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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1799 when Goya painted his full length portrait of Charles IV in hunting costume, *Charles IV, King of Spain* (Fig. 1), he employed a tradition that went back over two hundred years which grew to have nationalistic significance. The hunt was not merely a game, but was a sport in which the king was expected to excel. In 1634 Juan de Mateos wrote, “The forest is the school, the enemies are the beasts, and thus with reason hunting is known as the living image of war.”¹ Because of its inherent connection to the battlefield, hunting was indispensable to a prince’s education.² In addition, the royal hunt served as spectacle and entertainment, as a rite of passage and familial bond among the royal family, and in some cases a necessary retreat for the king. Since hunting was such a prominent fixture in the atmosphere of the court, portraits of kings as hunters functioned as important symbols of royal lineage and monarchical power but their meaning and audience varied.


² The concept of hunting as suitable training for war is an idea that was expressed for centuries and often the two ideas were directly connected in art in a shared narrative. For example, the ancient Protocorinthian Chigi vase depicts the maturity of male youth using the hunt as practice for the ultimate battle of warfare. See: Jeffrey Hurwit, “Reading the Chigi Vase,” *Hesperia* 71 (2002): 1-22. A more recent and subtler example of hunting’s direct association to war is the anonymous portrait *Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, and Sir John Harington* (1603) where the men’s hunting costumes echo the armor of the time. See: Elizabeth E. Gardner, “A British Hunting Portrait,” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 3, no. 5 (1945): 113-117.
This thesis examines Spanish royal hunting portraits from the reign of Philip IV (1621-1665) to the reign of Charles IV (1788-1808) in order to shed light on the development of Spanish royal hunting portraits. Of particular interest is how their audience and function changed over time, growing to represent Spanish identity for a monarch. Although the evolution of Spanish royal portraiture has been thoroughly explored, hunting portraits have not been grouped and examined in their own right as a genre.

The field of Spanish portraiture is indebted to figures like Jonathan Brown, Manuela B. Mena Marques, and Nigel Glendinning, but the relevant work of each of these scholars remained largely confined by a particular time period, focusing on a certain artist or monarch. While this study stands on the shoulders of their work, it strives to use a different framework, focusing on a specific type of portrait. Often the discussion of hunting portraits falls into the investigation of royal pastimes and sports. Hunting did serve a recreational purpose, yet these images reflect more than the celebration of a favorite pastime. While hunting portraits comprise only a small fraction of royal representation and could have both private and public audiences, these are iconic depictions of kingship. Despite a change from the Habsburg to the Bourbon dynasty, and an accompanying change in portrait style, hunting portraits continued to be produced, following a formula with iconographical similarities.

Before investigating individual portraits, it is necessary to first demonstrate the iconographic consistency of Spanish hunting portraits. Whether of a king or a queen, Habsburg or Bourbon, Spanish hunting portraits maintain some continuity in that they
depict a single full-length figure without attendants and usually with a dog. Dogs were an essential feature of the royal hunt and became an important symbol in Spanish hunting portraits. The raising and training of dogs was considered a privilege for the nobleman and a good dog reflected highly upon the owner. Numerous hunting manuals describe in detail how to choose and raise dogs for the hunt and it is apparent from these texts that dogs were held in very high esteem. As symbols in hunting portraits, the presence of dogs was likely a source of pride on behalf of the king and projected an image of control. The dogs are alert and ready to follow commands: just as a king is ready to lead and govern, so too should his subjects be ready to follow.

In Spanish hunting portraits, the gun is an even more prevalent element than the dog. Each hunting portrait of a Spanish king or queen includes a contemporary gun. As opposed to parade pieces, there were guns that had practical use in the field, and in some (if not all) cases, guns that were actual pieces in the royal collection. Yet though there are similarities in the portraits, there were also shifts, shifts which can be best understood in the context of court ritual and contemporary politics.


