idolized so.

Taking two more paintings, we find the same things occurring. "The Doctor" of 1779 is very similar in composi-
tion to "The Parasol." It is a solid rectangle essentially held together by a diagonal (the doctor's walking stick) but still vibrant because of the bold shapes within. Its base is definitely a saucer, and the group is decidedly independent from the edge of the canvas. The figures form part of the horizon and again there is no middle ground. The light is rather eerie and baroque-like, and we have large, bold areas of sensuous color. This is almost an exact repetition of the discussion of "The Parasol," which isn't surprising, because Goya employed a method, a very particular formula for composing his figure groups, and he used it in almost every case. We shall see presently how very much he relied upon Tiepolo for this formula and, in fact, for several other things.

"The Pottery Stall" is a more complicated painting done in 1779. It involves several figure groups, only this time they are masterfully composed; the self-consciousness and awkwardness are entirely gone. It is a crowded but well organized and defined composition. A coach with a noblewoman inside, two elegant footman, a butler and a driver races past a pottery stall in the open market, narrowly missing both the people and the crockery. There are twelve people in all, and they are composed into five separate groups which are beautifully related. The boy in the foreground, himself a solid rectangle, is at the bottom of a strong but pleasing diagonal which passes
back into the picture through the three women, the two seated "petimetres" and the driver of the coach. The diagonal is further stressed by light falling on each of the groups, and in this way the fifth group, the two footmen and the butler, is held in as part of the scene, for light falls on it as well. The flow and the interplay between the groups is completely natural, and we feel entirely at ease. Here we are truly looking at an unblemished slice of Madrilenan life. It is as charming a picture as Goya painted for the first set of tapestries.

The painting contains several of the typical aspects of the cartoons. The figures become the horizon; the saucer shape is employed as a base for the groups; the action is in no way subservient to the boundaries of the canvas; there is no middle ground; the shapes are big, bold and powerful; and the color is sumptuous and rich.

By the time Goya starts doing the second series of tapestry cartoons, he has become a thoroughly accomplished master of composition and lighting. "The Vintage" is a charming painting in which two women, a man, and a little boy form the central group. As in most of the paintings, there is an interesting interplay of shapes within the group which keeps it alive. Here, for the first time, Goya shows us a middle ground, and an interest, although a vague one at best, in landscape. There is a hazy, idyllic atmosphere with no definite light source, and there are no
cast shadows. This rather transcendental type of atmosphere, which creates a timeless mood, is typical of a great many of the cartoons, and is one of their most charming aspects. "The Rendezvous," "The Parasol," "The Village," "Blind Man's Buff," "The Pottery Stall," and many, many others are permeated with this feeling. It comes directly from Tiepolo (and partially from Velazquez), and is one of the things which links Goya most strongly with the great Italians.

There is another type of cartoon—the few that were done at the very end and begin to involve themselves with social comment and protest. These are basically bold, powerful, simple compositions, and of course have none of the light, gay feeling of the others. The only thing the two types do have in common, in fact, is the type of figure groups, which, as I say, remain consistent throughout the painter's life; always big, always bold, always self-contained, and never static. Among these paintings are "The Wounded Mason," "Poor Family at the Well," and "Winter." There is evoked here a feeling of poignancy, of despair, of hardship. The compositions are simple and direct, even when there are several people involved, as in "Winter." A powerful diagonal consisting of three separate shapes (the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{34} of, for instance, "The Forge," one of Goya's most powerful and striking works, which was done a full thirty-five years later.}\]
middle one containing four people) plods its way across the countryside in the middle of a blizzard. There is no gayety or happiness; it is a struggle for survival, and the meticulous, but simple, composition is very effective in emphasizing the stark reality of the situation.

It has been pointed out several times that Goya was substantially influenced by the elder Tiepolo, but nothing very specific has yet been said. To do this, we must first look a little into the art of Tiepolo himself, which is what we shall do now.

If we look superficially at an overall survey of Tiepolo's work, it is difficult to see any relationship between him and Goya. The huge billowy clouds, the nude muscular figures, the allegorical themes and the open soaring compositions don't seem to lend themselves to a comparison between the two men. But let's look more closely. Tiepolo's early works could be summed up as having very strong diagonals, very agitated figures, shocking light and shadow contrasts which produce a dramatic effect, and powerful grouping. And one would have to add that he possessed an incredible knowledge and control of foreshortening and perspective. Any of his early paintings such as as "The Sacrifice of Abraham" or "The Glory of Sta. Teresa" in the Chiesa degli Scalzi in Venice demonstrate this clearly. Later on, in the late 1730's, in the Clereci Palace ceilings he introduces a new, centri-
fugal compositional element which "frees the central field from all dense masses and pushes groups of figures along the edges of the ceiling, thus achieving a much more effective plasticity in the figures placed almost on the walls, and, by contrast, a more luminous brilliance and lightness in the distant figures." 35

And then, as the artist reaches his full maturity, in the 1740's and '50's, we can see the classical ideas becoming fixed. There is a positive desire for decorative balance, and in the quality of the paint, a greater fusion and transparency. The forms are now bathed in a more atmospheric light, and the figures float more weightlessly than in the early days of Venetian painting with Titian and Veronese.

Reviewing, then, what has just been written, we notice that there are several rather striking similarities between the art of Goya and the art of Tiepolo. The strong diagonal element that we find frequently in the latter is almost always there in the former. Compare, for instance, Goya's "The Pottery Stall" with Tiepolo's "The Agony in the Garden" or "The Crowing with Thorns." 36 In these two paintings by the Italian, and more particularly in the former, there is a strong, solid diagonal which is clearly

35 Antonio Morassi, G. B. Tiepolo, His Life and Work, p. 18.
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emphasized by light, and the central figures are strongly illuminated, which is precisely what we find in "The Pottery Stall." The diagonal itself is lit up all the way along, and the three women in the center of the composition are the most significantly illuminated. Diagonal composition is not, of course, peculiar to Tiepolo and Goya, but the similarity here goes further than that, it seems to me. In innumerable Goya cartoons, and in a great many Tiepolo canvases and frescoes, there is this idea of a diagonal which is very predominant, and whose central features are illuminated by a blast of light.

Perhaps the connection here appears stronger because of the remarkable and most definite similarity in figure grouping. It is in this respect that Goya borrows most conspicuously from Tiepolo. The examples are so numerous that we can hardly begin to mention them. The fact is, the two men simply painted groups of figures in the same way, and since one man studied and admired the other, it is safe to assume that his method of arranging his figures must have derived from him. Look at Tiepolo's "Rinaldo and Armida" and compare it to Goya's "The Parasol." A solid triangle formed by a man and a woman in an idyllic setting. This could be used to describe either of the paintings. Both men painted bold decisive figures and arranged them into solid geometrical shapes. And both
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men did this throughout their careers; it is not something limited to Goya's tapestry cartoons or one of Tiepolo's phases.

In his smaller canvases, Tiepolo did away with the middle ground—he went directly from the foreground to the background by bringing the horizon down as low as possible. Goya adopted this, too, as we have seen, by detaching the figures from the background landscape. It is in these smaller pictures by the Italian that we see the greatest overall similarities between the two men. The "Saint Francis" painting by Tiepolo could almost have been done by Goya. Note the powerful central group within a very simplified composition. How very like a painting such as "The Wounded Mason" is this!

There is no question that Goya learned a tremendous amount about composition from Tiepolo, but that's not all. The lighting and colors and atmospheres in the tapestry cartoons are also very reminiscent of Tiepolo, and it is fairly certain that Goya was also borrowing a bit of these from the Italian. During his very early years as a painter, Goya had studied under José Luzán y Martinez, and it was at this time that he first came into contact—indirect contact—with the colors of Tiepolo, for Luzán had very definitely borrowed from the Italian's palette. For
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a long time Goya continued using these colors which he had learned from his master.

The similarity between Goya and Tiepolo in this respect is really quite striking. Their colors are rich, bright and sensuous, and are used to fill broad areas. This is clear in every last one of the tapestry cartoons, even towards the end when he was painting social commentary. Goya's colors don't become dark and oppressive until the middle or the end of the 1790's when he begins painting macabre witch scenes, and comes strongly under the influence of Rembrandt's and Caravaggio's chiaroscuro via the etchings. If we compare any of Tiepolo's frescoes, with their luminous, bright, almost transparent, large patches of colors to any of the tapestry cartoons, we see just how far this similarity goes. Look, for instance, at "Apollo Pursuing Daphne"39 next to Goya's "The Parasol" and see how similar are the oranges and reds--colors which seem to glow from within. Or compare Tiepolo's "The Marriage of Barbarossa"40 with Goya's "The Pottery Stall." The lights and reflections dancing across the draperies are almost the same as we progress in both from the warm bright spots to the cool shadows. Goya must have been very impressed by Tiepolo's use of color while he was in Italy, and even

39Tbid., color plate IX.
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before then when he saw it in Luzan's work, because it is very evident and predominant in virtually all of the tapestry cartoons.

And stemming from this we find a strong similarity in atmosphere. There is a soft hazy glow that pervades in the air in the pictures of both men, creating a rather idyllic, paradise-like effect. Again, "The Parasol" is as good an example as I can think of in Goya's work, although it is there in most of the cartoons. See, for example, "The Washerwomen," "The Pottery Stall," "The Stilt Walkers," "Kites Flying," "The Rendezvous," or a host of others. It gives a weightless, airy sensation. Particularly in Tiepolo, it makes the figures appear to float, which is, of course, exactly what they are intended to do up there in the rafters of those huge cathedrals. This was something that Tiepolo developed more and more, until he at last perfected it in the 1760's and '70's, when he was in Madrid. Goya was, of course, very much affected by these tremendous, airy frescoes the Italian master was producing in the Royal Palace--and it is no wonder that some of it should have crept into his painting. At that time he was young and impressionable, just starting out on his first important commission, and why not borrow a bit from one of Europe's most popular and famous painters? Certainly, this couldn't help but impress his boss, Mengs,
and the rest of the people involved in the commission.
And, of course, Goya was very successful in his borrowing. It was not something which was completely natural to his way of painting, as we see later when he needs not impress anyone, but it was a nice way of painting idyllic genre scenes, of idealizing the populace and his beloved "Majos" and "Majas."

Soon after the cartoons were completely finished, Goya stopped painting in that manner, but things from Tiepolo remained with him for the rest of his life. Most notable, of course, is the figure grouping, but now and again the Spaniard turned to the Italian for compositional aid, and we see an example of this nowhere more clearly than in the frescoes in the Church of San Antonio de la Florida, which we shall look at in detail further on.

At the end of the year 1792, Goya fell very sick, and remained so for over a year. There is no doubt that this was the great turning point in his life. Until that time he had produced very little of interest other than the tapestries, and had he died then, as he very nearly did, he would have gone down in the history of art as a rather second-rate painter, perhaps one of the better Spanish painters of his particular epoch, and of interest
at all only because he recorded the manners and society of Madrid in a charming way. The Frenchman Bourgoing sums it up rather accurately in the diary of his Spanish travels, which was published in 1788. He says:

Don Francisco de Goya also deserves honourable mention for his gifts. He describes in a pleasing style the customs, habits and entertainments of his country.41

During much of his illness, Goya was so sick that he couldn’t even write a letter, much less paint. He was completely helpless, and it is remarkable that he recovered at all. He did eventually overcome the crisis, but he was left with impaired vision and completely deaf. He must have been wracked by all kinds of tortuous imaginings and hideous nightmares. He was seized by rages that made him, by his own admission, hate himself and drove him to the brink of killing himself.

As he recuperated and was able to take brush in hand again, he started painting entirely different things than he had been doing previously. He wrote to his friend, Bernardo Yriarte, in January 1794:

In order to occupy my imagination, crushed by my miseries, and in order partly to meet the great expense which my illness has caused me, I have started to paint a series of cabinet pictures in which I have apportioned a place to observation, which is usually in works done to commission, where fantasy and invention cannot be developed.42

41 Miroslav Micko, Francisco Goya y Lucientes Caprichos, p. 13.
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The things he painted for some time thereafter were rather macabre. There were scenes from madhouses and deathhouses, from the courts of the Inquisition, from executions and incantations. His imagination seems to have been occupied by a different world, his mind perhaps a bit distorted— for the time being at least.

Joseph Addison had written in 1712, in "The Pleasures of the Imagination," that "When the brain is hurt by an accident, and the mind disordered by dreams or sickness, the fancy is overrun with wild dismal ideas and terrified with a thousand hideous monsters of its own framing." This was a popular idea at the end of the eighteenth century, and as we shall see later, it is curiously akin to Goya's own explanation of the Caprichos. And although it is perhaps not considered very medically sound today, it certainly seems to apply to Goya. His mind was overrun by "a thousand hideous monsters," and he felt compelled to display them to the world. Perhaps this was the only way he could free himself from them. In any case, a great part of this deluge of horror wound up in the Caprichos, particularly in the last half of them.

There is more than mere horror in the etchings. There is also history and satire and love and hate and humor; nevertheless, the macabre aspect is certainly a very important and interesting part of them and, above all, the most
personal part. It is a series of etchings in which the artist has bared his soul and his mind to all the world. That in itself is significant enough to make them important.

But Goya's illness was far from being the only thing which prompted him to produce the **Caprichos**. It was perhaps what caused them to be done in the particular mood that they were, but we must consider that maybe something similar, at least in the way of social commentary, would have been done by Goya at one time or another even had he not fallen ill. We saw him leading up to it towards the end of the tapestry cartoons, in such works as "Winter," "The Wounded Mason" and "Poor Family by the Well." His portraits of the late eighties and early nineties were becoming more and more personal and intense. They were beginning to tell more and more about the sitters; they were getting less and less formalized. He was getting much closer to life and reality in them. The portrait of Sebastián Martinez in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, done in 1792, is a good example of this. I think we must definitely consider that he was on the road to social criticism before he became ill. His sickness speeded his journey and changed his mood; his deafness never let him forget this, and changed his whole life.

The **Caprichos** were not the first etchings Goya had done. Fifteen years earlier, while recuperating from another, less serious, illness, he had done a series of
prints after Velazquez. It was through these, incidentally, that the profound influence of the seventeenth century master on Goya got started. His painting from that time on becomes much freer and more original. The etchings after Velazquez, though, were far from great works of art, and, above all, not very original. They were run of the mill, self-conscious works of the type being produced by a great many artists of the day. They serve merely as a background for the great etchings which Goya was to produce years later in the Caprichos, the Desastres and the Desparates, and are useful only in that they supplied Goya with an intimate knowledge of the work of Velazquez, as well as a certain amount of experience with etchings. This latter point is important. Goya had come to know the etchings of Rembrandt in the seventeen years between the Velazquez series and the Caprichos, and he was particularly affected by the Dutchman's very baroque use of light and dark; by his startling chiaroscuro. As he designed the Caprichos, Goya realized just how dramatic they were going to be, and he began searching about for a new medium through which he could convey the drama—remembering Rembrandt's stark lights and darks all the time.

Aquatint, which was a comparatively new method of illustration, came to mind, particularly since it offered such a wide range of possibilities for variations in tone and because it lent itself so easily to producing dramatic
contrasts between light and dark. Rowlandson had used this type of flat wash in some prints after some pastoral landscape drawings by Gainsborough which he published in 1789. Goya could easily have seen and been affected by these—or he might have gone right to the etchings of Jean Baptiste Le Prince, who seems to have invented the process. 43

The idea for a series of illustrations satirizing mankind and all his follies probably did not come from deep within Goya's own imagination. The English had produced a great many etchings dealing with just such a subject. Edith Helman discusses this at some length in her book Trasmundo de Goya. She mentions that Goya might have become familiar with these English etchings at the home of Don Sebastián Martínez in Cadiz, where he spent several months convalescing. 44 Further, there was at least one of these English etchings in Goya's own personal collection at the time of his death, although it is not known when he acquired it. The similarities between the English prints and the Caprichos are too many to go unmentioned or unnoted. Says Helman:

Nota Mmeatín que las caricaturas inglesas ridiculizaban todos los vicios del hombre en sociedad, la gravedad de los magistrados, la

---

43 Malcom C. Salaman, Masters of Etching, Francisco de Goya, p. 11.

44 Edith Helman, Trasmundo de Goya, p. 37.
afectación de las señoritas . . . , la vanidad de los nobles, la bajeza de los cortesanos, todos temas predilectos de Goya y también de la sátira costumbrista del día. 45

Social criticism in art and cartoons was not original to Goya, nor even to Spain, and these English etchings probably were a source of inspiration to Goya. But let's look carefully at the last phrase of the above quotation, "y también de la sátira costumbrista del día"-- "and also of the 'costumbrista' satire of the day." This word "costumbrista" is difficult to translate. It usually refers to literature--to a certain type of literature which concerns itself with customs and manners of a certain region or country. The sainetes of Juan Ramón de la Cruz are "costumbrista." But it can also apply to art, as we shall see, and it can be satirical or not. In the case of the latter it merely records the times without comment, which again is pretty much what the "sainetes" of de la Cruz were doing. In literature it reached its peak in Spain with the great columnist and essayist Mariano José de Larra in about 1830. Larra wrote


Translation--"Moratín notes that the English caricatures of men in society ridiculed all the vices of man in society, the gravity of the magistrates, the affectation of the señoritas, . . . the vanity of the nobility, the lowliness of the courtesans, all of Goya's favorite themes and also of the 'costumbrista' satire of the day."
about all aspects of Spanish life and society, usually in a pretty critical vein. He used a wide variety of pseudonyms, that of "Fígaro" being the most famous and the one under which he goes down in the annals of Spanish literature as the best author of prose of the first half of the nineteenth century in Spain. He treated everything from "artículos de costumbres" to political-social essays to literary criticism. He interests us here as a recorder of Spanish manners. But Larra went a lot further than mere recording. Says Angel del Río in his famous survey of Spanish literature:

Larra, no se limita a ridiculizar con sátira afable los hábitos de la burguesía de su tiempo o a retratar con realismo fiel los tipos sociales. Va al fondo mismo de la psicología española, penetra en las causas de la decadencia, y traza una visión pesimista del atraso de España.46

How very similar is this to the kind of thing Goya was doing in the Caprichos thirty years earlier; and how similar are the attitudes of the two men!

Etchings were quite popular in Madrid in the 1790's and were used for all kinds of illustration. Some were used for advertisements, others to illustrate stories and

46 Angel del Río, Historia de la literatura Española, p. 67.

Translation—"Larra doesn't limit himself to ridiculing the bourgeois of his time with affable satire, or to portraying the social types with faithful realism. He goes to the very depths of the Spanish psyche, penetrating into the causes of the decadence, and he draws a pessimistic vision of the backwardness of Spain."
articles, and still others—those that were merely decorative—were printed in the daily newspapers advertising themselves. Of such a type was a series by Juan de la Cruz (not to be confused with the playwright Ramón de la Cruz) entitled "Colección de trajes de España tanto antiguos como modernos"\(^{47}\) and illustrating all kinds of costumes from different regions and epochs. These were published daily in the "Diario de Madrid" during the summer of 1791.\(^{48}\)

In 1798 a collection of etchings entitled "Gritos de Madrid" ("Shouts of Madrid") dealing with the lower classes was published. There are old hags dressed as "majas," decrepit soldiers, night watchmen, and even a monkey dressed as a charlatan.\(^{49}\)

In April of 1795 still another collection was announced as follows: "Colección de cuatro estampas de caprichos, bien iluminadas y grabadas al aguafuerte."\(^{50}\)

\(^{47}\)The translation is: "Collection of ancient and modern Spanish costumes."

\(^{48}\)Helman, p. 38.

\(^{49}\)Ibid.

\(^{50}\)The translation is: "A collection of four prints of capricious subjects, skillfully drawn and lit by etching."
The subjects were very reminiscent of the things Goya painted in the Tapestry Cartoons. They are: the good humor of the Andalusians, a "peñimetra" in the Prado, a Madrid chestnut dealer, and an orange vendor from Murcia. These are still the things that are popular among the people of Madrid. They aren't at all similar to the Caprichos Goya produced, but then Goya was no longer the same man who painted the cartoons.

And so we see that the announcement of Goya's Caprichos in 1793 was nothing out of the ordinary. Throughout the decade people were accustomed to opening the paper and reading about new sets of etchings. The artist paid for the space and hoped to sell his work. It was a perfectly normal thing. What was abnormal, of course, was the quality, scope, and tone of the etchings produced by Goya. It is ironic that the sale of them was going so badly that Goya withdrew them from the market in a few days. Even if they had been valueless artistically, one would think that they would have sold well if only because of the scandal and controversy which arose over them. (Goya was barely spared appearing before the tribunal of the Inquisition, thanks to the benevolence of the King and the power of Godoy). When that kind of thing happens today, the artist or author, such as William Manchester,

---

51 Helman, p. 39.
for instance, makes a fortune. At any rate, in spite of their genius, the etchings were monetarily unsuccessful for Goya. Fortunately, this was unimportant to him. He seems to have produced them solely for his own pleasure and satisfaction anyway. He wasn't, it appears, expecting to make a lot of money with them.

The word "Capricho," which doesn't lend itself to exact translation into English, was also quite common at the time of Goya's publication. Sánchez Cantón suggests that Goya knew of several cases in which artists had used the word to designate a certain type of etching. Callot had entitled a series "Capricci di vari figure" 120 years earlier, and more recently Giovanni Tiepolo had subtitled a section of his "Scherzi di fantasia" dealing with his children "Capricci." But, as Miss Helman points out:

El caso es que la palabra "capricho" se empleaba con gran frecuencia en aquella época y los más fervorosos partidarios de la Razón eran precisamente los más adictos al uso del vocabulario en sus diversos sentidos.52

In order to understand the why of the Caprichos as well as their significance, we must have an idea of what was going on in Spain at the time. What were the pervading ideas? What kind of people lived there? Was there a

52 Ibid., p. 115.

The translation is: "The case is that the word Capricho was employed with great frequency in that epoch, and the most fervent partisans of Reason were precisely the ones most addicted to using the vocabulary in its most diverse senses."
majority of literates, or illiterates, of clergymen or nobles? Rather than spend several pages summing up and capsulizing what I've found in the history books, perhaps the best thing is to simply lift an entire paragraph from Miško's book on the Caprichos, a paragraph which is concise and clear and does a very good job of summing up the situation:

Spain at that time was one of the most backward countries in Europe. It was a country of neglected farming and undeveloped industry whose overseas colonies did not suffice to feed it, a country of the most extreme social contrasts, where two-thirds of the arable land belonged to the nobility and to the Church, where there were more aristocrats than artisans, where the large number of the clergy was far surpassed by the number of beggars, where the luxury and pride of the privileged classes contrasted with the misery and destitution of the people; a country full of absurdities, of medieval survivals and superstitions, stagnation and ignorance, where the educated were only a very small proportion of a nation that was almost completely illiterate. An absolute monarchy along with the Inquisition, which had lost very little of its notorious power, ruled over this lonely and unfortunate land, over this great yet backward people. Reason, deified on the other side of the Pyrenees, in Spain was sent to the stocks by the Inquisition with a dunce's cap on its head.53

It was a country of total intolerance. It was starving to death--intellectually and physically. The great revolution that was taking place in the rest of Europe was passing it by completely. Most of the things that were wrong at the end of the eighteenth century had been wrong for centuries. The Church had always been too powerful and intolerant. It

was the Spanish monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella—so famous for having been the ones who finally expelled the Moors from the peninsula, and for having backed Columbus' expedition in the same year—who founded the Inquisition. Miško points out that there were more aristocrats than artisans. This is true, and always had been. At the end of the Middle Ages there were many ways one could become a noble in Spain; one did not have to be born to it—but most of them were so poor that they were literally starving. And they were worse off than the regular peasants, because they were so proud that they wouldn't work! This is poignantly brought out in one of Spain's great novels, Lazarillo de Tormes, already mentioned in the section on the tapestries as being a novel of the picaro, in which the young protagonist becomes the servant to just such a noble, a noble who eats no more than a small piece of bread daily, who doesn't accept invitations to dinner for fear people will think he is not eating well at home, and who always wears his cloak and his sword in the street. The urchin, in fact, ends up caring for the master. How typical this is of the many paradoxes and incongruities which had existed in Spain for so long, and still did at the time of the Caprichos! In these etchings Goya said something about it. The entire nineteenth century in Spain was spent fighting about it, although not much was accomplished. And then in 1898
Spain suffered her final, great humiliation at the hands of the United States. A generation of writers—Unamuno, Baroja, Azañón, Gañivet and others—began saying serious things about it, and slowly the country began to wake up. They are still merely awakening, but they are taking giant steps in the right direction, opening their eyes to the world, untying their self-imposed shackles, unfettering their minds. It is this that Goya would have had them do a full century and a half ago.

Charles III was an enlightened, intelligent, fairly competent monarch who was doing more for Spain than anyone had done for two hundred and fifty years. He was by far the most successful of the Bourbon kings, and Spain was even beginning to attain a certain amount of the prominence which she had enjoyed during her "Golden Age." Had this king been succeeded by anyone as competent, Spain might well have become a world power again. At the very least, she would have embraced the ideas of the revolution and not been left a hundred and fifty years behind the rest of Western Europe.

However, such was not the case. In 1788, as Goya was finishing the Tapestry Cartoons, Charles III died and was succeeded by his son, Charles IV. Unfortunately, he was a dolt, a mere puppet. He cared little for the throne, for Spain, or for the responsibility of government. His consuming passion was hunting, and he spent virtually
all his time at the chase. (He also played the violin, although not well, and did so for very special guests. Goya wrote to Zapater that the King had played for him personally on one occasion, and he was ecstatic, considering it the greatest compliment he had yet been paid.)

The power in Spain was at first controlled by Charles' unattractive, overbearing wife, María Louisa, and later by her young lover, Don Manuel Godoy. Godoy was actually no more than a non-commissioned officer in the palace guard when he was noticed by the Queen, mainly because his older brother had acted as part time lover to María. He was young, tall, extremely handsome, arrogant, and apparently very attractive to the Queen. She made him her lover, showered him with gifts and titles and honors. Eventually he acquired a tremendous amount of power, being the first grande in Spain and first minister under the Crown. He treated María Louisa badly, but she was spellbound by him, and overlooked all his faithlessness, continuing to show proofs of her favor with still more titles. The most outrageous part of all this is that none of it was a secret. It was greatly talked about all over Spain. The only person who seemed not to have known of the affair was the King himself, who considered Godoy a trusted and loyal friend who was doing a good job administering the affairs of state. In a rather interesting phrase, Mićko sums up
what he says about Godoy like this: "He was a typical figure in the masquerade which Goya had decided to unmask in his Caprichos."54

Still Charles IV was loved by the majority; the Spanish people have traditionally been totally dedicated to their monarchs. Liberalism and the Enlightenment were not especially popular, particularly after the death of Charles III, whose battle to liberalize the country had been uphill. Thus the victory of the French Revolution caused hope in only a few Spaniards—most were stricken with terror. For the liberals it was particularly rough. The government strengthened its reactionary views, it tightened censorship even more, and persecution of anyone holding progressive views increased.

Spain tried to remain neutral, but could stay out no longer when the French Bourbons were executed. This was a fiasco; Spain was all but impotent militarily. French republican forces invaded. The situation for Spain was catastrophic. She emerged not as badly as she might have, however, with the Peace of Bazel, a peace which brought Godoy the title of Principe de la Paz—the Prince of Peace. This also caused problems though, because now the government embarked on a more liberal course, causing resentment and alarm among the reactionaries. The Inquisition, in fact, endeavored to bring Godoy himself before

54 Ibid., p. 115.
their court, but by chance accident their plan failed. Godoy did resign in 1798, in order that he might return at a more appropriate time. This he eventually did.

We can see that the situation was anything but clear in Spain at the end of the eighteenth century. Goya certainly did not lack material for inspiration if he intended any social criticism. And this is exactly what he did intend, imbued with liberal ideas as he was. All his friends were liberals, and he must have had many fruitful and stimulating discussions at the "Tertulias," which gathered before dinner at the various bars in downtown Madrid. (This is another custom which is still very much in evidence in Spain.) To these men the French Revolution was an epoch-making event, something which must be supported, whose fever should be imported south of the Pyrenees. Among these men were Don Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, the leader and great writer and critic who translated Rousseau's *Social Contract* into Spanish. He was probably Goya's closest friend among the liberals, and certainly had a profound interest in the artist throughout his life. There was José Vargas Ponce, who wrote the pamphlet *Pan y Toros* ("Bread and Bulls") which was ostensibly a criticism of bullfighting, but actually went deep into Spanish society. Klingender calls it "a bitterly satirical survey
of Spanish life and Spanish Institutions." The pamphlet is particularly interesting because it is really more or less of a literary parallel to the Carriochos, both of them treating a lot of the same things. There was the poet Melendez Valdés, and the playwright Leandro Moratin, who, incidentally, later shared Goya's exile in Bordeaux. And there were a few others. But mostly, it was a small group, and they could do nothing alone. Spain remained shackled in her self-imposed chains.

The feeling of this group is perhaps best expressed by José Vargas Ponée, author of the aforementioned Pan y Toros, as he writes about an enlightened Spaniard comparing his miserable country to the more progressive European countries. It is also a very good indication of the state of affairs in Spain at the time, as seen by a contemporary who had the intelligence to think about it and the courage to write about it.

The Melancholy English, the Voltairean French, spend their days and nights in thankless study and in dangerous political skirmishes and promulgate a law only after months of discussion. The carefree Spanish spend their time in pleasant relaxation and entertaining spectacles, and all at once they discover that they have a thousand laws which have been passed without the slightest opposition. The former have refined their palates to such an extent that an omelette seems hard to them, the latter, satisfied with their poverty and hardship, have reached the point where they can swallow thistles without discomfort; the former are like bees that swarm in anger when their honey is taken from them; the latter are like sheep,
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patiently waiting to be fleeced and slaughtered; the former with an insatiable desire for wealth and prosperity, the slaves of their business and their trades, the latter, satisfied with their poverty and hardship, devoting themselves without a qualm to their amusements and idleness; the former worshipping freedom and finding too oppressive but a link of the chain of oppression, the latter dragging their chains of servitude and not knowing what freedom is; the former grandiose in their rewards even for virtue; the latter showering them even upon vices; with them a nobleman is a hero of rarity; with us they grow rank as the onion or the leek. Happy Spain! Happy country... Continue along this road of glory and success and remain what you are, the furthest boundary of external fanaticism. Pay no heed, as before, to the envious tongues of foreigners; treat revolutionary ideas with contempt; condemn free thought; censure books not approved by the Church; and rest in peace, lulled by the pleasant music of the booing of those who hold you up to ridicule. 56

One had to be a part of it to write about it so poignantly. Goya did not write; but he was a part of it, and he expressed it in the Caprichos as emotionally, perhaps, as any period of history has ever been expressed by an artist.

The whole concept of art which Goya adhered to in his Tapestry Cartoons has changed in the etchings. His art is now highly personal and intensive. He isn't drawing for the public, but for himself. Nor is he drawing for Mengs or Winklemann or David or any particular style. What he has produced here is a mixture of many things. But most importantly it is a product of himself. For the first time it is really Goya. According to Andre Malraux, this

56 Misce, p. 15.
was very important. "To allow his genius to become apparent it was necessary that he should dare to give up his aiming to please. He was impelled to etching by the loneliness imposed upon him by his deafness. He engraved to please himself, not others." 57

We shall see later when we look at the etchings from a technical point of view just how significant Goya's art has been to the last two hundred years of drawing and painting.

In the February 6, 1799 edition of the "Diano de Madrid," Spain's major newspaper at that time, there appeared a passage introducing the Caprichos. Thus, two and a half years after completion, they were being published. Justino Fernández 58 points out two rather valid reasons for this delay. First, the Inquisition was still remarkably powerful at that time (Godoy did not gain complete control over it until several years later), and Goya may have been a bit leary about getting himself into what could have been a lot of trouble. And second, the artist feared that they would not be accepted as "good" art. That is, that they wouldn't be considered "real" art in view of the canons of the day. This, in fact, was the case; the Caprichos were quite

58 Justino Fernández, El Sueño de la razón produce monstruos.
unsuccessful commercially from the start, and not long after publication Goya actually withdrew them from the market, as we have seen. But in the end he did publish them. Presumably he was prevailed upon by his liberal friends, and the plates finally appeared in February of 1799.

Most people seem to agree that Goya's testimony in the introduction, which appeared in "Diario de Madrid," was probably not written solely by him, but that he collaborated with his author friend Cean Bermudez. Whether or not this is true is not important—what is important is that Goya agreed with and adhered to the principles therein outlined. It more than discusses the Caprichos; it is a reflection of the whole new outlook and concept which Goya had developed as the decade progressed. It is a most illuminating document, and must be the starting point of any detailed discussion of the Caprichos.  

A Collection of Prints of Capricious Subjects, Invented and Etched by Don Francisco Goya. Since the artist is convinced that the censure of human errors and vices (though they may seem to be the province of Eloquence and Poetry) may also be the object of painting, he has chosen as subjects adequate for his work, from the multitude of follies and blunders common in every civil society, as well as from the vulgar prejudices and lies authorized by custom, ignorance, or interest, those that he has thought most suitable matter for ridicule as well as for exercising the artificer's fancy.

---

59 José Lopez-Rey, Goya's Caprichos, Beauty, Reason and Caricature, pp. 78-79. This particular version of the newspaper article was, of course, taken from the cited work. The entire text, here reproduced, is difficult to find without going directly to the newspaper. Certain segments of it can be found in almost every book on Goya or the Caprichos.
Since the majority of the objects presented in this work are ideal, it may not be too daring to expect that their defects will perhaps meet with forgiveness on the part of the connoisseurs as they will realize that the artist has neither followed the examples of others, nor has been able to copy from nature. And if imitating nature is as difficult as it is admirable when one succeeds in doing so, some esteem must be shown toward him who, holding aloof from her, has had to put before the eyes forms and attitudes that so far have existed only in the human mind, obscured and confused by lack or illustration, or existed by the unruliness of passions.

One would be assuming too much ignorance of the fine arts, if one were to warn the people that in none of the compositions which form these scenes has the artist had in mind any one individual, in order to ridicule particular defects. For truly, to say so would mean narrowing overmuch the boundaries of talent, and mistaking the methods used by the arts of imitation in producing perfect works.