4 For a discussion of hunting poems and songs about hounds see: Edward Bliss Reed, “Two Seventeenth-Century Hunting Songs,” Modern Philology 14 (1917): 519-524. Charles III was so fond of his dogs that he insisted they join him for dinner despite objections from members of the court. This scenario is depicted in a painting by Luis Paret, Charles III Dining Before the Court (1788). See: Victoria López-Cordón, Ángeles Pérez Samper, and Teresa Martínez de Sas, La Casa de Borbón: Familia, corte y política Vol. 1 (1700-1808) (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2000), 284. One can tell from Francisco Goya’s letter to his friend Martín that into in the eighteenth century dogs remained important animals to the hunt: “I can’t bear to know that you have deprived yourself of such a fine dog in order to send it to me...I am so deeply moved and at the same time appreciate it so much. I shall care for the dog as I would for him from whom it comes!” Goya to Martin Zapater, 20 April 1785. Sarah Symmons, Goya A Life in Letters, trans. Philip Troutman (London: Pimilico, 2004), 162.
The main body of the thesis has been divided into three chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter two, “The Hunt at Court: Princely Education and Court Ritual,” examines hunting manuals and hunting portraits in order to shed light on the hunt’s place at court and its accompanying rituals. For the Habsburgs, hunting portraits had a relatively private audience and the portraits functioned as images of self-definition rather than propaganda. During times of increasing nationalistic tendencies, particularly during the reigns of Charles III and Charles IV, court artists, like Francisco Goya, referenced the hunting portraits of previous kings. Rather than hanging the portraits in a private setting, the paintings functioned as official images, with copies made and distributed. The continued existence of hunting portraits in the canon of royal representation reflected not only the Bourbon need to proclaim the continuity of their dynasty, but also the importance that the sport still held at the court.

The following chapter, “The Hunting Queen,” investigates female hunting portraits and their purpose as images of queenship. Although more rare than hunting portraits of kings, in many ways hunting portraits of queens could add an image of strength to a queen’s persona and equate her with her husband. Pendant portraits of kings and queens complicate the subject of female hunting portraits and the implications of this are also addressed.

The final chapter of this thesis, “The Firearm in Spanish Hunting Portraits” is concerned with firearms and their significance in hunting portraits, which thus far has been ignored in art historical scholarship. As symbols in portraits, guns represent the ability and marksmanship of the carrier. Likewise, because of restrictions on who could
carry arms, they had elite associations. In addition, they convey a sense of patriotism, particularly for the eighteenth-century portraits where the guns serve as part of the hunting portrait tradition while calling attention to Madrid’s modern firearm manufacturing center, thereby promoting Spain’s past and present.

With this thematic approach to the subject of Spanish royal hunting portraits, this thesis strives to shed light on how hunting enriched the public image and private identity of successive monarchs. Although as decades passed, guns became more advanced, and dynasties came and went, artists still functioned within a portrait tradition and hunting portraits remained a consistent part of identity for a Spanish ruler.
CHAPTER II
THE HUNT AT COURT: PRINCELY EDUCATION AND COURT RITUAL

At the Spanish court hunting was necessary to a prince’s education as it was considered valuable training for warfare. During times of peace, hunting was a means to practice marksmanship and maintain physical strength. Despite its relationship with war, hunting was important and necessary to the image of kingship and a king dressed as a hunter suggested physical and mental preparedness.

Although Spanish hunting portraits of the monarchy continued to be produced throughout the decades, their function and audience varied greatly depending on the dynasty. Some portraits, like those Velázquez created for the Torre de la Parada, Philip IV as Hunter (Fig. 2), Don Fernando as Hunter (Fig. 3), and Baltasar Carlos as Hunter (Fig. 4), were private and were used more for self definition than propagandistic purposes. With the waveri ng political climate of the eighteenth century, the Bourbon dynasty felt the need to project an image of continuity and used the Habsburg portraits to bolster their own public image. The Bourbon hunting portraits not only were public, but as their official portraits they were copied, thereby greatly increasing the audience. The variations in function and audience come as no surprise when the hunt at court could be an intimate family affair or an extravagant spectacle. Despite the differences in meaning,
hunting played a consistent role in the atmosphere of both the Habsburg and Bourbon courts.

Hunting as an essential part of a gentleman's education was by no means unique to Spain and a number of books and essays from the Renaissance and onward demonstrate this. Influential writers such as Baldassare Castiglione, who wrote about princely education, encouraged this concept:

There are also many other sports which...are closely related to arms and demand a great deal of manly exertion. Among these it seems to me that hunting is the most important, since in many ways it resembles warfare; moreover it is the true pastime of great lords, it is suitable pursuit for a courtier, and we know that it was very popular in the ancient world.¹

The French Renaissance scholar, Michel de Montaigne also argued that exercise, namely hunting and the training with horses and arms, was imperative to the education of a gentleman.² And in *A Gentleman's Recreation* (1677), the English writer Nicholas Cox claims, "Hunting is a Game and Recreation commendable not onely for Kings, Princes, and the Nobility, but likewiffe for private Gentlemen: And it is a Noble and Healthy Paftime, so it is a thing which hath been highly prized in all Ages."³

¹ Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), 63. Although this is an Italian work, it was widely influential and is recorded in the inventory of the library of Philip IV. See, Fernando J. Bouza Álvarez, *El libro y el cetro: la biblioteca de Felipe IV en la Torre del Alcázar de Madrid* (Salamanca: Instituto de Historia del Libro y de la Lectura, 2005). Although hunting in the ancient world was popular, still there were ethical debates raised over human consumption of meat. For example, Plutarch in his *Moralia*, argues that humans are vegetarian by nature. This text is briefly discussed in Susan Koslow, “Law and Order in Rubens' Wolf and Fox Hunt,” *The Art Bulletin* 78, no. 4 (1996): 684-685.

Apart from these texts, Spain also had its own popular writing that promoted these ideas, such as the 1634 hunting manual by Juan de Mateos, *Origen y dignidad de la caza* (The Origins and Dignity of the Hunt).\(^4\) Hunting at court was not merely suggested however, it was required by a Castilian law that actually stated a connection between political leadership and hunting. Partida 2, 4, 20, declared that the king should be a skilled hunter as it was good for the body and mind.\(^5\)

However, the same authors stress that hunting must only be done in moderation. Too much hunting could not only lead to neglect of other duties, but could in fact make a person less human,

...there is a especial need to hold a strict Rein over our affections, that this Pleasure, which is allowable in its season, may not intrench upon other Domestical affairs. There is great danger lest we be transported with this Pastime, and so our selves grow Wilde, haunting the Woods till we resemble the Beasts which are Citizens of them...\(^6\)

The right amount of hunting led to good health and strength, but too much could lead to anger and an inordinate love of war.\(^7\)

---


\(^7\) Ibid, 1. In addition, there were cases in Spain where the lower social orders complained of excessive hunting by the nobility. Some of the issues raised concern over the neglect of governmental duties, the frivolous spending on hunting expeditions, and the damage done to the farming land and property either by the hunters themselves or by animals. See: Owens, *Diana at the Bar*, 23.
Spanish hunting manuals provided instructions on all types of hunting and often included stories on impressive hunts that the king had, thereby adding to his legacy as a skilled hunter. For example *Origen y dignidad de la caza* contained engravings by Francisco Collante that depicted Philip IV (1621-1665) killing a boar single handedly and the accompanying text describes the method in which it was done.\(^8\) The inclusion of these engravings allowed the public to see Philip IV’s hunting prowess even though they did not have access to his hunting portrait.

Although often considered a recreational sport, hunting also served as an essential part of political relations. Hunting with other royal families strengthened political bonds and even a painting of this type of hunt could also benefit the relationship between monarchs during delicate times. Lucas Cranach’s painting *Stag Hunt in Honor of Charles V in Torgau* (1544) (Fig. 5) demonstrates the political importance of the hunt. While the painting shows a fanciful depiction of a hunt that never actually took place, it reveals the political agenda involved. The painting was a gift to Charles V from John Frederick the Magnaminous, Duke of Saxony and both men are depicted hunting together in the lower left corner. The work is a composite of various kinds of hunting: a boar hunt with dogs and spears, a bear hunt with lances, and a deer hunt with crossbows. Of course the combination of hunt scenes is completely unrealistic as each different type of game had a

\(^8\) Juan de Mateos, *Origen y dignidad de la caza* (Madrid, 1634). Although this work is one of the most famous Spanish hunting manuals, it is certainly not the only one. Another important example from the reign of Philip IV is Alonso Martínez de Espinár’s, *Arte de ballestería y montería*, 1644. These hunting manuals continued to be used decades later and new editions were published. However, newer hunting manuals were also created and one such example is Juan Manuel de Arellano’s *El cazador instruido, y arte de cazar, con escopeta, y perros, a pie, y a caballo* (The Learned Hunter and the Art of Hunting with a Gun and Dogs, on Foot, and on Horseback) 1745.
unique hunting method associated with it. Although this was not a historical event, the recipient of the painting could imagine such a hunt, providing a more personal connection between him and John Frederick. Additionally, the imagery in the painting demonstrates political propaganda, showing the power of the giver by depicting his large castle of Hartenfels surrounded by lush grounds bursting with forests, streams, more than sixty hunting dogs, and various kinds of wild game. The painting simultaneously complimented the recipient, Charles V showing him hitting a stag with an arrow, with two dead stags at his feet, flatteringly indicating his prowess at the hunt.