Painting chooses from the universal what it considers suitable to its own ends: it reunites in a single, fantastic personage circumstances and characteristics that nature has divided among many. From such a combination, ingeniously arranged, results the kind of successful imitation for which a good artificer deserves the title of inventor, and not that of servile copyist.60

We are presented here with Goya's intentions. Or are we? I would say that a good deal of this article was intended as a cover-up to what the Caprichos actually were. On the one hand, they were an indictment of a tremendous number of "human errors and evils"—vanity, ignorance, superstition, cruelty, hypocrisy, intolerance, deceit, fickleness, treachery, drunkenness, lewdness, etc. He exposes corruption in relationships between men and women;

60Mikó, p. 21.
he shows us the coldness of prostitution and the perversity of the brain and heart. But most important of all, "He sees people not only as individuals, but in their multifarious associations and relationships; he describes human deprivities not as isolated phenomena, but in their social implications." He strikes out not only at Spain, but at all the evils of all societies since the dawn of time. And this is exactly what he has proposed he would do.

On the other hand, however, he has, within this general framework, become very specific in his attacks. The introduction in the newspaper was not the only place in which Goya tried to cover this up. On one of the preparatory sketches for plate 43, "The Dream of Reason Produces Monsters," which was originally, in fact, intended as a frontispiece for the whole series, are printed the words "Dream of an author who wishes through these 'Caprichos' to admonish and correct ridiculous behaviour and help truth to prevail." And the commentaries which were added by the author to the already cryptic captions were in many cases intended to muddle the issue; they obscured the true meaning of many of the plates. Too many of the plates came too close to too many scandalous stories that were circulating about Madrid at that time or to things which had personally affected the artist for me to believe that Goya did not

61 Ibid., p. 34.
intend any direct personal satire. Capricho #33 shows a young man, presumably a doctor, attending three patients with very little success. This is rather graphically illustrated. The caption "Al Conde Palatino" means "To the Palace Count." The comment reads: "In all the sciences there are charlatans who know everything without having studied anything, and have a cure for every ill. You must not let yourself be taken in by their self-advertisement. Real scholars are always distrustful of too great accuracy and precision: they promise little and fulfill much. The Palace Count, however, does not keep a single promise." This is a double edged sword. On the one hand he attacks quacks and frauds in all professions; while on the other we have a satire on the "political quackery" of Godoy—something which seems to me to be undeniable in view of the actual caption and the last line of the artist's comment.

There can be no question that plate 39 "Asta su Abuelo" ("Back to his Grandfather"), about which Goya comments, "The poor creature's head is turned by the genealogists and experts on heraldom. Nor is he the only one.", and which depicts a major's mule leafing through a volume of his family tree, is a definite reference to the fake genealogy forged by the Queen for Godoy in order to document his ancient nobility. This etching is, in fact, the middle in a series of six—all containing mules and all of which, with a very little imagination, seem to correspond to the
career of "the Prince of Peace." Look in particular at plate 38, which shows a monkey playing a guitar for the mule, while two men laugh in the background. Here is the old Queen—the resemblance isn't difficult to discover—doting over the young Minister, singing of his virtue, while the cognizant public laughs in ridicule behind their backs; or at plate 40 which shows a donkey sitting at the bed of a moribund young man, taking his pulse and asking, "Of what disease will he die?" Once again, there is a double meaning here. The obvious one is the comment on the ineffectiveness of the medical profession. Or else this is the inept Prime Minister—his identity as a mule has already been established—in whose irresponsible hands rested the fate of the nation. The other plates in this series are easily linked to Godoy as well.

Individual people weren't the only things singled out by the artist for his satire. In plates 23 and 24 the absurd and inhuman judicial procedure is strongly criticized. In the first a woman with a dunce's cap on her bowed head sits on a platform and listens to the reading of the sentence. The caption says, "Who touches filth" and the commentary, "That is bad! To treat a respectable woman in such a way, who served everyone so willingly and usefully for a crust of bread! That is bad!" The caption is from the old Spanish proverb "De aquellos polvos vienen estos lodos!" or, in English, "From such dust follows such dirt!"
which corresponds to the English proverb "Who touches pitch cannot remain undefiled." Goya questions which is worse, the prostitute or the judges who have no conception of mercy and hold the poor creature up to ridicule.

In the next etching a woman is led through the streets—an object of mockery—on her way to the gallows. The officials with her are not men but cats, and they seem to relish the situation. The crowd is rancorous and out of control; some of the faces are barely discernible as human beings. The caption reads, "No hubo remedio"—"There was no other remedy." Goya's comment says: "This woman is being condemned. After passing sentence they will lead her through the streets in triumph. And she deserves it, too. But if they do so in order to put her to shame, they are wasting their time. Nobody can be shamed who knows no shame." The first part of this is obvious sarcasm. She certainly doesn't deserve it any more than the executioners do. The part about shame is an interesting bit of philosophy, but is added to temper the viciousness of the etching itself. Had Goya intended only to criticize the woman and her crime, would the guards or executioners have monstrous cat-like heads?

In plate 55, the old hag fixing herself up in the mirror is thought by some to be the Queen, ugly as can be but very vain. Plate 56 suggests the rise and fall of

---
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careers—as dictated by fate. This kind of thing must have been very prevalent at the court at this time, just as it is on Madison Avenue today. Did Goya have a particular case in mind? Perhaps even Godoy, whose meteoric rise was bound to be followed by just as sudden a plunge.

Capricho #58 is an obvious attack on the Inquisition. It shows a desperate looking man about to be given an enema by several horrifying inquisitors. The caption says, "¡Trágalo perro!" ("Swallow it, dog!") and the comment reads: "Whoever lives among people is sure to get an enema sooner or later. If he wishes to avoid it, he must live in the mountains; and when he is there he only finds out that a lonely life is an enema anyway." Goya's comment here definitely tempers and, in fact, attempts to obscure the attack, the real target of which is, of course, the enema procedure used by the Inquisition in those times to torture heretics.

There are many, many other plates which can be easily related to specific events or people of the 1790's in Madrid and Spain. The ones pointed out here are the most obvious—in the other cases a bit more imagination is needed, and someone doubting the validity of the argument might be able to put up a good argument.

There are some very personal elements and references in the Caprichos as well. Aside from the haunting, nightmare
visions that come from the very depths of Goya's mind and soul, we find the artist drawing certain people with whom he had personal connections, particularly the Duchess of Alba. A great deal of importance has been attached to the relationship between the Duchess and the artist, and rightly so, I think. Perhaps this would be a good place to go into this in a little more detail.

The Duchess appears relentlessly in Goya's work from the day they met. "Her face haunts his art." She is in his drawings and paintings and etchings. There are two large, full-length portraits. In the first she wears a white dress with a scarlet sash. A dog plays at her feet. She doesn't seem alive and vital here, but more like a dummy; Goya was probably not yet in love with her. Two years later he did the second. Things seem to have changed. Here she is a magnificent mysterious figure. Her beautiful face is outlined by the lace mantilla, which serves to heighten the blackness of her hair and eyebrows. She stares at us boldly, defiantly, with her left hand on her hip, her right hand pointing down to the words inscribed in the sand, "Solo Goya," or "Only Goya," which would add validity to the belief that at this time there still existed an idyllic or romantic relationship between the two. Further, the Duchess bears on her right hand two rings, one inscribed
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"Alba" and the other "Goya." However, things were to change very soon. At the time of the portrait Goya was either with the Duchess at her ranch in Sanlucar, or had just returned from there to Madrid. It had been an idyllic stay, three months of calm and bliss, and there exist two sketch books which give us an idea of the relationship and several intimate glimpses of the Duchess at her toilette. These sketches reappear not long afterwards (about a year and a half) in the Caprichos, in a much different vein. We shall look into this more closely further on.

Doña María del Pilar Teresa Cayetana was as enigmatic a figure as can be found in those times. She, in fact, still remains so. She is as indecipherable now as she was then. As Antonia Valentín points out, every circumstance connected with her life conspired to make her an unfettered being. 64

Her father had died while she was young; he never succeeded to his title. Her grandfather brought her up, and he was the epitome of Feudal Spain. He was the possessor of the proudest heritage in the land and a fortune which is said to have surpassed that of the royal family itself. He had been the dazzling Spanish ambassador to the French court, the confidant of kings, the
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tormentor of dukes. Next to the King, he was for most of his life the most powerful man in Spain. To all this Doña María was the sole heiress. Through her mother, she acquired an interest in the arts, as well as a certain vibrant flair, an unquietness, an effervescence which is totally uncharacteristic of the Spanish female.

She became the most talked about and most admired woman in Spain. Nature had endowed her with rare beauty at the same time that it gave her a lively imagination and a keen intellect. She was also, not surprisingly, of a rather capricious nature. Her beauty is probably her most famous attribute. Valentín and Poore recall that Fleurot de Langle, the Frenchman travelling through Spain at that time, was moved to remark: "The Duchess of Alba has not a hair on her head which does not provoke desire. When the Duchess passes through the street all the world is at the windows to gaze and even the children leave their games to look at her."65

She was married three times, the first at the age of thirteen. A year later she succeeded to the title of Duchess of Alba, and from that moment on she was master of her life, and almost any life that came into contact with hers. She spent a great deal of her time in the pursuit of pleasure. She had no set moral standards, no
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qualms about any of her escapades. The past was done and she lived for the present and future. Being capricious, she would yield to any whim; being arrogant and competitive, she got herself into innumerable social duels, mostly with her arch-rival the Duchess of Osuna (who, incidentally, with her husband, remained Goya's greatest patron throughout his career), but sometimes with the Queen herself, whom she always made look very silly.

The two Duchesses battled endlessly. One would favor one musician, the other another. All Madrid would take sides. Or artists, or poets, or bullfighters. These last were the protagonists of their most famous duel. At the time, about 1788, there were two great matadors, Costillares and Romero, in Spain. Naturally, the two women took different sides, and, with them, the rest of the population. The thing seems to have reached a real frenzy. Carlos Yriarte, one of the budding poets of the day and the "official" poet of the Duchess of Osuna, wrote: "We subsist at the present moment between Costillarists and Romerists. There is no other talk to be heard from the time one gets up in the morning until he goes to bed at night."66 And no less a person than Godoy wrote from his exile: "In 1788 the Duchesses of Alba and Osuna vied with each other for the possession of Costillares or of Romero, the champion bull-killers of
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the time. All the gossip was of this ignoble excess. People recounted the episodes, the demonstrations of passion, the generousities in the lives of the rivals, but the immorality of the situation shocked no one.\textsuperscript{67} This really is not as strange or unusual as it may seem. Since the inception of the art of bullfighting Spaniards have become notoriously excited about their favorite matadors. And in the rare times when two exceptionally skilled bullfighters have come along at the same time, the country has always divided itself almost evenly into partisans of the one or the other. The most famous duel of all took place in the second decade of the twentieth century. Called the "Golden Age of Bullfighting," it ended with the death in the ring of Joselito, one of the two protagonists. This rivalry in 1788 was really not so exceptional but for the participation of the two Duchesses, something which perhaps gave it a more romantic flair than it already possessed, and most certainly added a measure of excitement.

But the Duchess did not stop there. She had everything the Queen didn't—beauty, grace, charm and popularity, and let no opportunity slip by to remind María Louisa of this. There is a story about the Duchess hearing that the Queen was having a new gown sent from Paris. She succeeded in getting an exact copy
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of it, had it duplicated several times, put the dresses on her maids and paraded them up and down the Paseo del Prado in their carriages.

The particulars of the relationship between the Duchess of Alba and Goya are difficult to establish. It is assumed that they knew each other as far back as 1787, but there isn't any real certainty. Some feel that we already see her likeness in some of the cartoons such as "The Vintage" and "Blind Man's Buff." I myself don't see the connection. The resemblance between some of these women and those in other cartoons to the Duchess of Alba is simply not great enough for there to be any valid cause for assuming that she served as a model or inspiration at that time. And furthermore, it would be ridiculous to assume that the Duchess of Osuna would allow paintings in which her rival appeared to hang in her hall.68

The first dated portraits of the Duke and Duchess of Alba were done in 1795. (Mićko69 says there was one done in 1790, but does not say which one, and I have not been able to find it or anything about it.) For various practical reasons, it is safe to assume, I think, that it was just before this that Goya became acquainted with the Duchess. First, we know that the Duchess was an overbearing woman. When she entered someone's life, she
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did so completely. There was no doubt about it. After 1795, there is no doubt that she was very much a part of Goya's life. There is considerable doubt about the period before 1795. And one more interesting point is made by Antonia Valentín. She points out that it would have been ridiculous for a fledgling Goya to have let this controversial woman into his affairs at the risk of jeopardizing himself with the Queen and, moreover, with his greatest patrons, the Duke and Duchess of Osuna. But after his illness, by 1795, his reputation and he himself were so firmly established that this would have made no difference. In fact, in August, 1795 Francisco Bayeau died, and in October of that year Goya was elected Director of the School of Painting of the Royal Academy. Although he never assumed the position officially because of his deafness, he had at last "arrived" and could do pretty much as he pleased without endangering his career.

At the time of the 1795 portrait, in which the Duchess wears a white dress with a red sash, Goya does not yet seem to have been in love with the lady. We have already pointed out the lifelessness and doll-like quality of the portrait. Two years later, of course, she has totally invaded his life, and we see this thoroughly in the second portrait. These manifestations of their relationship have also already been mentioned. Goya, then, probably met the Duchess in late 1794 or 1795, and
became more and more involved until he was inextricably taken up by her. There is no written document of any of this, so we must assume what we can from the paintings and drawings.

In June of 1796 the Duchess' third husband died, and she retired to her estate at Sanlúcar for a period of mourning. There is a story, not true, as is the case with so many of the legends concerning Goya, that the artist went with her; that on the way the axle of the coach broke in the middle of the night; that Goya got out of the carriage, removed the axle, fixed it, returned it to its place; and that they went on their way. Supposedly at this time he contracted a chill which led to his deafness. Since it is most probable that Goya emerged from his illness of 1792 deaf, this fable, of course, cannot be true and must be relegated to the storybooks along with the other outrageous legends.

Actually, there are no written documents of the trip to Sanlúcar, but it is assumed that the artist joined the Duchess there later on. It is known that he was away from the capital by October of 1796, and it is clear that he had returned by April of 1797, because at this time he resigned his position at the Academy.

Of the actual stay at Sanlúcar we have as charming a document as imaginable—two sketchbooks filled
with intimate scenes of life at the estate. There is a sketch of the Duchess pulling on a stocking, or sitting with her little Negro ward, or formally dressed, straight and stiff. All her emotions are caught—despair, surprise, anger, happiness. Life there must have been idyllic for Goya. He was totally in love with Doña María. And for the time, she seems to have been his alone. She was thirty-four, at the prime of her life; he was fifty, ill and crippled, and yet for the first time in his life he had discovered a passionate, unreserved love. The calmness and happiness of the brief scene is wonderfully caught in these two sketchbooks.

All of this was not to last long, though; not long after Goya's return to Madrid, the Duchess must have tired of him in her whimsical, capricious way. He was hurt and bewildered, and the charming sketches became the models for biting satire and criticism. Her face is ever-present in his art for twenty more years, but nowhere is she more predominant than in the Caprichos. Poore says that the Duchess "... stirred Goya to art as no woman ever did, even in desperation. If his most light-hearted testament of their intimacy is the Sanlucar sketchbook, the best is in the mantilla portrait, where she stands pointing to the inscription he has written for her in the sand beneath her pointed slippers and
wearing two rings: his name on one, hers on the other."  
He neglects what happened later—the bitterness of the 
artist is thoroughly expressed in the Caprichos—he 
still stirred him to art even after they parted. And 
perhaps she inspired him even further than to the bitter-
ness he displayed towards her in the plates. Asks Miško, 
"Did he perhaps need the last, cruel, disillusion of 
love to see the world in all its naturalness?"  

Amongst the Caprichos we first meet the Duchess 
in plate #7, "Ni así la distingue" ("Even so he does not 
recognize her"). It shows a man looking at a woman very 
close up through an eyeglass, and Goya's comment reads: 
"And how would he recognize her? To do so an eyeglass 
is not enough, but judgment and a knowledge of the 
world are needed as well—and these are just what the 
poor gallant is lacking in." The original drawing for 
this plate is in the large Sanluca sketchbook, and 
the woman has a strong resemblance to the Duchess. Goya 
ridicules himself here for possessing neither the wit, 
charm nor worldliness of Alba. It is possible that he 
understands, or is beginning to understand, about things 
to come.  

Ten plates later we find the Duchess again, this 
time pulling a stocking up tight while being watched by  
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an old, monkey-faced servant, who becomes, incidentally, a familiar figure and a means for recognizing Alba in Goya's art. It's called "Bien tirada está" ("It's well pulled up"). By this time a hint of bitterness has crept into the work; the relationship must have started going badly. The Duchess here serves as a model for a prostitute getting well dressed, preparing to go out to the street. Goya's comment, "Oh, Auntie Curra is not stupid. She knows that stockings should be nicely pulled up." doesn't add much light to the subject, but we know the young lady is Alba not only because of the resemblance, but also because the original sketch for this one too is in the Sanlucar sketchbook. Hardly a fitting subject for which to use your lover as a model—if you are in perfect rapport with her, that is. Things certainly have changed from the intimate, happy life they must have shared those few months in Sanlucar.