At the court of Philip IV the hunt infiltrated numerous aspects of courtly life and was a regular pastime for the king. In some cases, the chase occurred not in the countryside, but at the palaces, in makeshift arenas where even more members of the court could see the king’s prowess and skill on horseback. Velázquez’s La Tela Real (1636-1638) (Fig. 6) shows this courtly spectacle where men on horseback wielding lances trot around the arena. Some guests watch the exploit while others converse with each other. These spectacles were so extravagant that Philip IV had a staff of 167 people ready to organize his hunting and sporting events.10

9 It was common to show composite hunt scenes where various game are hunted in one scene. Goya’s tapestry cartoon A Hunting Party (1775) shows three different hunting methods in it. Peter Paul Rubens’ Wolf and Fox Hunt (1616) also shows an inaccurate hunting scene.

10 John H. Elliot, “Power and Propaganda in the Spain of Philip IV,” in Spain and Its World 1500-1700 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 144. Another similar spectacle was bullfighting. The idea of bullfighting as a uniquely “Spanish” activity was fostered in the eighteenth century. One of the most famous works is Goya’s print series La tauromaquia. The series traces the history of bullfighting back to the ancient Spaniards and the Moors, up to Goya’s day. In addition, he includes a print of Charles V fighting a bull during a celebration for the birth of Philip II. See: Selma Reuben Holo, “Goya and the Bullfight,” in La Tauromaquia: Goya, Picasso, and the Bullfight (Milwaukee: Milwaukee Art Museum, 1986), 15-30.
At times when the king ventured into the countryside, the actual hunt was only a part of the retreat as often these trips into the country offered other chances for amusement. For example, the Pardo palace was set among the woods north of Madrid and consisted of numerous small buildings including La Zarzuela, a theater built for the entertainment of Philip IV and his court.\textsuperscript{11} After hunting expeditions, actors would travel from Madrid to provide the king and his company with entertainment in the form of plays or music.\textsuperscript{12} Even though all classes of society loved hunting, the royal hunting parties were very exclusive and only involved close members of the court.\textsuperscript{13}

Although hunting was a normal activity for Spanish kings, Philip IV was particularly fond of the hunt and relished his time in the countryside where he could escape the pressures of his tumultuous reign during which the economy, territory, and military might of the nation suffered greatly. The king cherished his moments away from work. This desire can be gleaned from his statement regarding the reading of history books,

\begin{quote}
Indeed, I read many of these books more for enjoyment than for any other reason. There is nothing wrong with this, since one can absorb many precept of a serious nature and yet simultaneously be entertained. After all, it is necessary to seek a little diversion in this way when the continuing pressure of work so rarely permits any relaxation.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{11}] Everett W. Hesse, “Court References in Calderón’s Zarzuelas,” \textit{Hispanic Review} 15 (1947): 374.
\item[\textsuperscript{12}] Ibid, 365.
\item[\textsuperscript{13}] Carl Justi, \textit{Velázquez and his Times} (New York: Parkstone Press International, 2006), 111.
\end{enumerate}
According to John Elliot, the hunt fulfilled an even greater desire for the king, “The arts of war were not, as Philip IV had wistfully hoped, to be embodied in his person. His ambition to lead his armies into battle was consistently thwarted by Olivares, and he was forced to find his compensation on the hunting field.”

Historiography has placed much of the downfall of Spain on Philip IV’s shoulders, but the arts flourished as never before under his reign. He acquired a substantial collection of paintings both from foreign and local artists, in particular Diego Velázquez who worked as court painter. Philip IV was able to combine both of his passions, hunting and painting, in the creation of idyllic hunting retreats. For the sake of this discussion, no hunting lodge was as important as the Torre de la Parada, a small lodge on the grounds of the larger Pardo palace. Unlike palaces such as the Buen Retiro, the Torre de la Parada was more private for the king and only select people would have visited the lodge. Although relatively small in size, the lodge was decorated with paintings from the masters of the time: a series of mythological paintings by Peter Paul Rubens, animal and hunting scenes by Frans Snyders, and eleven paintings by Velázquez including *La Tela Real* and three hunting portraits, *Philip IV as Hunter*, *Don Fernando as Hunter*, and *Baltasar Carlos as Hunter*. Because of the intimate setting of the lodge, the

---

14 This quotation is from the manuscript of Philip IV’s translation of Francesco Guicciardiní’s *History of Italy* into Castilian and is quoted in, R.A. Stradling, *Philip IV and the Government of Spain 1621-1665* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 310-311.

15 Elliot, *Power and Propaganda*, 175.

paintings served a different function than paintings in other palace galleries. With their limited audience, the hunting portraits were created for the family to meditate on, demonstrating the familial bond that hunting expeditions secured.

The bond the hunting trips brought to families is evident from the paintings in the Torre de la Parada. The similar compositions, color palette, and poses in the portraits provide a visual connection that strengthens the close relationship between the king, his brother, and his son. Each figure stands full-length in an outdoor setting, wearing similar attire and holding a shotgun in his hand. In each painting a dog (or dogs in the case of Baltasar Carlos as Hunter), rests by the figure’s side. There are other parts of the paintings that demonstrate how important hunting was to relationships. For example, the gun that Baltasar Carlos holds was actually the gun his father used as a child when he hunted. Just as the king passes down the reins of the government to his son, so too does he hand down his hunting weapon. This indicates hunting as a rite of passage. As a king, it is his duty to raise his sons to be future leaders; in order for Baltasar Carlos to be a

17 While it is important to examine these paintings within the context of the rest of the decoration of the Torre de la Parada, it is beyond the scope of this thesis and has been treated well in the work by Svetlana Alpers in her book on Peter Paul Rubens and the Torre de la Parada. In fact, she argues that the scheme of the paintings is only loosely connected and that all the paintings were included because they have a connection to the general theme of hunting. Some of the works were commissioned for the Torre itself and others were transported there simply because they fit the theme of the hunt. For a thorough discussion on the painting cycles in the hunting lodge see: Alpers, Torre de la Parada.

18 Of all the palaces with painting galleries, perhaps none was so glorious as the Buen Retiro palace. Largely constructed by the Count-Duke of Olivares, Philip IV’s favorite, it was a palace for entertaining and would have had a much larger audience to entertain. Among the thousands of works of art was one of Velázquez’s most famous works, The Surrender of Breda that hung in the Hall of Realms among other military paintings by major artists that commemorated Spain’s military victories. For a larger discussion and reconstruction of the Hall of Realms see: Jonathan Brown and J.H. Elliot, A Palace for a King: The Buen Retiro and the Court of Philip IV (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).

successful king, he must first become a great hunter. Although few people would have seen this portrait, Baltasar Carlos would have seen it and felt his responsibility as the future king.

The bond between brothers was also strong which is demonstrated in the correspondence between Philip IV and Fernando. Prior to Fernando’s departure to Flanders the two brothers had always hunted together.\(^{20}\) Fernando is present in some of the paintings commissioned for the Torre such as in *La Tela Real*, which were painted after his departure from Spain thus paying tribute to the brothers hunting together.\(^{21}\) Likely the portraits would have brought back intimate family memories of the family’s hunting experiences together.

When the Bourbon dynasty ascended to the Spanish throne in 1701, hunting continued to be an important part of court ritual and life and remained both a private retreat while other times it was a spectacle sport. For example, when Luis I was proclaimed king in Madrid on February 9, 1724 part of the afternoon celebration included dove and rabbit hunting at the Buen Retiro.\(^{22}\)

Philip V (1701-1746) preferred his country palaces such as San Idelfonso de la Granja where there were fewer courtiers but abundant game.\(^{23}\) He had recurring bouts of

\(^{20}\) Alpers, *Torre de la Parada*, 104. After Fernando became Regent of Flanders, he sent many letters to his brother where he complained of the hunting in his new home.

\(^{21}\) Ibid, 124.

melancholy and the hunt was a way for the king to recuperate from his debilitating depression. From the beginning Philip V had formidable obstacles to face. He was barely seventeen when he took the throne, and spoke no Spanish, fostering feelings of isolation. At the early stages of his reign he said, “I would rather go back to being Duke of Anjou, and I can’t stand Spain!” In addition, his reign began during the tumultuous time of the War of Succession where the possible union of the Spanish and French crowns sent a shockwave of fear across Europe. With both France and Austria claming rights to the Spanish throne, the war grew to include England, Portugal and the Netherlands, with battlefronts in Europe and the Americas, and did not end until 1715.