Goya seems to be at his most bitter concerning this relationship in an etching originally intended as one of the Caprichos, but which was never published as such, an etching which is, nevertheless, very closely related to one of the later Caprichos, "Volaverunt." It is called "Sueño de la mentira y ña yenconstacia" ("Dream of lying and inconstancy") and shows as much about the personality and feelings of the artist as does any
single one of the plates. It depicts two two-headed women, the upper parts of their bodies partly bate, lying in a sort of dreamlike setting, all lit by the pale moonlight. One of the women, the Duchess, has a pair of butterfly wings protruding from each head. She has her right arm extended towards a man at the far left of the picture, who grasps the arm desperately to his body. This man is Goya. Her left arm is extended in the other direction, and the hand is being placed by the other woman, who is presumably her servant, into the hand of a second man. This is done in secret, without Goya's notice, and the second man makes a gesture of silence to the viewer. In the background is an eerie castle, and in the foreground are two saddlebags standing by themselves, with a ghastly, ghoulish mask between them, forming, in my opinion, a rather hideous phallic symbol—although I doubt Goya was aware of this. Also in the foreground is a snake which hypnotizes a frog, while being attacked further back by another frog.

There is a great deal of iconography in this etching. According to Nordström, Goya's inspiration for a lot of this was Cesare Ripa's "Iconologia," which states that butterfly wings are a symbol of "inconsiderato," inconsideration or imprudence, and they
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are placed in exact conformity with Ripa's instructions. Further, also according to Ripa, the moon, whose light is very essential to the overall effect of the picture here, is a symbol of "inconstanza", inconstancy, which fits in perfectly with the caption, "Dream of lying and inconstancy." The mask is described in a great many places, including Ripa, as a symbol of hypocrisy, and it is possible that Goya's arrangement of it in between two saddlebags comes from the old Spanish saying "pasarse a la otra alforja," "to change over to another saddlebag," which means to take undue liberties, or to be deceitful. Thus we have hypocrisy surrounded by deceit—not a very pleasant or amusing combination.

One last detail worthy of mention is that the Duchess, the woman with the butterfly wings, is not actually lying on the ground, but rather, she is floating in midair. The clutching Goya is desperately trying to keep her to earth. The whole thing, then, is an extremely personal and bitter work, directed at the inconstancy of the Duchess of Alba.

As we noted, this etching is closely related to Capricho #61, "Volaverunt," in which a woman, again the Duchess of Alba, with butterfly wings on her head and her arms spread holding out her mantilla so that she looks strikingly like a large bat, is borne through the sky

---
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on the backs of three crumpled-up witches we've noticed before in the Alba drawings. Again, the background is illuminated by the pale, white moonlight. The comment here reads: "There are heads so swollen with inflammable gas that they can fly without being helped by a balloon or by witches." This is, of course, very suitable to his now broken relationship with the Duchess, and is obviously related to the "Sueño de la mentira . . ." etching. Nordstrom believes that the first was a definite inspiration for the second, and, in fact, may have even been a preliminary study which the artist eventually decided to carry further.75

The connection between this plate and Goya's relationship with the Duchess is even more closely drawn when we look at the double meaning of the title itself, "Volaverunt," which means literally "They have flown" but figuratively can be used to express the total loss of something.76 Both of the etchings are typical of Goya in that again they have a double entendre. That is, not only do they concern themselves with the end of the ideal relationship between Goya and his famous mistress, but, of course, are commentaries on the general inconstancy and faithlessness of all women. Nordström aptly points out that the principal difference between
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the two etchings is that in the first the Duchess has lost her love but Goya has not, and he still clings to her desperately--his passion is still alive. In the second, though, she has made her escape, and he too seems to have lost his passion. 77 We might look here for a third inspiration for the title--a contemporary and well known play, "Thetis y Peleo" by Augustin de Salazar, in which the parting of two lovers is described as follows: "What of her passion? It's finished. And your affection? Volaverunt." 78 By the time the Caprichos were actually published, Goya no longer felt his passion for Alba, and hence the first etching no longer had any meaning; this is why it was omitted.

The best known probably of all the Caprichos is #43, which is believed to start the second part of the series. It was originally intended as the frontispiece, but was for some reason substituted by the wonderful self portrait, which bears the title "Francisco Goya y Lucientes, Pintor." Plate 43 is called "El sueno de la razon produce monstruos"--"The sleep of reason produces monsters"--and it merits careful consideration.

The etching consists of a man sitting in a chair with his head resting in his arms, which are
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folded on a table. This man is presumably Goya, and he is asleep. Surrounding him are a great variety of monsters and night creatures. There are bats, owls, cats, a lynx and several other creatures. If we are to accept all of what Nordström says, there is a tremendous amount of iconographical content here, and the etching is a manifestation of the sufferings of a melancholic man. The resting head and the crossed legs are, for instance, traditional melancholy postures. The bat seems to be traditionally associated with melancholy as well. In fact, it is safe to assume, says Nordström, that the reason the creatures are all identifiable is that each one of them has an association with melancholy. At this time Goya had resumed with his art "in order to occupy an imagination mortified by the contemplation of my sufferings." Says Nordström: "And therefore, it would certainly fit in well with this for us to imagine the artist represented here as though overwhelmed by melancholy." Mr. Nordström goes much further than this, delving into a vast source of references and texts to prove a great many iconographical connections. And in most cases, they seem
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to make sense. Certainly melancholy does play a large role here, and certainly Goya was a disillusioned, tortured unhappy man as he went about producing these Caprichos, but he hadn't lost all sight of reality, and what is much more important about this etching is that here Goya is making a significant and revealing comment about "reason." Reason--this is what the French Revolution and the French philosophers were all about. Goya loved the idea and he recognized its powers. What he says here about it is very interesting, as well as far-reaching.

The artist's commentary to the plate reads:

"Imagination abandoned by reason beget impossible monsters; united with it, she is the mother of all arts and the source of their wonders." This can mean several things. It can mean, as George Levitine says, that Goya stresses the dangers for an artist to overstep the boundaries assigned to imagination. In other words, let's not let our imagination get carried away; all sorts of hideous things can happen if we do. What Goya says is that imagination is not enough--an artist must be in possession of his faculties--he must be able to use reason, to sort out his fancies. And he must have reasonable goals--he must

be trying to accomplish something with a purpose. This is in keeping with both the quotation on the first ink drawing of Caprichos 43 quoted above: "The artist dreaming, his only purpose is to banish harmful religious beliefs, and to perpetuate in this world of caprices the solid testimony of truth" and with the first paragraph of the announcement of the Caprichos, also quoted above.

The artist's real beliefs along these lines come out best in the last paragraph of that quotation: "Painting chooses from the universal what it considers suitable to its own ends: it reunites in a single, fantastic personage circumstances and characteristics that nature has divided among many. From such a combination, ingenuously arranged, results the kind of successful imitation for which a good artificer deserves the title of inventor, and not that of servile copyist." Notice that the combination must be "ingenuously arranged." The artist has to assimilate, to organize, to control his imagination.

And we know from the Caprichos and a great many other things Goya did that his imagination was extremely fertile, and in some cases it took a great effort to control it. His intention in the Caprichos is just that, to let his imagination go, but at the same time to keep it under enough control so that what is produced isn't the product of the "begetter of impossible mon-
sters," but rather of the mother of the arts. Lopez-Rey says:

On discovering the polemic tone of Goya's exposition, it becomes clear that he was guided not only by the desire to ridicule certain vices—prostitution, injustice, bad education, etc.—but also, and principally, by a necessity to bring to the real world of concrete forms those forms and attitudes which had until then existed only in the darkened or fiery human mind. 83

There was a genuine desire on the part of Goya to reveal to the world the absurdities and atrocities which can be conjured up by the mind or imagination deserted by reason. This is due, I think, to the still vivid memories Goya had of his own tortuous days on the verge of insanity. It was due to his own personal experience that he first began to understand the tremendous importance and power of reason. Lopez-Rey continues:

On the other hand, if the fancy of the artist used its powers of imagination, caprice, and invention to grasp the attractive figures and attitudes of witches, dwarfs and other monsters sheltered in the darkness of the human mind, at the same time it used these figures and attitudes as an expression of a negative world which ought to be eliminated by reason.

In other words, Goya has not taken the attractive qualities of these creatures of the mind as is perhaps suggested in the introduction to the plates. He has
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shown them to us in all their hideousness and atrocity—as an "expression of a negative world," as Rey says. It depressed the artist that these creatures exist, and were, in fact, so very prevalent in his time. He knows that reason eliminates them; he has had personal experience with them. But the majority of Spaniards did not have the reasoning powers to dispel them, and they did exist, just as they have existed in all primitive or uneducated cultures since the dawn of time. The Caprichos are a vicious attack on witchery and sorcery and ignorance and superstition, and on the total lack of reason that must necessarily exist in order for people to believe in these things.

Enrique Lafuente Ferrari makes an interesting point about the interpretation of the Caprichos in an article entitled "La situación histórica del arte de Goya."

He points out first that perhaps Goya himself wasn't so very cultured, but that what he did know and feel came from his cultural and intelligent friends. And through their vitality, his spirit and work were made echoes of their dreams of happy progressiveness.

The eagerness for new things and for criticism which he always carried with him, at times violently, became apparent in the
most intimate works of Goya, especially in the drawings and etchings, as much in the collection of the Caprichos as in the plates of the disasters of war.  

And from this LaFuente Ferrari begins to comment on the ever-presence of reason, that is, the love of and faith in reason that permeates the plates. There are, he aptly points out, two possible interpretations to Goya's ideas on reason. The first is the far more fitting of the two for those times—that is, that we would believe the straightforward account of Goya's faith in reason and all the progressiveness and enlightenment that comes with it. But suppose we look at it another way. Is it not possible that reason becomes, in effect, the villain if we decide that the breakdown of all beliefs by reason, all the things taught by the church and the government for centuries, actually causes people to draw up age-old superstitions and fantasies, because the broken-down faith has left a vacuum? And such a breakdown, we know, makes life as impossible as living alone does, which Goya points out is an enema. The superstitions are, of course, expressed by the artist in the witches and goblins and monsters which appear throughout the plates.

Now, Goya himself would have never thought of this. He believed in and loved reason, and one of his

principal purposes in the plates was to make a mockery of archaic superstitions and to show that these foolish notions could easily be dispelled through the use of reason. But how fitting is this line of thought now, a time when solid religious notions are being seriously questioned not only by the people but by responsible individuals of the church as well! Says Ferrara:

This interpretation was hardly the one Goya would have given his own creations, but it becomes for us the most exact and profound meaning which could possibly be given to this informal and strange world, which Goya leaves at liberty when reason sleeps.86

Goya draws his goblins and witches so convincingly, and his knowledge of their ways is so obviously thorough, that unless we look closely it would be easy for us to decide that he himself believed in these things. After all, he was a peasant boy from a small town in the heart of Aragon, the province in Spain which is famous for being the heart of superstition. Ramón de Valle-Inclan wrote many, many plays in the beginning of this century about these people from Aragon and their strange ways. Aragon is to Spain, I suppose, what Transylvania was to Eastern Europe, and Goya was from the heart of the province. It certainly would have been very easy for him to have adopted the ancient beliefs and customs, but such was not the case. Careful examination of the plates makes it clear that the attack is on

superstition and the ruthless prosecutors of the Inquisition. Goya was not "in the witness box for the prosecution of witches" at all. He did not "serve those who mystified the people"; rather he fought against them, as Miško points out. There are several plates which make this very evident. Number 12—"A Caza de dientes"—shows a woman plucking the teeth from a hanged man. She is nauseated and covers her turned away face with a kerchief as she timidly yanks at his teeth with her other hand. The caption reads: "The teeth of a man who has been hung are indispensable for spell-binding. Without this ingredient, nothing succeeds. A pity that people believe such nonsense."

There isn't any obscured meaning here. Goya means exactly what he says, and the picture itself is just moving enough, or grotesque enough, to prove to us just how strongly he felt about this kind of thing.

The comment to plate #46, "Corección" ("Correction"), is a masterpiece of sarcasm. The drawing shows a rat-like old man holding court, it seems, for several other rather hideous old men and women. Hovering above are monkeys and bats and an old hag with wings. The comment reads: "Without correction and censorship, you won't progress at any faculty. At the faculty of the

---
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Black Arts: there is need of special talent, industry and application, mature age, subordination and obedience to the teachers of the great wizard that holds the seminary at Barahena."

"Lo que puede un sastre" ("What a Tailor Can Do"), plate number 52, is as clear an example as any of Goya's guiding thought. A woman kneels with her hands clasped at the foot of a fantastic looking figure, but which is actually no more than a cloak draped over a small tree, its arms spread by the branches. Behind the woman cowers a terrified, screaming child, and further back a crowd watches in fascinated horror. Horrid little creatures, the servants of the sorceress, are lightly sketched in hovering above. The commentary once again veils the meaning a bit, but not so much as to keep it from being instructive: "How often a ridiculous fellow changes into a fantastic creature, who is nothing really, and yet seems to be so much. That is what the tailor's art can do and the stupidity of those who judge things only by the outward appearance." And as if that weren't enough of an indictment the etching is placed in between two other plates, 89 #51, which shows some very complacent demons cutting each other's talons, and #53, which has a golden beaked parrot preaching to a group of attentive
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monks. "The artist's intention is unmistakable: he wishes to laugh the spectres out of court, to tear to shreds the web of superstition and lies."90

And, just as when we were talking about his personal attacks on certain individuals and customs, it is impossible for us here to refer to every plate which strikes at superstition and sorcery. There are certainly many others which do exactly that. The ones described here are merely the most obvious.

It is in keeping with the general character of the overall set that Goya attacks not only superstition and sorcery itself, but also the vile creatures who actually did exist because of a popular belief in witches and phantoms. These were, of course, the judges and exorcists who happened at that time to have an important, if despicable and very dishonest, social function. Goya attacks the Inquisition and the clergy by dressing his phantoms in monks' and priests' clothing; they wear cowls and cloaks and tiaras on their heads. How ludicrous do their rites and dogmas and rituals appear here in the Caprichos! Goya "ridiculed their witch hunts, expressed his contempt for their informers . . . documented the presence of all kinds of roguery of knavish, gluttonous, parasitical, lascivious gnomes and imps in monastic garb."91 The informers referred to here by Mićko are
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ridiculed especially savagely in plate #49, "Soplones" ("Spouters"). The etching shows a monkey-like creature with wings riding on a cat, blowing a gust of air at a couple of old men who hold their ears and wince. The comment is vicious: "Spouting monsters are the most repulsive of the whole devil's brood and the most stupid in that art. If they knew anything, they wouldn't take to spouting." In Spanish, the title contains a play on the word "soplón," which means "spouter" as the caption says, or "informer," and it clarifies what the picture clearly shows—that the monsters depicted are no more than lowly whisperers and informers, the worst of the devil's brood.

The Caprichos can be divided rather conveniently into two parts—just about at the middle. The dividing plate is number 43, "The Sleep of Reason Begets Monsters," which, as has been mentioned, was originally intended as the frontispiece to the whole set. In the first half, the artist sticks pretty much to the real world and to straight social criticism. It is here that we find most of the attack on the absurdities and vanities of life. It is in plate 6 that the whole world is a masquerade in which nobody knows anybody; or that we find (plate 13) some lascivious old men so greedy that they eat this porridge so hot that it burns them. The comment: "They are so greedy that they swallow their porridge hot. In enjoyment,
too, moderation and discrimination are needed." In the following plate we find a repetition of a theme found in one of the tapestry cartoons. A bride is unhappily wedding a hideous little groom. The caption is "Que Sacrificio!" ("What a Sacrifice!") and the comment makes it clear: "As is often the way, the bridegroom is not exactly the most attractive, but he is wealth, and at the price of the unhappy girl's freedom is bought support for the starving family. Such is the way of the world." As is the case with a lot of the themes repeated in the Caprichos from the tapestries, the difference is that in the earlier works there is an element of humor, and the tone is light and jovial. Clearly, the painting of the "Wedding Procession" in which the bride also must marry an ugly little man is done in a good-natured way and is intended as a cartoon, as a humorous remark. How different is this from the bitter etching of the Caprichos, in which we really feel the tremendous loss of the girl and her family! Further or (plates 20 and 21) we see prostitutes plucking their gentleman visitors, and then gentlemen of the court plucking the prostitutes. The comment here is particularly amusing: "And the chickens, too, have vultures that pluck them. For the saying goes: 'For every rogue—one and a half.'" In plate 25 a woman beats her son with a shoe. He has just broken a jug. Says Goya: "The boy is wild and the woman is choleric. Which is worse?" And so
on right up to plate 43. There isn't a human error or vice which escapes the master's criticism. It is an extremely interesting and witty set of drawings or etchings.

But starting with the "Dream of Reason" plate, there seems to be a radical change in the subject matter. From here on Goya reveals to us the real world of the dream of reason; that is, the irrational world--the world of demons and sorcery and witchery. As we saw, in the first half he was doing nothing more than a social criticism. The Celestina of the first part is transformed into an authentic witch.92 There is a certain fatalist attitude there. The only link between these and the second half of the Caprichos is the portrayal of humanized animals. These are very effective in the criticism, and just as importantly are a necessary step towards the radical change to the fantastic which takes place at plate 43.

The second half is like a dream, a nightmare. We pass from the real world to the dream world at the flick of a page. Back and forth from rationalism and realism to horror and superstition. Goya must have been tremendously involved upon his work at this point. He himself passes from the real to the illusionary--a contemporary Quixote, who is "tilting at windmills and battling with

92Fernández, p. 10.
actual monsters."\(^{93}\) We see them all, and we learn their habits and customs. They don't like long toenails, they ride brooms, they must obey and honor their superiors, and they take a rigorous oath upon becoming witches. They are scared of the daylight and they leave when it dawns.

In all but a few of these etchings Goya is fighting these monsters. The drawings and comments are very sarcastic; he feels compelled to alert the world to the inanity of belief in them. To do so he has presented us with a very real picture of what belief in the supernatural entailed, of the childlike mind of the Spanish peasant, who had not yet discarded the middle ages. It is miraculous that Goya, coming from Aragon as he did and not having had much formal education, escaped this superstitious world himself. In fact, he never did entirely escape. When his mind was weakened by illness these monsters, about which he had heard so much in his youth, were always there to haunt him, to parasitize him, to drive him crazy. It must have taken a supreme effort for him to reject them at all. And as he drew the Caprichos they were still with him. He didn't believe in them, but he knew of them and this knowledge enabled him to endow the Caprichos with the tremendous vitality and detail we find in them. Lord Derwent, in his short book entitled Goya, an Impression of Spain, makes an interesting comment along these lines. He says: "The
Caprichos . . . possess a unique quality; they are reality passed through the dying vats of nightmare, reality in the sense that they represent things seen or heard of, or born elsewhere in other imaginations; it is not the object represented that mystifies us, but its surroundings and the moral significance pinned to them by the painter."\(^9\)

Goya realized that if he could reject this hideous world of the devil, then others could; that with a faith in reason and a bit of common sense universal rejection could be attained. He saw the end of centuries of grotesque beliefs in the French and other European revolutions which based their foundations on rationalism. Says Mičko: "In his criticism of medieval survivals, Goya, in this cycle of etchings, shows himself to be a bold successor to Cervantes; the gloomily grotesque peasants of his satire toll the death knell of the old order."\(^5\)

Along these lines, a bit has been said about the modernity of the Caprichos, both stylistically and philosophically. We notice several interesting things about the style of the etchings right away. In the very first plates there is a predominance of small, broken lines; he is seeking to capture a bit of lace, a mantilla, or some embroidery. (See plate 7, "No la distingue," or plate 11, "Muchachos ol avío.") But even here he has already begun

\(^9\) Dorwent, p. 57.
\(^5\) Mičko, p. 27.
to develop another style, that of rapidly executed workmanship, which reaches a peak as the *Caprichos* progress. In this he achieves a remarkable effect of dark, gloomy tones, something which was made considerably easier when he adopted a technique of combining etchings and aquatint, a technique which had just recently been invented by the Frenchman Le Prince. Now he had complete control over a fine, very subtle scale of values, which became, rather than the line, his principal means of expression. By the end of the set he has become incredibly skillful with the technique, and the plates became more and more sophisticated and clear. Interestingly enough, the style becomes considerably simpler and more powerful with the change. This is remarkably evident in plate 39, "Las Rinde el Sueño," which shows a group of women prisoners in a gloomy dungeon, and which comes as close to being an abstract juxtaposition of dark and light shapes as anything which had been done to that time. The clarity of form which he maintains within this abstraction is amazing, to say the least. How different is this from plate 72, which is every bit as simple but so much lighter and more graceful. Here he uses a single contour line to define the shape, and we feel as if the girl is about to float away.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century there developed in Europe the possibility that caricature could
be considered a serious art. Hogarth ushered this in in England, and Daumier was the principal exponent in France fifty years later. It seems to me, though, that Frans Hals was doing something in some of his paintings which, if it couldn't actually be considered caricature as such, certainly bordered on it. Nevertheless, it was a fairly new idea at the time Goya was doing the Caprichos. Stylistically, he wasn't influenced at all by either Hogarth or Daumier (who, of course, couldn't have been an influence since he worked a half century later--France came into this late because she had been so strongly under the influence first of David and the Neo-Classicists and then Delacroix and the Romantics). What was important to him was the idea of caricature, that it could be good art, and we find it throughout the Caprichos. By 1795 caricature was very acceptable in the world of art. Malraux makes the point that it wasn't just an inspiration to Goya--it was, in fact, his raw material. Balzac's genius wasn't brought to light until the newspapers gave him the opportunity to satirize contemporary events through caricature. The same happened later on in Spain to the great satirical columnist Larra. And Goya's genius first becomes truly apparent when he caricatures Spanish society and customs in the Caprichos.

Once again, Goya starts with something and carries it to an extreme. At the outset of the set we have
straight caricature, but almost immediately things begin to happen. Slowly but steadily the figures become more grotesque, more perverse and perhaps more bitter. We begin to feel the full blunt of Goya's dissatisfaction in the two plates 20 and 21 ("Ya van desplumados," and "Qual la descañonan"), which depict the prostitutes and their masters and which we have already discussed. Certainly as we get into the second half of the set the creatures become totally fantastic. The artist has gone a step further, delving into his imagination for the most macabre forms he can conceive. Says Malraux: "Already the aggravation of life expressed in caricature was giving away to a deeper and more uneasy feeling. Often the borderline between the face and that which is taking its place is no longer discernible." As early as plate #2 we find this to be true. The young woman certainly wears a mask, but the old hag behind her is discerned from a true monster with difficulty, and she wears no mask.

The procession of masks is interesting. It brings us back to the contrast of reality and illusion which we were talking about earlier. In the beginning the masks are real and hide real features; at the end the features are more grotesque than any mask. This contrast between the rational and the irrational comes up constantly. It makes Goya a precursor of our times. According to

---
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Fernández, Goya refers himself back to life with this contrast, and thus creates a new expression—anti-traditional and, as such, revolutionary. He gives us an insight into new possibilities of penetration into reality. "Showing the power of imagination and of reality, he creates a formal language, out of the necessity of alluding to the newly discovered worlds." Several people have been successful in penetrating into reality by contrasting the rational and irrational since Goya: Gauguin, Fuseli, Munich, and Rousseau, but most important of all are Picasso and Orozco. Fernández points out significantly that one admits the limits of reason when he delves into the irrational, and that this irrationality is what gives a new sense to life, to art, and in general to reality. "This, which taken seriously is the great novelty, was what Goya predicted, and is the reason we can compare him to contemporary art." Goya's merit, he says, and in part I agree, is in having found the limits of reason, and, in a sense, of having found as well the limits of the irrational. It is the synthesis of these two which makes his art so great.

There is another dimension to this. Ferrari indicates that Goya's great contribution to the history
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of art was that he changed the concept of painting and drawing from the reconstruction in two dimensions of physical reality to "his impression evoked on the canvas." This, of course, we see already in the Caprichos. Most of these plates use fleeting impressions, illusionary, dream-like visions placed on the paper as quickly as possible. Painting all of a sudden became very subjective. Rembrandt and Velazquez had both experimented with this, but neither one ever really got away from his two dimensional reconstruction of reality. In Goya's art there is an important element of fugacity, of the temporal. This, of course, is a strong foundation for the concepts of impressionism.

And so the Caprichos are a great many things. They are social satire and criticism; they are the intensely personal expression of a very sensitive man; they are an indictment of all human folly and vice; a new style in art; an accurate reflection of a perturbed society; but most important, a solid forerunner of modern art. They are, along with Goya's later art, the brakes on the old and the fuel for the new. Ferrari sums them up very concisely in a passage which he means to relate to all of Goya's drawings, but which is particularly applicable here:

\[100\] Ferrari, p. 25.
drawings, which prove to us the subtlety of perception and analysis of this artist... He is an artist whom we ought to recognize with justice not only as the true precursor of modern art, but also the definer of a new mental attitude of man before the world, the artist who succeeds in expressing a new historical situation.  

* * *

We mentioned earlier that we would look closely at the frescoes in the little church of San Antonio de la Florida. This, perhaps, is as good a place as any to do this, for with these paintings we can follow through with this idea of Goya as a modern artist. I don't think the modernity of Goya's work is anywhere more clearly manifest than here, with the possible exception of the "black" Quinta del Sordo frescoes.

On June 13th of every year thousand of Madrileños go down to the banks of the Manzanares to welcome in the Spring. It is a traditional religious festival that has been going on for centuries, and is very popular with the people. On these same banks of the river is situated the beautiful little church of San Antonio de la Florida, and "On these festal occasions the doors of the church containing Goya's decorations stand open, and a spirit of pagan mirth, combined with local piety, a traditional homage paid by life to religion and art, reigns within
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There have actually been several churches on or near the spot where the present one stands. The present edition is the last in a long series of chapels which originally were solely for the use of the two excisemen who levied taxes on all goods brought in through the city gates. The particular gates that this chapel served are no longer in existence. The original San Antonio de la Florida was no more than a small shack which housed a rather humble shrine. It had been in existence since the sixteenth century when the Guardia Mayor, Don Francisco de Olmo, commissioned the architect Churriguera to tear it down and build a new one, which was completed in brick in 1732.  

Under Charles III Madrid underwent a great face-lifting. Among other things, the track from La Cuesta de San Vicente to the riverbanks was enlarged in order that it might be used by carriages, and to make room for this widening the Church of San Antonio was demolished in 1766. But Charles had no intention of destroying forever a monument which was beginning to be thought of as a tradition. He commissioned the Italian architect Francesco Sabatini

---
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103 Ibid., p. 14. This and the following brief account of the history of the church comes directly from Ferrari.
to build another. To this man Madrid owes thanks for a number of important edifices, including the famous Puerta de Alcalá which stood magnificently at the entrance to what was slowly becoming one of the foremost capitals of the world. The city has grown, but the great gate still stands, an imposing monument, guarding the entrance to Retiro on one side and to the very heart of the city, Cibeles and Sol, on the other.

Sabatini completed the new chapel in 1775, but it had a short life in spite of the fact that it was a beautiful building. Charles IV, who succeeded to the throne in 1788, had it torn down in order that he might improve the la Florida estate. For some reason he decided to build another, though, and in 1792 he issued orders for the purchase from the Hieronymite Order of "all the land needful for erecting on this site the new Chapel of San Antonio." The architect chosen was a man named Felipe Fontana, apparently a minor court artist about whom very little is known. It is certain, however, that he was the architect for the new church, and he did an excellent job. It is a charming little neo-classical chapel, of Greek cross design—in excellent taste, and a very harmonious whole. It is curious that more is not known of Fontana, and more curious still that we know of nothing else which was done entirely by this man.

—111—

---
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There is discrepancy as to the date of the ceremonial inauguration. The Count of Viñaza in "Goya, su tiempo, su vida, sus obras," says July first 1799; Ferrari is certain that it was July 11. In any case, it was about a year after Goya had completed his work on the frescoes. This, of course, is the church that still stands today—something which is rather miraculous in itself. Its history since 1800 is an interesting one, but here I think it is time to turn to the actual painting and how they came about.

There is no question whatsoever that the frescoes are by Goya. There are many documents attesting to this, and I don't believe anyone has ever questioned it. Jovellanos was minister of justice at this time, and it was probably he who secured the commission for Goya, who seems to have been in financial straits after his illness and long convalescence. He probably signed the commission sometime in June of 1799 and began work at the beginning of August. He worked fast, and it is assumed that it did not take him a great deal of time to complete the work; he was probably finished by the end of the year.

I mentioned that Goya borrowed from Tiepolo in these frescoes. In that all the figures are clustered around the edges, hanging over a balcony (wood here, marble in Tiepolo) and in that the center is the uncluttered sky soaring right on up to heaven, he did.
In everything else the frescoes are totally without precedent. The originality of these paintings cannot be overemphasized. In every respect—conception, execution and effect—they are a break with the past. He inverts the traditional Baroque and places the earthly beings on top of the angels and cherubs; he paints an earthly scene way up in the sky, departing completely from the idealized floating angels, nymphs and clouds and chariots. The composition—a great many people crowded into a small circle—was revolutionary, and of course the technical way in which he applied the paint—his brushwork—was, as we shall see, again totally new. He had been leading up to this type of thing in the Caprichos, but this is where Goya really comes into his own as a painter. Unfettered by dogmas and rules, by bosses such as Mengs and Bayeu (who shackled him so at Zaragoza), he has let himself go completely—to paint as he desired—to flick the paint on in broad areas—to simplify—to record his impressions—to play with color and design, and, most of all, to be rapid and spontaneous. He paints man in a new way. The Baroque idea was to make man perfect—to lift him above the human condition and all its defects and frailties. Goya becomes the foundation of all modern art as he rejects this idea—rather, he explores the soul of man (we see him starting to do this in the Caprichos).
without any attempt to sweeten his discoveries. In fact, he goes out of his way to point out the viciousness, the ugliness, and the diabolical. It is a pessimistic outlook in which man is a non-hero being made to look foolish by the gods of fate. That is why there is no glorification here in these figures. We are looking at real, identifiable people, most of whom are in pretty miserable condition.

These are among the most modernistic of all Goya's creations. So modern, in fact, that only through the tremendous boldness of the art of the twentieth century are we truly able to understand them. They were not unpopular in Goya's time, nor for the entire nineteenth century, but neither were they considered the masterpiece which they are thought of as being today. (There are still those who pass them off lightly: Hans Ruthe says that what Goya painted is not of a religious order but a sort of popular fiesta; and many nineteenth century critics were openly hostile to them.) But the reason for this is logical. The concept here was too bold for most nineteenth century artists, critics and historians. It remained for men of genius such as Degas and Manet to discover their real merit. Goya here is a remarkably direct forerunner of all modern art. As Ferrari says, these are "paintings whose complete originality and bold-
ness of conception were an amazing anticipation of an art undreamed of by his contemporaries." It is here, in San Antonio de la Florida, that we find the true beginning or modern art. These frescoes not only directly anticipate the Impressionists, but they have no precedent. Beruete points this out in his book *Goya, composiciones y figuritas*. "These compositions have no direct forerunners—a phenomenon all but unique in art." If ever there was a work of art which is the foundation of a new idea or concept, this is it. It took seventy-five years for people to catch on, but this is the starting point.

The frescoes in the Cupola are what concern us here. There is one scene, the miracle of St. Anthony raising a man from the dead. The story is that the monk’s father was accused of murdering this man and that the monk, later St. Anthony, brought the man back to life in front of the tribunal to ask him to tell the truth of the matter. Naturally, the father is exonerated. Notice that Goya has here abstracted all but the actual miracle. The scene is not in a courtroom, but outside, and there are no judges present. Goya seems concerned only with the miraculous act and its effect upon the witnesses, who are crowded behind the balustrade and recede into the picture space in well established planes. It is typical of Goya,

and striking too, that the figures represent all types of people, all social strata, all walks of life. Their individual reactions are a remarkable psychological study by the artist. Some are awed, some inspired, some frightened, some surprised, and quite a few are simply not interested. There is certainly no unity of action, nor of time, nor even of place. But there is a unity of technical, purely pictorial order, and this is what holds the composition together. Says Ferrari: "The unifying principle is rhythm, a uniform vibration of the picture surface, an all-pervading textural excitement produced by juxtaposed touches, broad streaks of color, and visible traces of each brushstroke."\(^{106}\) (How very like the effect produced by many Renoirs and Manets!)

Throughout we cannot help noticing the superb quality of Goya's brushstroke and how effective it is in producing an idea of volume.\(^{107}\) See in particular the resuscitated dead man. Color thoroughly subdues line, but the head is rendered with complete precision. This group centered around the monk is the most interesting of the whole composition. It has been suggested that the man with the cane dressed in yellow is the accused father,

\(^{106}\)Tbid., p. 27.

\(^{107}\)For all references to the paintings and illustrations, see Ferrari's book. This contains by far the best reproductions of the frescoes published to date.
because of his expression of grief, and that the man, also in yellow, behind the saint fleeing into the crowd is the real murderer, attempting to escape as the truth becomes known.

The eight figures around the corpse are the central group. They are part of and take part in the action. The rest of the people are spectators, each reacting differently to the scene; some, as I say, not reacting at all. The deftness and the sureness and the spontaneity with which they are painted is remarkable. The broad, quick brush-stroke is clearly apparent. Goya's spontaneous composing and masterful positioning of the figures, for instance the young boys playing on the balustrade, or the solitary standing figure just opposite the miracle scene, give the whole composition a life and vitality which is extraordinary. Just how far Goya carried this modernity can be clearly seen in the two heads which are barely visible behind the right shoulder of the man dressed in green and the left shoulder of the woman dressed in red and white with an awed expression. 108 Here, with just one or two strokes, the artist has given us a profile and a full face. It is more abstract than many of the most modern paintings. It is all the more remarkable in that as we look at it quickly we don't even feel there is a lack of detail. Or look at the close-up of the snaggle-toothed
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man on page 69 of Ferrari. What an incredible sureness and
deftness we find here! And so on around the circle. A
patch here, a stroke there, a highlight here, there a
shadow, and pretty soon we have a crowd of vital people,
teeming with life and emotion, with fears and joys and
sorrows. Pretty young women, innocent children, faithful
old men; the pious and the hypocrites, the rich and the
poor, the honest and the dishonest. They are all here,
in this pageant of humanity which the artist has placed
before us. Goya was painting as he felt--he is once again
at his most personal, all alone, high up on that scaf-
dolding with nothing to accompany him but his imagination,
and no one to tell him what not to do. In some of the
figures he goes as far as he ever did to show us the
wickedness of man. Talking of the vagabonds and beggars
throughout the composition, Ferrari says:

It is among these predatory types--spec-
tators plainly anxious not to betray their guilty
secrets and intentions--that we find some of the
boldest, most terrifying representations of the
human visage that even Goya ever made. In these
faces the paint is laid on in sudden, savage
strokes leaving the features undefined; they
call to mind the creations of Solana or Romualt
and equal, indeed outdo, the most audacious dis-
tortions of modern Expressionism.109

With all the action of painting and psychological
interplay, Goya has maintained, as we've said, a remarkable
unity. In these paintings, which are among the very best
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works in the whole Goya portfolio. The artist was working at a peak. There was nothing to interfere with him and, even more important, after his years of recuperation and idleness (official idleness, that is—he had, we remember, done all of the work on the Caprichos in the 1790's) he was anxious to do some big, important work, and he devoted a great deal of time to these frescoes in the little chapel. The genius of the work he produced is still not fully realized or understood. Let me conclude with the following quotation, perhaps a little melodramatic but appropriately taken from Ferrari's book on the chapel:

It is the unity of execution, of technique that makes the entire fresco throb with a uniform vibration throughout, despite abrupt, well-nigh savage brushstrokes, despite splashes of color bold to the point of crudeness and distortions verging on sheer caricature. These are what create that atmosphere of feverish animation which reigns in the cupola, and that strongly emoteda polyphony of forms and colors in which certain notes, taken by themselves, mean nothing, but in combination build up a fugue woven in threads of independent melody and rich in tempestuous sonorities scored for full orchestra by a master hand.\(^\text{110}\)

And this brings us to the nineteenth century. Unfortunately I will not be able to consider this in as much detail as I would have liked. The following is not much more than a sketch. Further work will have to wait until later.