1712 was a significant year for Philip V as he officially abdicated his rights to the French throne. His loyalties were now focused on keeping the Spanish crown and as he put it, “God has placed the crown of Spain on my head; I shall maintain it so long as I have a drop of blood in my veins.” This sentiment, drastically different from his initial feelings of Spain, demonstrates his changing devotions. Although the war did not officially end until three years later, this was the year that Philip V truly became a Spanish king. Perhaps not coincidentally, 1712 is the same year Miguel Meléndez painted the pendant hunting portraits of Philip V (Fig. 7) and his first wife, María Luisa of Savoy.

---


25 Ibid, 72.
Having a hunting portrait created by a Spanish artist placed Philip V firmly among the tradition of the Spanish kings of the past.

The Meléndez portraits depart stylistically from the conservative Habsburg hunting portraits, yet they still convey that hunting is a noble sport for royalty, and one that provides a familial bond. The anxiety that Philip V felt when he was apart from his first and second wives is well documented. Because he was rarely separated from his wives, they often accompanied him while hunting. Although there is not a pair of portraits of Philip V and his second wife, Isabel Farnese, they also hunted regularly together. When Philip V abdicated the throne in 1724 largely due to his illness, the two retired to his palace at La Granja where they spent so much time hunting that they needed to lease the nearby land of Riofrío. Even though Philip V and María Luisa are not depicted together in a single portrait, the matching compositions and palette visually connect the king and queen and portray them at an activity that they enjoyed together.

Meléndez depicts the king at only half-length, but the figure is pressed close to the picture plane, dominating most of the painting and leaving little room for the scenery and sky. While the body is posed in an almost profile position, the head turns out in three-quarters towards the viewer. The king cradles a shotgun in his left hand while his right gestures to the scenery behind. The figure wears sumptuous clothing complete with lace cuffs and gold embroidery and the hat is even adorned with a feather trim. María

---

26 The concept of pendant portraits is important and is discussed in more detail in the following chapter of this thesis, "The Hunting Queen."

27 Lavalle Cobo, Isabel de Farnesio, 92.

28 Ibid, 92.
Luisa is shown in a similar manner as her husband. The composition of the two paintings is similar, and the queen wears equally rich clothing as her husband. Although by a Spanish artist, these portraits share more with the French portrait style that favored rich clothing, swirling drapery, and bright hues, than the naturalistic and somewhat restrained manner of Habsburg portraits.

Although Philip V largely used hunting as a means to maintain his mental health, hunting was still viewed as necessary education for a prince during the following decades. During the reigns of Charles III and Charles IV hunting prowess was a trait of good leadership. However hunting became such a fixture of court life that it could be said the kings were obsessed with it. Charles III's (1759-1788) infatuation with the hunt transformed it from a seasonal escape to an integral part of court life. The court moved to where the hunt took place, changing locations depending on the season and available game. The king felt burdened by the trappings of kingship and often lamented the rigid court attire required for stately functions and ceremonies. One courtier recorded, 'When he had to dress for a ceremony he would sulkily wear a costume of rich material, sometimes with diamond buttons, over his hunting suit...'

---

29 Anthony H. Hull, *Charles III and the Revival of Spain* (Washington D.C.: University Press of America, Inc., 1981), 148. Many of his hunting rituals were already in place when Charles III was the King of Naples and they remained intact after he became king of Spain and moved to Madrid. Hunting was included in the daily regimen, taking place after siesta—food was to be ready for the king and his dogs upon their return to the palace.

30 Quoted in Harold Acton, *The Bourbons of Naples (1734-1825)* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1956), 50. Various laws ensured that the king had the most successful hunts. The animals of the hunting grounds were regularly checked to make certain their numbers were sufficient. There were restrictions, such as the prohibition of firearms, to limit the amount of hunting done by commoners. These strict regulations did more than ensure that the king had the most fruitful hunting experience. In the larger sense they kept the tradition of hunting as a royal sport and one that was especially reserved for the king. While
Although the average citizen would not have been exposed to hunting portraits of
the king, Charles III’s subjects knew he was an avid hunter. *The Wisest Hunter of the
Forest: targeted in this romance are the experiences in the political hunt of our beloved
king, Don Charles III* was a popular romance of the time that not only praised the king
and his own hunting ability, but also in turn portrayed hunting as a sport fit for a king.\(^{31}\)
The romance was printed on broadsheets that were inexpensive and available to a wide
audience. Thus the royal hunt in some ways infiltrated down to members of society that
were not at court and would not have the chance to see the king hunting.