\* \* \*

\(^{110}\)Ibid., p. 25.
The history of Spain from 1798 to 1814 is really an extension of the history of France. From the very first moment in which it occurred to Napoleon to make Spain subservient to France (at one point he even considered annexing it and making it sort of a nearby colony) the histories of the two nations are inextricably intertwined. The turn of events in Spain is such a ludicrous and at the same time sad collection of mistakes that at times it is difficult for us to even believe some of the stories. It is a true life tragi-comedy that profoundly influenced the following one hundred years of history, not only in Spain but in France as well. The end result is that the Spaniards acquired a tremendous sense of national pride and purpose, something which had been missing since the end of the sixteenth century with the death of Philip II (and also something which caused them a great deal of trouble for the remainder of the century). As a further result, Napoleon lost everything. He had not counted on anything like the resistance he received from his neighbor to the south, and his attempt to fight a war on two fronts (the fact that he had to fight a full scale war in Spain was a great surprise to him) was his final undoing. Such important developments could not fail to influence to a large extent the work of a sensitive and profoundly patriotic artist, and this, of course, is exactly the case with Goya. To see what
happened, though, we must look a little more closely at exactly what was going on in Spain during that first decade of the century.

During the years leading up to 1798, Godoy, "The Prince of Peace," was falling more and more into disfavor with the populace. He had been in one mess after another, particularly the war with France from which, ironically enough, he emerged unscathed and with the above title. But the disfavor grew so strong that it actually became threatening, and in March of that year he was dismissed, being replaced as minister by the liberal Jovellanos, who was also, as a matter of fact, Goya's closest friend.

Madrid went mad with joy. However, there really wasn't much to rejoice about. First of all, the new secretary of state was Francisco Saavedra, another liberal but rather a weak man, who took warning from Godoy's downfall and immediately became the obsequious servant of the French. And secondly, Godoy lost none of his influence, and continued to assert himself in national affairs as potently as ever in an unofficial capacity.

Godoy himself was totally blind to Napoleon's intentions. England, Austria, Russia and Italy all formed an alliance against the French; Spain, under Charles IV (as weak a monarch as there ever was) and at the prompting of Godoy, sided with the French. The reasoning of the Queen's favorite was that Napoleon was
going to place either Charles himself or his son Ferdinand on the throne of France. And thus through sheer stupidity and pure weakness, the Spanish King found himself on the wrong side. Martin Hume puts it very well: "Charles, blind to the interests of his country and his order, clung—

with increasing servility to those whose very existence was a negation of the right of kings to rule."

Godoy was the power behind the throne, but the power behind Godoy was the Queen of Spain, María Luisa. Here we have a cold, austere, ugly woman. Full of lust, she must have been just as she appeared in Goya's remarkable portraits of her, as domineering a female as there ever was. She cared nothing of the continual gossip about her which entertained all of Madrid, most of which was true. She had many lovers, but her favorite was Godoy, as we saw early in the discussion of the Caprichos. Nothing was too good for him. He accumulated titles and wealth faster than he could count them. He was secretary to the Queen, general superintendent of roads and postal services, president of the Royal Academy, the Natural History Cabinet, the Botanical Garden, the Chemical Laboratory and the Astronomical Observatory, not to mention Grand Cross of the four military orders and prime minister of Spain, a post which, as we saw, he lost in

1798 but regained not long afterwards. His fortune at the time of his fall in 1805 was estimated at forty million reales.¹¹²

1801 was a bad year. Spain had antagonized every country in Europe, and was now officially allied with France. Napoleon had Godoy placed at the head of the Spanish army and told him to conquer Portugal, that he would receive all the French help he needed. Godoy agreed and did just that. But the Emperor had no real interest in Portugal, only in getting as many French troops into Spain as possible. Only a few Spaniards were farsighted enough to realize before it was too late that the presence of French troops on their soil could only be a bad thing. The most ironic part of this is that the real liberals, the enlightened men such as Goya and Jovellanos and Moratín and other intellectuals who truly had Spain's best interests at heart were among the last to realize the French danger. The reason for this is that they believed in the ideals propounded by the French Revolution and desired an influx of these ideals into Spain. In fact, many of them actively encouraged French intervention. The people who thought all this were labeled Afrancesados and were generally despised by most Spaniards. Goya was such a man, and it was for this that many of his earlier biographers found it easy to consider him an

¹¹²Klingender, p. 70.
unpatriotic, weak man. Close examination of any work done after 1808, particularly the "Desastres de la Guerra", shows that this is as far from the truth as it is possible to get. Goya was an intensely patriotic man. His point of view, as is the case with all the Afrancesados, was naive and idealistic. But he understood the depravity of the Spanish crown and the cruelty and narrow-mindedness of the government. He was totally opposed to the oppression of a whole people and all their rights to some kind of freedom. The French had successfully revolted against just this kind of rule; they had in theory established a system of government by which all the rights of the individual were respected. It was naive to think that this would be transferred to Spain through Napoleon's troops, but nevertheless it was at least considering the best interests of Spain.

Goya's feelings are perhaps best summed up for us by Pierre Gassiere in the following quotation. This helps us not only to understand the feelings of the artist, but of all men of progressive ideas.

He \\textit{Goya} hated Napoleon's soldiery for the havoc it wrought in Spain, but he also felt an immense contempt for the idle, bigoted, parasitic monks and priests who paralyzed his country and drained its life-blood. A Frenchman on the Spanish throne was an unbearable affront to the Spanish in him, but the despotic, petty-minded absolutism of Ferdinand VII was no less galling. What Goya, like so many Spaniards, yearned for was a liberal government of honest,
responsible patriots capable of carrying out needful reforms, while he looked to France not for an invasion by arms, but for an invigorating flow of new ideas.\textsuperscript{113}

The Afrancesados, labeled traitors by their fellow countrymen, were, in fact, the most patriotic Spaniards of all.

Godoy became overconfident after his victory over the Portuguese, and he suggested that Napoleon remove the French troops from Spanish territory. Nothing could have annoyed the Emperor more, and it was at this moment that he decided to take Spain and dominate her completely, by whatever means he could. This was towards the end of 1801.

At the same time Ferdinand, "Prince of the Asturias" and heir to the throne, married Princess María Antonia of Naples. This seemingly insignificant event was really rather important to the history of Spain. In the first place, Ferdinand had never gotten along with his mother very well, and he despised Godoy. This new young princess seems to have felt the same way, and she became the first person to openly denounce the Queen for her adulterous relationships. The longer she remained in Madrid, the more relentless was she in her attack, and, of course, she was in an untouchable position, for who would consider harming the wife of the heir to the throne, the beloved Ferdinand? Not only did she disturb things at the court
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in this manner, but also she added tremendously to the fiery hatred for the couple which burned within the young Prince. In the second place, she was a Neapolitan, and as such she hated the French, a passion which she also sparked and flamed within her husband. These things made a lasting impression on Ferdinand, and remained with him long after the untimely death of the Princess in 1806.

The Spanish crown was far too naive to see what was going on. But Napoleon wasn't, and he did everything he could to fan the hatred within Ferdinand, to widen the gap between him and his parents. Napoleon, in fact, was also opposed to the marriage, but he chose to use it for his own ends rather than to openly object to it. He had now decided that unless he became master of Spain as thoroughly as he was master of France, he would not succeed in his far-reaching plans. 114

Meanwhile, both countries were having trouble with the English. The dealings here are so intertwined and complicated that I won't go into them in detail. Suffice it to say that France, of course was at continual war with Britain, and that Spain was at war with her only now and then. The trouble was, though, that during those times that Spain and England were at relative peace Napoleon threatened Spain with such devastation that Spain could do nothing but yield to the French demands and consider

114: Hume, p. 62.
England her enemy. For instance, in 1803 Spain and England were at such peace through the Treaty of Amiens that they were actually trading, and in fact Spain was in a period of relative prosperity. The people were happy; they hated the French and were basking in this warm peace. Napoleon was so furious that he threatened Spain with a French army which would sweep across everything in sight if Godoy were not removed and something done about the situation with England. The tragedy of it all is that Napoleon won; in October of 1803 the Spanish signed the Treaty of Paris, by which Spain bought her neutrality for six million francs a month and a series of humiliating commercial concessions.

1803 was the year in which Godoy finally realized that the French intentions in Iberia were anything but brotherly, and it was a rather interesting deal which proved it to him. In October of 1800 the Spanish had ceded Louisiana to France through the Treaty of Ildefonso, with the provision that France would never transfer the colony to any country other than Spain. Of course this wasn't the way it worked out, and when in the summer of 1803 Louisiana was sold to the United States by Napoleon in order to raise money for his war with England, Spain protested more vigorously than she ever had to the French. Now everything was out in the open; it was clear that the Emperor had no intention of using Spain for anything but his own ends.
It was a delicate situation for a man like Goya. He and the other liberal intellectuals still clung to the belief that anything (particularly something with the enlightened background of France) would be better than María Louisa and Godoy—or than Ferdinand. The people as a whole hated the French with a passion which only a Spaniard can know, and had set up the young Prince of Asturias as their savior, their new idol. With the possible exception of Germany in the 1930's, never has a nation been more wrong about the person they wanted for a ruler. Of course they were going to have him eventually whether they liked it or not, but the fact is, they loved him. The intellectuals, the Afrancesados, on the other hand, thought no more of him than they did of the Queen and her favorite. And the King was scared of him, a fear instilled by Godoy, who understood the tremendous popularity that was behind Ferdinand, and that if he weren't careful it wouldn't be long before this young man who hated him so would be ruling the country.

And so we can see that the situation was pretty muddled in those first few years of the century. France was becoming a true menace, England represented a real problem, and the two nations were constantly bickering; the government consisted of a triumvirate of the most incompetent, weak-minded, selfish people imaginable (as
inefficient a government as any country ever had), and the social system was growing steadily worse. Poverty and misery ran rampant. The church and the nobility squeezed the masses for everything they could in a country whose morality and pride had reached a nadir. It is no wonder that Napoleon felt he could master the Peninsula in a matter of months. Nor is it a surprise that a few enlightened individuals were willing to accept the presence of the French in the hopes of some progressive change.

But things got worse, and tension grew. In 1804 Spain and England were finally in outright war, a war which the former simply could not afford financially. In 1805 the entire Spanish Navy was demolished by Nelson at Trafalgar, more through rank incompetence and French stupidity than anything else. The hatred of the Spanish people for the French and for Godoy increased daily. With each treacherous deal made by the Queen and "El Choricero" to save their own personal positions, Godoy came closer and closer to his downfall. The Spanish people could not tolerate much more.

By the end of 1804 the French had a large army thoroughly planted in Spain. All pretense of friendship was dropped, and there were now and then outbreaks of violence. In March of 1808 the French force was numbered
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at one hundred thousand troops. Clearly something very disastrous was going to happen quite soon.

In that same month the people finally erupted against Godoy. They stormed his palace in the little town of Aranjuez just south of Madrid, but the favorite escaped by rolling himself up in a rug. Two and a half days later, on the 19th of March, he emerged from his hiding place, half dead of thirst. He was captured by a guard, who would not accept a bribe, and turned over to the people. It seemed as if it was all over for him when Ferdinand, who was in complete control of the mob, intervened. A deal was made, and Charles IV abdicated in favor of his son in return for Godoy's release. A shout of joy was heard all over Spain. "El Choricero" was out; the beloved Ferdinand was the new king.

For the first few weeks it looked as if things were going to go a little better. Liberal intellectuals were installed into power and several progressive measures were passed. But this was only surface regalia. The treacherous and cowardly Ferdinand had already placed himself in the hands of Napoleon through a letter. The French situation grew worse. Riots in several cities were quelled by French troops.

Napoleon connived, and he actually got both the old King and Queen and Ferdinand to meet together in
Bayonne in late April. Through a series of maneuvers which are too involved to go into here but which played on the stupidity of the old monarchs and the cowardliness of the younger one, he managed to get Ferdinand to give the throne back to his father; the father's part in the deal was that he would subsequently relinquish the throne to Napoleon's brother Joseph, who was at that time King of Naples.

During this conniving an event took place in Madrid which was to change not only the history of Spain, but of all Europe, and subsequently the whole world. It was certainly the most important single event since the Parisian mob stormed the Bastille, and possibly was as important as anything which happened in Europe throughout the nineteenth century.

Madrid was seething. The city was pretty much under the control of the French general Murat, who kept order because of the large number of troops he commanded there. Their presence did nothing to subdue the growing hatred of the Spaniards. The citizens were becoming restless, and were much disturbed by the absence of the Spanish royalty from the Palace. The minor members of the family left behind included the King's brother, Don Antonio, the Queen of Etruria and her children, and the Prince, Francisco de Paula, who was the Queen's youngest son, the bastard of Godoy, and very much a favorite of
the people. On the first of May a rumor circulated throughout the city that Murat was sending even these people off to Bayonne, thus in effect expelling the entire family from the country. The next morning a large crowd gathered outside the Royal Palace to watch the family board the coaches and be on their way. It was noticed that the young boy, Prince Francisco, decidedly did not want to go and was crying, and the crowd realized that he was going no matter what his desires may have been, that he was being forced. It is said that an old woman cried out, "God help us! They are taking all our royalty to France!" and that with this the mob exploded. It surged forward, tore apart the coaches, and seriously threatened the lives of Murat and his aides, who were barely saved by the quick intervention of the Walloon bodyguard. At this point a French patrol arrived upon the scene and opened fire into the crowd, killing many. Word of this spread rapidly throughout the city, and it was like taking the lid off a volcano. Ten years of suppression, and misery, and poverty, and above all hatred were released in seconds. The result was a tidal wave of violence that spread like wildfire. The people surged out into the streets with knives, forks, clubs, scissors or anything they could get their hands on for weapons. The most violent part of the fighting was in the very center of the city, from the Royal Palace across to the Puerta del Sol, which is the
very heart of Madrid. Whether or not Goya was living here at the time is not definite, although most people seem to think he was. It makes no difference. He certainly witnessed a great deal of the slaughter (for it was a slaughter) and it made as lasting an impression on him as anything he ever saw in his whole life. Hundreds of Madrileños lost their lives, and the whole thing only lasted a day. A totally unarmed and unorganized people had risen against a powerful army. It was one of the most heroic single acts of war in history. It spurred communities and villages all over Spain to revolt, to cast off the shackles of foreign intervention, and it sparked a desperate war which lasted six years and which ended in the total destruction of Napoleon. But it became more than a war against the French. It became a revolution of itself. It was the Spanish peasant expressing himself for the first time in his history, freeing himself from the medieval bonds which he had willfully accepted for so long. The longer the war lasted the more passionate and brutal it became. There could, of course, be no other kind of war involving Spaniards, and we shall see this a bit further on.

There were immediate reprisals for the Madrid uprising. Hundreds and hundreds of people were taken just outside the city to the Casa de Campo and shot. (Today families go and picnic there on sunny Sunday afternoons.)
Citizens were tied together in pairs and executed without trial. Anyone found carrying a knife or a pair of scissors or anything at all suspicious was shot on the spot. It was a particularly brutal revenge, taken by a man who realized the power of hatred and who thought the only way he could maintain control was to instill so much fear into the people that they would dare not do anything more. Murat misjudged the Spaniards, exactly as did Napoleon. Neither of them foresaw a peninsular war, and both, particularly the latter, were very annoyed at the thought of a full scale struggle in Spain. It is interesting to ponder over how long it took Napoleon's annoyance to turn to fear.

As if the events of the 2nd and 3rd of May weren't enough by themselves, Goya immortalized them on canvas in two of his most memorable paintings. "The 2nd of May, 1808" represents the actual surge of the masses against the Mamelukes of the French cavalry. It is a new concept in picture making. Everything becomes subservient to the swirling action. It is a tumultuous scene, full of color and movement. Form is totally disregarded. The overall whole is what is important. Within it, bodies, weapons, and animals are presented as integral parts. We feel trapped within the picture. It appears as a chaotic mass, and thus the desperate emotion of the event is successfully
imparted to us. We even feel the passion and utter frustration of the outmanned and badly organized but determined peasants. And within the chaos there is a remarkable clarity—notice the buildings in the background and the individual bodies—which gives the picture a stability. The fury of the event is also caught up in the bold, slashing brushwork and a fiery quickness of hand.

Gassier points out that "The weird impasto of colors might have been strewn over the canvas by a man beside himself with rage. Slashed with tints chosen for their violence and nothing else, horses and men are unlike anything on earth. The brushwork is so furious as to bring out the bare essentials and make the picture as a whole strike like a whiplash on our nerves." The tremendous power of the painting is truly overwhelming. We need only be in the same room with it and there can be no doubt that Goya was an eyewitness to the events. It is not the kind of picture which can be done from secondhand accounts.