Some information can be gleaned on how hunting fit into courtly life through
palace decoration. Charles III’s palaces were adorned with hunting scenes and portraits
so that this pastime was even more intertwined with daily palace life. Although hunting
scenes served as a major decorative feature of the Habsburgs’ Torre de la Parada, the
building’s function was different than a palace. The Torre served as a private temporary
lodging rather than a royal residence used to entertain dignitaries.

Perhaps no Bourbon hunting decorative scheme is as noteworthy as that by court
painter Francisco Goya to decorate the palace of San Lorenzo at El Escorial. In 1775
Goya, under the direction of Francisco Bayeu, painted nine tapestry cartoons depicting
hunting scenes that were to hang in the dining room of the Prince and Princess of

---

\(^{31}\) These broadsheets were published in Barcelona and Saragossa. Copies of them exist today in the
Archivo del Ayuntamiento in Barcelona. Janis Tomlinson, *Francisco Goya: The Tapestry Cartoons and
Asturias at El Escorial. Recreational images of hunts provided entertainment to the royal family who would reside at the palace in autumn. The Prince and Princess were enthralled by the activities of everyday people and depicting ordinary people at the hunt fit the theme of the other tapestries commissioned for their bedchambers, which showed common figures such as musicians or washerwomen.

In some cases the tapestry cartoons are remarkably poignant in their quiet portrayal events at the hunt. For example, *A Hunter Loading his Shotgun* (Fig. 9) depicts exactly that. A hunter stands in the foreground, loading his gun while one hound, apparently exhausted from the day, curls up by his side as two others lazily approach. Some of the tapestry cartoons are not completely accurate portrayals of the hunt, but rather composites of different types of hunting, such as *A Hunting Party* (plate 10) where three different hunting scenes are depicted. Other cartoons such as *The Wild Boar Hunt* (plate 11), have more realistic renderings of the hunt. As in a traditional boar hunt the dogs have chased the boar in the direction of the hunter, who approaching from the front.

---


34 Ibid, 153. Because the subject matter of these tapestries shows commoners hunting, it is necessary to clarify the differences between the common hunt and the royal hunt. The general thought at this time was that hunting was a God-given right to man and that by divine law any man had the right to hunt. However, there were restrictions over the types of animals that people were allowed to hunt and harsh penalties were imposed for those who hunted on royal property. These rules maintained class distinctions, thereby making the royal hunt elite. Furthermore, hunting manuals that had a wide audience and accessibility to the average hunter contained frontispieces with flattering dedications to the king. Therefore the distinction between the common hunt and the royal hunt was clearly defined. Koslow, *Law and Order*, 680-706.
stabs the boar between the eyes with a bayonet. Even though the activities of commoners fulfilled a sort of curious desire on behalf of the royal family, the subject matter also conformed to the passion that both the king and his son had for hunting.

Hunting was not only a hobby for Goya, who wrote about it regularly in his letters to his friends, but it also served as a way for him to form a relationship with the king. In a letter to his good friend, Martín de Zapater he wrote, “His Highness has shown me a thousand kindnesses...I have twice been shooting with His Highness, and he shoots very well; and on the last afternoon after I had shot a rabbit, he remarked, ‘this dauber is a better enthusiast than me.’” Other letters to Zapater report on Goya’s hunts and his various trophies. In addition Goya often lamented when he didn’t have time to go out hunting. His admiration for hunting is obvious when he writes, “you couldn’t know how envious I get when you talk about shooting...for me there is no better entertainment in all the world.” Thus Goya’s paintings reflect not only a personal interest in the hunt, but a relationship between him and the king that was maintained in some ways by hunting together.

Although Bourbon hunting portraits reflected the personal hobbies of the king, the portraits also served a larger propagandistic purpose. Anton Raphael Mengs was the First

---

35 I say traditional because this technique has precedents as far back at the thirteenth century BCE. Using hounds to chase boars towards the hunter, who then kills the boar from the front with a stab between the eyes or in the shoulder, is shown in the ancient Greek frescoes from the Palace at Tiryns. In a more popular example, Homer describes this technique in The Odyssey when he explains the scar on Odysseus’s leg. See: Homer, The Odyssey, trans. W.H.D. Rouse (New York: Signet Classic, 1999), 222.