The corresponding painting, "The Third of May, 1808," is even more successful. Goya reaches a peak
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117 The full title is "The Third of May, 1808, at Madrid: the Shootings on Principe Pio Mountain." The power of this painting cannot be understood without looking at the original. One of the most remarkable experiences I ever had was walking for the first time into the room of the Prado where this painting hangs and being struck by the full, monumental force of the painting. I was transfixed and could not remove my eyes from it. This, I noticed, was the reaction of most who were seeing it for the first time. It was an unforgettable experience.
here, and if it isn't his best work it is undoubtedly his most famous. There is a legend that just after the shootings he and his servant wandered through the heaps of dead bodies while he made sketches. This macabre story has no truth to it, but the painting certainly could not have been done by someone who was not very emotionally involved with the uprising and the killings, nor by a man who didn't witness many of the events at first hand.

It is a truly horrible scene. On the left are the already dead and those on the verge of being shot. Goya has chosen the most terrible moment of all—the instant before the volley is fired, the split second when tensions are at their highest. The bodies on the ground are riddled with bullet holes and spill quantities of blood all over. The group awaiting the volley is a monumental psychological study. One man cowers, hiding his face behind his hands; another gestures angrily with his fist; and a third glares defiantly at his executioners. The central figure flings his arms skyward, assuming a Christ-like posture which recurs frequently in Goya's work, in a gesture which could be either despair or defiance. The group is brightly illuminated by a lantern whose light creates an eerie, Baroque effect. On the right is the solid wall of French soldiers, feet wide apart and set in a determined stance, straight backs leading into anonymous faces. The steel barrels of their
rifles flash menacingly. It turns into a universal event. Goya here not only condemns the French for their brutality, but the viciousness of all executions everywhere. Much more than the companion piece, it is a condemnation of the horror of all war and all violence. Says Gassiere: "Together with the etchings of the Disasters of War which we shall discuss presently... this is the most scathing indictment of man's cruelty to man that an artist has ever produced."\(^\text{118}\)

The emotion is further enhanced by the group of people in the background awaiting their own turns to die. They cannot look at their doomed compatriots, and the fear among them is a physical thing. A greater, more compelling tragedy we cannot imagine.

Goya could not have made the picture more dramatic. The stark lighting, the bold, powerful figures and composition, and the horror of the event are still further intensified by the varied tonality. Again, more than in the "Napoleonic" painting Goya here slashed the paint on to the canvas with a fiery quickness. The blood is only smeared on, and some of the faces are merely sketched in, much as he had done years earlier in the Chapel of San Antonio. It is as powerful and spontaneous a picture as we can imagine.

Actually, the paintings were done six years after the events. In February, 1814, partly I think because he
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was still in trouble with the Spanish authorities for his early French sympathies, Goya proposed to the regency counsel "to commemorate with my brush the exploits, the most remarkable and heroic episodes of our glorious insurrection against the tyrant of Europe." It was to be a large project, but these were the only paintings completed. They are enough--the execution scene alone would be enough. There is no question that this is as dramatic an historical painting as has ever been made. How deeply affected Goya must have been by these events to have recorded them so vividly so long afterwards!

One final point that ought to be made about these events is that they re-awakened within Goya a vital concern for the Spanish peasant. This is something which had not been terribly important in his art since he finished the Tapestry Cartoons, but which in around 1810 reappears for good. The mood is different. The peasant is portrayed in total realism, not as an idealized, romantic figure. There is no gaiety or frivolity in his paintings of the second decade--the lower class is presented just as it existed. What there is, though, is a monumental compassion on the part of the artist--a compassion which he had always felt, but which was sparked to action by the heroics of the war with France and was maintained by the tremendous injustices done to these people by Ferdinand VII from the very beginning of his reign in 1813. The dignity
of the young woman in "The Water Seller" (1810) and the young man in "The Knife Grinder" (1810), or the vitality of the blacksmith in "The Forge" (1815), and the gentle passion of one of Goya's very last works, "The Milkmaid of Bordeaux," are all outgrowths of this new compassion the artist felt for the peasant.

But we are ahead of ourselves. Let's look for a moment and see what Goya was producing between 1800 and around 1810 when he started work on the etchings for the "Disasters of War" series.

By the turn of the century Goya had reached the peak of his official career. In July of 1800 he painted the famous group portrait of the royal family, in which he takes a vicious swipe at the whole Bourbon dynasty and clearly shows the moral decay which was running rampant throughout Spain's royalty. In this painting there is a bourgeois feeling (we might be looking at the butcher and his family dressed in their Sunday best posing for a photograph), not because Goya wanted to be sarcastic but because the family itself was simply bourgeois. Not physically, of course, but nothing they did was consistent with the noble heritage of royalty throughout Europe. It was, in fact, as miserable a conglomeration of royal personages as has ever been assembled in one country, and Goya portrays them here exactly as they were.
This was the artist's last official portrait, not because the family was insulted by it (they were too stupid to see the affront and were, in fact, flattered and dazzled by the bright regalia) but for several rather different reasons, none of which are too certain. Perhaps because the Caprichos had been too much, or because the Duchess of Alba had died and Goya was more affected than we might think, but most probably because of the new appointment of Vicente López as court painter in 1803 and the incarceration of Jovellanos in 1802. Nevertheless, Goya continued to receive his full salary, and he was from that time on free to paint as he pleased.

He did a great many portraits in those first years, most of which are not of outstanding quality. Exceptions are the portrait of the Count Fernán Nuñez (1803) and particularly the portrait of the actor Don Isidro Maíquez.

The Spanish theater experienced a tremendous burst of success in the first decade of the century, partly because of the sainetes of Ramón de la Cruz, but mostly due to the genius of Isidro Maíquez. This man was possibly the greatest Spanish actor of all time, and he reached his peak during this period in fiercely patriotic roles. After the uprising of May 1808 many theaters began staging some very nationalistic, patriotic plays with titles such as "Aragón Restored by the Valour of her Sons," "The
Patriots of Aragón," and "The Bombardment of Saragossa," and it was through this type of play that Maíquez became so popular. Naturally, he was the champion of the people, and all Spaniards held him up as a hero. His performances were wild and very expressive. He participated as well in classical theater, two of his most famous roles being Macbeth and particularly Arnault's Oscar. He has been likened in style to Goya, and according to what we know of him Maíquez' interpretation of Oscar "must have been as profoundly disturbing as Goya's most wildly expressionistic pictures of robbery, rape, and murder." 119

The painting is dated 1807, and it begins a series of very dynamic portraits which, in my opinion, are the very best among the artist's works. It is alive and vivid. There is a palpable, fleshy feeling which the artist had not achieved earlier. The color is subdued and somber, completely sacrificed to movement. Great locks of hair tumble across the actor's forehead. The beard is full and unkempt, and the very black eyes gaze out at us with intent and determination. The sensitivity and intelligence of the man are conveyed with warm sympathy. Swirling powerful brushstrokes are used in the cravat and coat. But stability is maintained by the solid, almost too triangular composition. It is in the final analysis a bold, striking portrait of a man Goya
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obviously admired very much.

Most of the portraits actually came a little before this, in the years 1805 and 1806. They are so numerous that I won't even begin to list them here. As I say, they are good, but few measure up to the quality of the portrait of the actor Maíquez.

The portraits were done for commission in order to keep the money coming in. But because Goya was still receiving his salary from the King, but not actually working for him, he had plenty of time to paint for himself, and he branched out in all directions.

Contemporary events were also much in Goya's mind. One of the most interesting works of this time is the series of wood panels depicting the capture of the bandit Maragato by Fray Pedro de Zaldivia, which was one of the most talked about events of 1806. It had a charming, even romantic appeal which Goya could not resist, and it especially delighted the Spanish people, as do all events which involve individual courage.

El Maragato was a particularly savage individual, who as the leader of a band of outlaws ravaged the fertile vineyard district of Oropesa for several years at the beginning of the century. The story goes that on the 10th of July of 1806 the bandit accosted Brother Pedro de Zaldivia, demanding all he had. The Brother offered his
slippers, but to no avail. Other monks came to his assistance, but they were engaged by Maragato's men. A full scale battle ensued, during which the brave Zaldivia succeeded in disarming Maragato of his rifle, and in fact wounded him. The bandit allowed himself to be captured, and the vineyard area was spared further worry.

It was an appealing event, and Goya's paintings are no less charming. The panels are small, and they concentrate on the main act. There is the first confrontation, the struggle, the ensuing disarming, the shot, and the final surrender. The monks and bandits appear in only two of the six panels, the courage of the humble Brother being what particularly interested Goya. They are very quickly done, lightly treated, but important because they demonstrate clearly the imaginative realism of the artist, and they give us an interesting insight into the everyday lives of the Spanish peasants.

In a completely different vein, Goya painted at this time his famous "Nude and Clothed Majas." The exact date is unknown, but it must have been around 1804. More legends center around these two paintings than any other aspect of Goya's entire career. The most famous is that the woman is the Duchess of Alba, that her husband the Duke heard Goya was doing a picture of his wife with no clothes on, and that he rushed to the studio to accost the artist. Meanwhile Goya heard he was coming and
quickly painted another picture of the Duchess with her clothes on; thus the sketchy, quick quality of the "Clothed Maja." Not only is the story itself not true, but the woman represented is simply not the Duchess of Alba. She resembles her in no way; this girl is about twenty; the Duchess would have been about forty. If the picture was done in 1804, the Duchess was dead. Here we have the cute, prettiness of the Spanish peasant, not the regal beauty of Spanish nobility, particularly of Alba herself.

But the pictures are among Goya's most famous, and are actually quite important to the history of painting. This was only the second nude in the entire history of Spanish art, and it is in no way similar to the first, the idealized, beautiful "Venus of the Mirror" by Velazquez. Heavy and realistic, it is imbued with an overwhelming, sensuous, palpable quality. There is little modelling, but the way in which the paint is applied makes the girl compact and solid. She is a stunning, imposing figure, as much for her realism as for her nudity. The picture is a landmark in the realm of nude painting and set the stage for such paintings as Manet's "Olympia," which is quite similar in many ways and perhaps even more pleasing aesthetically, for Goya's picture borders on bad taste so palpably real is the body. It is hard to tell whether the girl is nude or undressed. The ironic thing is that for sheer sensuality and sexuality, the "Clothed Maja" goes
even further than her companion. Here a delightfully coquettish young lady sprawls out on a sofa in the exact same position as the nude maja with her arms behind her head and stares out at the viewer with a gleam in her eye, offering her body to whomever might care to partake. Her mouth turns up just a little as she smiles invitingly. How different is this from the satisfied, almost complacent look of the nude! She wears no clothes, but she is considerably more modest than the clothed maja; who, in fact, is really rather shameless. It is a fascinating psychological study, without precedent or sequel in the history of art, for, as Antonia Valentín points out, Goya has here presented us the before and after of the act of love.\textsuperscript{120}

There are a few other examples of works Goya produced for his own personal satisfaction, but, as I say, most of what the artist did during the first eight years of the century was portraiture. There are so many, in fact, that it is easy to believe that perhaps the tremendous effort of the \textit{Caprichos} and San Antonio de la Florida had used up all of Goya's imagination, that they had drained him both emotionally and intellectually, particularly since only relatively few of the portraits are true masterpieces (although every last one is, of course, of much better than average quality). To think this, though,
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would be to totally disregard the hundreds of drawings which are now in the Prado Museum and which were also done at about this time. In these Goya is as expressive, as imaginative, and as original as ever, and particularly attuned to the times. There are far too many of these to go into detail about them here, but it should be mentioned that it is this aspect of Goya's work, I think, which had the greatest influence on Daumier, for his political and social cartoons are exactly the kind of thing we find in these drawings by the Spaniard. Pierre Gassiere makes a very good point about all this. He says:

The fruit of Goya's serene maturity, all these portraits might have led people to believe that the vein of inspiration which had sprung the Caprichos and so many genre scenes had dried up altogether. Such was by no means the case, and it is a point worth stressing that Goya's deepest vision of men and things is to be found precisely in the many drawings of this period. Lightly drawn for the most part in India ink with the tip of the brush, all have a sureness and simplicity of design worthy of Rembrandt. The note they strike is not so much that of caricature as of realism, now grotesque, now compassionate, driven home with a crisp caption even more effectively—if that is possible—than in the Caprichos. 121

All this is very true. There is a remarkable frankness and certainty of vision in these drawings. Nowhere was Goya more devastating in his attacks on the injustices of the social system, nowhere more compassionate in his concern for the people. It is unfortunate that this work is not
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adequately reproduced anywhere, for how apparent is all this when we look at the magnificent collection of these drawings in the Prado. And it is worthy of note that the realism of these drawings is perfectly consistent with the overall feeling that pervades these years, and moreover that they are a direct forerunner of the things to come in Goya's art due to the Peninsula war, particularly the "Disasters of War."

What the drawings, or any other of Goya's work for that matter, don't have prior to the war is what Gassiere calls a "tragic sense of life." Goya had not yet been deeply enough moved by events to instill this into his art. "Caricature and satire, shrewd insight into men and things, an occasional revelation of human suffering, yes--but as yet neither anguish nor hallucination." It took the terrible tragedy of the war with the French to spur Goya on to works with a true tragic sense, and nowhere is this more evident than in the "Disasters of War" etchings.

To describe in detail the terrible tragedies of the war with the French wouldn't be appropriate here, for it is done so unforgottably in Goya's etchings. Briefly, though, it was a furious, dirty, passionate struggle. People all over Spain were swept up in a wave of emotion and moved to things they'd never been moved before. The hatred

---
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for the invader grew daily. Every offensive act of the French was countered by some barbarous cruelty on the part of the Spaniards, who had formed themselves into unorganized guerilla parties and roamed the hills and the countryside like a band of mounadens. There was a romantic flavor to it, which increased the passions. The separate groups were totally independent, but all were united in their desire to expel the French. Like a gigantic snowball growing bigger and bigger as it tumbles down the slope, the war grew more and more vicious, more ferocious. Unthinkable atrocities by the Spaniards were countered with even more devastating reprisals by the French. Whole towns and villages were totally wiped out, women and children left raped and slaughtered. And of course each time this kind of thing occurred, the Spanish were once again moved to new heights of barbarity. No one had counted on the monumental tenacity of the resistance, and the war dragged on like this for years.

The ferocity of the rural war was matched or surpassed in horror by the bitter sieges of some of the big cities. Again the stubbornness and tenacity of the Spaniards was a true monument to the heroism of a remarkable people. For sixty-four days the people of Saragossa withstood the French onslaught, and then resisted for fourteen more days by fighting from every house. The French commander, Lannes, wrote to Napoleon, "Never before, Sire,
have I witnessed such stubborn resistance as that put up by our enemies in defence of this town. I have seen women allowing themselves to be killed in front of a breach. We have to lay siege to every house."

There is no telling how long the citizens could have held out had it not been for the plague. When the fighting had stopped on the 20th of February, 1809, 54,000 Spaniards were dead. Over half had died of the plague. The French were appalled to find thousands of bodies rotting in the streets; and of the remaining citizens only a third were able to bear arms.

This was a particularly heroic defense, but not unusual. All over Spain the soldiers of the Emperor were encountering this type of stubborn resistance. For four years they could gain no significant foothold, although they had made some advances in the east. But in 1812 the English general, Wellington, consolidated the Spanish forces in a manner which at least approached organization, and a few victories were forthcoming for the Spanish. The disastrous Russian campaign in 1812 made it impossible for Napoleon to conduct a war on two fronts, and in 1813 the enemy was convincingly expelled from the country. It was the end of one of the most heroic wars any nation has ever fought anywhere. With nothing but courage and passion, the Spanish had held off the greatest army the world had ever known.
The most important aspect of this war is the social one. It is impossible to understand it if it is thought of merely as a war for national independence, for as soon as it started it took on an added, far more significant aspect, and that is it became a true social revolution. With no leaders, the Spanish were free to emancipate themselves. They had to elect new officials, make new laws. Every step required for the needs of war was, by the very nature of the old Spanish rule, a revolutionary step. National and social emancipation became identical tasks, and this as much as anything was burning in the heart of almost every Spaniard.

There is a very interesting paradox here, and it affected the thinking of every Spanish intellectual, among whom we number Goya. Until 1808 the Spanish citizen had for the most part been happy with his miserable plight. Never has a nation been so mistreated and so repressed by its government and accepted it so willingly. Only a few—those intellectuals about whom we spoke earlier—actively resisted or protested. When the French intervened, it was thought by those intellectuals that they would bring with them all the liberal ideas inherited from the revolution. The fact is, they did just that. The constitution Napoleon proclaimed in June 1808 at Bayonne was an immeasurable advance over the Bourbon
absolutism which had been repressing the people so blatantly. Early in the war, during the second occupation of Madrid, the Emperor and the new King, Joseph, swept aside almost every obstacle to the emergence of a new, bourgeois Spain. They abolished the Inquisition, the economic privileges of the Church, two thirds of all the monasteries, all feudal dues, and the nightmarish tangle of international customs barriers. Joseph went still further when the military situation permitted, and a great many Spanish intellectuals, who even at this early date seem to have understood how difficult or even impossible it is for Spaniards to govern themselves freely, were drawn over to the side of the French. It was not an unpatriotic thing to do; it was, they thought, the best thing for the country. It was not very easy to convince the Spanish peasant who was dying to save his nation of this.

Goya was torn between his intense love of the country and the people, his fierce patriotism on the one hand, and his love of reason, justice and liberty on the other. His first action of the revolution, which must be said to have begun on the day Godoy was overthrown back in March of 1808, was to paint an equestrian portrait of the new King, Ferdinand VII, for which he was granted a brief sitting. Characteristically, he nearly got himself into trouble by complaining that this was
nowhere near enough for a good portrait. The features of the King, slightly idealized, are thought to reflect the general feeling of hope and elation he at that time inspired, even in Goya. So at the very first, Goya was linked to the revolution.

But this did not last long. Because he was so torn, the artist remained throughout at least outwardly neutral, and he stayed in Madrid doing work for the French monarchy. He even received some awards for this work, and later on he got into a good deal of trouble for it. But as we have pointed out already, Goya's patriotism can be in no doubt when we look at the private work he was doing at this time, particularly the etchings.

For Goya, the period of the war was a time of constant soul searching. All his life he had loved liberty more than anything, but when the soldiers who passed for its defenders were transformed into looters and torturers, he was forced to reconsider. He began to doubt his hatred for the Church and the monks when he saw them fighting heroically for Spain. The reality of the social revolution which this was turned into was the factor which absolutely put Goya's heart and mind on the side of the motherland. And once he'd made up his mind, no man ever showed more compassion, or more fundamental feeling for his people. No man was ever more suited for
the task of immortalizing a heroic event. Xavier de Salas comments on this as follows:

It was, in fact, a kind of miracle that Goya should have lived at the most decisive moment which Spain had experienced until then, whereas in France, for instance, where nevertheless an unprecedented drama held the stage, not a single writer nor a single painter appeared to be aware of it. 123

Goya started the Disasters of War etchings during the war, and he continued with them right up until 1820. Most of the plates, however, were completed by 1814. Generally the scenes contain tremendous action and emotion, but interspersed here and there are several symbolic scenes. It is these that were probably done after 1814, and the action plates probably were etched during the war itself while the brutal memories and scenes were still vigorously impressed in Goya's mind.

The set contains eighty-five plates and it can be divided into three sections: the first part, plates 2-47, depicts the horrors and brutality of the war; the second part, plates 48-64, shows the misery of the people of Madrid during the year 1811-1812; and the third part is symbolical and even differs in style. Included in this is the first plate, a poignant picture of a man kneeling with his arms spread in a Christ-like position, looking towards the tumultuous heavens. The comment: "Sad pre-sentiments of things to come . . ." 123

123 Xavier de Salas and Elie Faure, The Disasters of War, 85 Aquatint Etchings by Francisco de Goya, p. 35.
The next forty-six plates lay open to us the incredible horror of the war. Plate 2 shows several statuesque, immobile, unemotional French soldiers shooting into a mob. "With reason or without" says Goya. Throughout, the soldiers of Napoleon are portrayed as inhuman robots, no more capable of obeying reason than are any automatic machines.

Women play an important role. They give courage (plate 4) and are also wild beasts, as they stab French soldiers with a spear held in one hand and carry their naked babies under the other arm (plate 5). In what I think is the most powerful of all the plates in the set (#7) Goya gives us the only scene which shows an individual act, an actual event. The beautiful young "Maid of Saragossa" climbs over heaps of dead bodies to fire a cannon. She lights the fuse with a torch just taken from the hand of her lover, who lies dead in the foreground. The attack was turned back and the city was saved. It is a poignant tribute to all the thousands of individual acts of heroism that must have occurred daily throughout the peninsula.

In plate 9 Goya tells us that the Spaniards "do not want this" as he shows a young woman being raped by a soldier while her mother raises a dagger to plunge into the soldier's back. The theme of rape is repeated in the following two plates, and then in #13, "Bitter
to be present," another sensuous young woman is raped while her shackled husband must look on helplessly.

The crescendo mounts as we move on. The horrors become worse. "And there is no remedy" (plate 15) repeats the theme of the May 3rd executions painting, with French soldiers lined up in a row and riddled corpses all about. In the next plate dead bodies are stripped and looted. Says Goya, "They take advantage." And so on we go. Building to a climax, and then for a few plates a catharsis; but each climax becomes more ferocious, more atrocious than the last. Goya carries us along as if we were on a seesaw, but each time we go up a little higher, and it is not so easy to come down.

We think we have become used to the mutilated corpses, but are brutally struck by the dead girls in plate 30, "Ravages of war." And we are somewhat ashamed that we feel not only repulsion, but that we derive a certain sensual pleasure from the smooth, fleshy thighs and the firm, round breasts of the young mother. Goya recognized this, too, and that is why he recorded it. All his emotions are here, even the most sadistic, unpleasant ones. There is horror, but there is also a curious fascination which he could not escape, nor can we.

In plate 33 French soldiers split a body down the middle with a sword, and Goya asks, "What more can be
done?" Four plates later he shows us a man impaled on the branch of a tree, both arms severed at the shoulders, and answers his own question, "This is worse." And finally we are pushed to the limits of endurance in plate 39 which shows carcasses and chopped off heads and limbs hanging from a tree as if they were but butcher meat. Goya recognizes that he can go no further, and gives us relief in plate 46, which is one of symbolic meaning and has no horror. In fact, none of these last few plates of the first part have a real horror impact, but the caption to plate 44, "I saw it," is one of the most moving of all, for it shows just how personally involved the artist was. And finally Goya ends this part with plate 47, "Thus it happened."

The plight of the citizens of Madrid in 1811-1812 was just as bad. The terrible famine of that year left thousands and thousands of dead, particularly among the lower class. All this was witnessed by Goya, and these plates dealing with the famine are among the most intense things he ever did. No horror escapes him. In plate 50 a weeping child follows three men who carry off with them her dead mother. Goya says ironically, "Unhappy mother." In plate 52 we are reminded again of the sensual fascination. The beautiful young woman who has just expired stirs us to desire, as she did Goya. In plate 54, starving citizens clamor in vain for a tiny
morsel, while an impassive policeman looks on. In plate 59 Goya asks the most poignant question of all, "What is the use of a cup?" It is one of the few places where he gives in to futility. In the following scene despair also reigns. An old woman surrounded by corpses hides her face in her hands and weeps. "There is no one to help them," says the comment.

Social comment is not one of the main themes of the "Disasters of War," but plate 61 is as biting a criticism of society as Goya ever made. On the left, a group of starving peasants bemoans its fate. On the right, a group of beautifully dressed and well-fed aristocrats looks on disdainfully. Separating the two groups is a sneering policeman. Says Goya, "They are of another breed."

Immediately, though, we are brought back to the ghastly plight of the people. Plate 63 shows us a pile of corpses, and the final plate of the group depicts two men unloading a woman from a carrion cart. Once again we realize that Goya looks at the war as a man, and he sadistically enjoys showing us the sensual aspects, the fleshy thighs, the firm pointed breasts, the smooth white skin, and graceful, opulent necks. He enjoys exposing the skin between the top of the silk stocking and the girdle of the beautiful young woman in this plate. One of the greatest horrors of all, I suppose,
is that we are excited by all this sensualism. Goya knew this, and realized that it is all part of the powerful emotions he was trying to incorporate into the plate.

The final section is allegorical and symbolic, closer to the Caprichos than the rest of the set. He ends on an optimistic note. Truth has died, but she has risen again, and we see her in the last plate, a beautiful young woman, shining light in all directions.

Stylistically the "Disasters of War" are very different from the Caprichos. In the latter there was no middle ground and there was a tremendous range of grays—a wide variation of tone. In the former there is almost nothing but middle ground, and the stark reality of the horror is effectively portrayed through dramatic contrasts of black and white. There is very little gray. This was a remarkable inspiration, and how very like Goya to have been so totally original in the manner he chose to immortalize the struggle.

There is one last point I would like to make before leaving these etchings. It has been said that in the "Disasters of War" we have a universal condemnation of all war, that it is done better here than anywhere else. This is true, but there is far more than that. Goya has here portrayed an intensely personal war. This is the war of the Spanish peasant against the inhuman French soldier, and at the same time an important social
revolutions. And further, it is the war of Goya himself, the war of an intensely patriotic man who at first was not sure which side to be on. The specific must not be discounted in any interpretation of these "Disasters of War."

* * *

The work that Goya did for the rest of his career, from about 1810 onwards, was of an entirely personal nature, except for a few official portraits. That is, he painted only what he wanted to paint. Mostly he did portraits, but there were some religious paintings in the latter part of the second decade of the century, the best of which is "The Last Communion of St. Joseph of Calasanz" dating from 1819. There were also some paintings with a social comment and dealing with the peasantry. We've already mentioned the three best, "The Water Seller" of 1810, "The Knife Grinder" of 1810, and "The Forge of 1815. This last is really quite an extraordinary painting. Done in bold, powerful shapes and big, slashing brushstrokes, it wonderfully conveys the vitality and strength of the lower class. And perhaps Goya didn't know it, but here too we have a remarkable allusion to the state of affairs in Spain at the time. The laborer with the sledge raised is Ferdinand VII about to slice off the head of the man on the right, who willingly places his head on the chopping
block. The man facing us, holding the tongs, symbolically enough aids in the execution. Is this not the Spanish people, who had begged for the return of Ferdinand and had greeted him with delirious joy, offering themselves to the slaughter? Is this not symbolic of the traitorous, treacherous actions of a deranged king and of the blind stupidity of the masses? Of course it is, only Goya takes sides when he renders the peasants in a compassionate, sympathetic manner. The artist had certainly not cut himself off from the times yet.

Goya also did several paintings of subjects which amused him, and in one of these, "Majas on a Balcony" (1811), it is interesting to notice just how much his style has changed from when we first met him. Bold, simple shapes, and monumentality and simplification of form have taken over from narrative sentiment and pictorial idealization. See how much more powerful is this painting in comparison with the "Maja and Majos" of 1777.

During this decade Goya was also working on the "Disparates" and his series of etchings from scenes of the bullfight. In 1817 he more or less retired from public life, and did very few paintings. In 1820 he moved into his new house outside Madrid, now renowned as the famous "Quinta del Sordo"—the house of the deaf man. His work becomes at this time very brooding and
heavy, and there are also a large number of weird, visionary paintings. And, of course, there are the famous murals done in the dining-room of the "Quinta," the so-called "Pinturas Negras" or Black Paintings. This is a completely different phase of Goya's art. At the age of seventy-four he began painting in an entirely original manner, attacking ever more imaginative scenes. These paintings are among the most interesting, if not the best things Goya ever did, and it is unfortunate that we will not have time to make a study of them here.

In the twenties Goya was forced out of Spain, and he settled in Bordeaux. Twice he made visits to Madrid, but did not remain. He did not work much, but the things he did are absolutely incredible for their vitality and vigor. In his late seventies and early eighties Goya had lost none of his monumental power, or fresh observation, nor of his ceaseless inquiry into new ways of doing things. Two of his very last works, the portrait of Don José Pio de Molina and the "Milkmaid of Bordeaux," attest to this fact and to the monumental creativity of a man whose genius and creative thirst never waned.

On the morning of April 16, 1828, Goya died at the age of eighty-two. His remains now lie in the church of San Antonio de la Florida. It is fitting that Goya's
ashes should have been brought to this chapel, for here, in the frescoes high up in the cupola, we have one of his most modern creations, and one of his most memorable legacies.
APPENDIX I

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY OF GOYA'S LIFE

1746 - Artist is born, March 30 at Fuentedos.

1760 - Begins four year apprenticeship in studio of José Luzán in Saragossa.

1763, 1766 - Competes twice for scholarship at Academy of San Fernando and fails both times.

1770 - Goes to Italy.

1771 - Wins second prize in competition at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Parma.

1773 - Marries Josefa Bayeu, sister of Francisco and Ramon.

1774 - Invited by Mengs to do tapestry cartoons for the Royal Factory of Santa Barbara.

1774 - First dated portrait.

1775 - Delivers first cartoon.

1778 - Artist does a series of etchings after Velazquez.

1780 - Goya unanimously elected to the Royal Academy of San Fernando because of the painting "Christ on the Cross"

1781 - Artist's father dies. Goya receives the commission for the altarpiece for the church of San Francisco el Grande.

1783 - Paints portrait of Count of Floridablanca.

1784 - San Francisco el Grande is opened to the public, and Goya's altarpiece is acclaimed the best among several.

1785 - Goya is appointed Assistant Director of Painting at the Academy of San Fernando. Paints the portraits of the Duke and Duchess of Osuna.
1786 - Artist appointed Official Painter of Tapestry Cartoons.
1786-1788 - Paints the last set of Tapestry Cartoons.
1789 - Goya appointed Court Painter as Charles IV accedes to the Crown. Paints his first Royal Portraits.
1792 - Goya falls ill in Cadiz.
1793 - Artist produces his first works after the illness. He does eleven paintings for the Royal Academy in which he gives free rein to "fancy and invention".
1795 - Francisco Bayeau dies. Goya is appointed Director of Painting at the Academy of San Fernando.
1797 - Goya spends several months in Sanlucar at the estate of the Duchess of Alba.
1798 - Caprichos completed. Artist does the frescoes in San Antonio de la Florida.
1799 - The Caprichos are published.
1800 - Goya paints "The Family of Charles IV".
1802 - The Duchess of Alba dies.
1803 - Paints the portraits of the Count and Countess Fernan Nuñez.
1804 (?) - Does the paintings of the nude and clothed Majas.
1805 - Goya's son, Xavier, is married.
1807 - Paints the portrait of the actor, Don Isidoro Maíquez.
1808 - Paints the equestrian portrait of Ferdinand VII. Spain goes to war against France.
1810-1814 - Most of the "Disasters of War" are completed.
1812 - Josefa dies. All of Goya's works are transferred to his son, Xavier.

1816 - The "Tauromaquia" is published. This is the only set of etchings besides the Caprichos which Goya published during his lifetime.

1817 - Goya goes to Seville.

1819 - Artist buys the "Quinta del Sordo".

1820 - Liberals take over from Ferdinand, and Goya swears allegiance to the new Constitution at a meeting at the Academy.

1820-1822 - Artist does the paintings in the "Quinta del Sordo".

1823 - Liberals are overthrown and Ferdinand takes over again.

1824 - Goes into hiding. Leaves Spain for Bordeaux.

1826 - Goya pays a brief visit to Madrid. Returns to Bordeaux.

1827 - Last visit to Madrid.

1828 - Goya dies in Bordeaux on the 16th of April at the age of 82.
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The point of this thesis is to show how the art of Francisco Goya evolved as his life progressed and how it reflected his times. Without having the time to go into his whole career in real detail, I have chosen what I consider to be the highlights, as well as the works or periods which are most closely related to the history of Spain and art at that time.

Basically, the paper can be divided into three parts. The first forty-seven pages concern themselves with the Tapestry Cartoons, which were done in the 1770's and 1780's. More than anywhere else in Goya's art these cartoons reflect the manners and customs of Spanish society at that time, and the first twenty pages are devoted to a discussion of these manners and customs and how they are reflected in the cartoons. The remainder of the section on the cartoons deals with the style of the paintings and the elements which influenced Goya at that time. Here I was obliged to talk at some length of Italian Genre painting of the 18th century, for this is where the main influence comes from. Crespi, Longhi, and the two Tiepolos are among the major artists discussed, the elder Tiepolo being the most important, and hence taking the most amount of space in the paper. For the early discussion on the "spirit" of the cartoons I relied most heavily on Klingender and Valentín (see bibliography), and for the
section on style Michael Levey and Antonio Morassi were the sources most frequently referred to.

The second part is the main body of the paper, and deals with the Caprichos and all the things which were working on Goya as influences at the time that he produced them. There is considerable discussion about the actual history of Spain and some of the significant personalities of the decade (1790's) There is interspersed at page 74 a particularly long discussion about the Duchess of Alba, with whom Goya was in love from about 1793 on. The overall section on the Caprichos runs from pages47 to 109, and it too is divided into a discussion of the "spirit" of the etchings (their conception, their intent, etc.) and a discussion of their style. For this part the author most heavily relied on was Miško. Others referred to include Nordström, Lafuente Ferrari, and Antonia Valentín.

At this point in the paper there is an eleven page section dealing with the frescos in the Church of San Antonio de la Florida. These paintings are less representative of the time than almost anything Goya ever did, but they are so significant to the following hundred and fifty years of art due to their incredible modernity that I felt it necessary to include a brief discussion about them. For this, I relied almost exclusively on Lafuente Ferrari's work,
The frescos in San Antonio de la Florida, which contains the only decent reproductions of these paintings to date.

With this we come to the third part of the paper, (pp. 119-161) which deals quite generally with the events of the early 19th century in Spain, their effects on Goya, and his manner of presenting them to us. There is more historical background here than anywhere else in the paper, and since Goya was doing no specific project at that time, (until 1810 anyway) his individual, separate works become the main topic of discussion. Once again we consider these from an historic as well as from a stylistic point of view. Also included in this section is a rather brief discussion of The Disasters of War, brief because of a lack of time, not because they are not important. In fact, the great disappointment of the paper to me is that I didn't have time to consider these etchings more thoroughly, for they are just as important as the Caprichos and every bit as fascinating. And with that the paper comes to an end, with only a few pages devoted to the last few years of the artist's life. The work he produced at this time was as good and original as anything he had ever done, but it is not particularly significant to our topic, so it is not considered thoroughly. If any author was heavily relied upon in this section, it was Pierre Gassiere in his book, Goya.