37 Goya to Zapater 6 October 1781. Ibid, 123.
Court Painter to Charles III who executed a number of portraits of members of the royal family including a hunting portrait of Charles IV, *Charles of Bourbon, Prince of Asturias* (1765) (Fig. 12). This portrait had a very different function than that of the Torre portraits. Far from being a private painting, this was used as an engagement painting and numerous copies of it were made.\(^3^8\)

Goya’s *Charles III in Hunting Costume* (1786-88) (Fig. 13) also had a very public function. As an official portrait, many copies were made.\(^3^9\) It is a full-length depiction of the king in an outdoor setting, likely the grounds of either the palace of El Pardo or El Escorial. The king stands holding in his right hand a white glove, and in the left a shotgun. A hound, wearing a collar with an inscription that proclaims the king’s ownership, lies curled up by his side. The king stares out at the viewer with an almost jovial expression. In the portrait of Charles III as a hunter, Goya has combined the courtly attire of the hunting jacket and breeches with the courtly regalia of the monarchial sashes. However unrealistic this may seem, Charles III often combined both types of attire in his everyday life, ‘His dress seldom varies from a large hat, gray Segovia frock, buff waistcoat, small dagger, black breeches, and worsted stockings...On gala days a fine

\(^3^8\) See: Martin, *Majesty of Spain*, 70. This work is believed to be the companion piece with the *Portrait of Queen Maria Luisa as Princess of Asturias* (1765) and possibly served as the official portraits commissioned for their engagement. Even though no documentation proves this, there are numerous copies of the portraits that exist. These pendant portraits are discussed in more detail in the following chapter of this thesis, “The Hunting Queen.”

\(^3^9\) There are at least five copies of this painting. Museo del Prado, *Catálogo de las pinturas* (Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, 1996), 137.
suit is hung upon his shoulders; but as he has an eye to his afternoon sport and is a great economist of his time, the black breeches are worn with all clothes.\footnote{H. Swinburne, *Travels Through Spain in the Years 1775 and 1776* (Dublin, 1779). Quoted in: Hull, *Charles III*, 148.}

In both Velázquez’s *Philip IV as Hunter* and Goya’s *Charles III in Hunting Costume* the figure of the king stands at full-length in a three-quarter pose, with the left leg slightly advanced. The backgrounds of both paintings depict a wide expanse of scenery. These similarities, achieved through his diligent execution of prints and drawings of Velázquez’s works, served both a political and stylistic purpose for Goya. There are multiple motives on why Goya would have looked to Velázquez for influence rather than earlier Bourbon portraits. Many of the reasons were artistic, while others were political and necessary to the survival of the Bourbon dynasty.

The Torre de la Parada portraits served a private function for Philip IV, but these same portraits served a very different function for the Bourbons. Sometime between 1747 and 1772 Velázquez’s hunting portraits were moved to the new Royal Palace.\footnote{Museo del Prado, *Catálogo*, 425-26.} No longer were they private portraits that served a self-reflexive function. Under the Bourbon rule they instead symbolized the continuity of the Spanish crown. Political reasons had much to do with the outcome of Goya’s hunting portraits. With the visual similarities that Goya’s hunting portraits of Charles III and Charles IV share with Velázquez’s *Philip IV as Hunter*, the Bourbon kings placed themselves firmly within the royal lineage. Because of the atmosphere of revolution spreading in Europe and the Americas, the Bourbons had an especial need to proclaim continuity that the Habsburgs...
did not. The monarchy desired to separate itself from the French Bourbons who were overthrown and executed in the French Revolution. Knowing that revolutionary ideas could easily spread to Spain and threaten their own power, it was wise to instead put forth an image of the longevity of the Spanish throne and associate it with its long past, in particular its Habsburg past.\textsuperscript{42}

In addition, the reign of Charles III was a time of increasing nationalistic tendencies. Among these was the recognition of a decidedly Spanish artistic past. Particularly during the years 1776-1778 reproductions of Spanish works were encouraged by academic and political dignitaries to document Spain’s artistic treasures.\textsuperscript{43} The project began with Juan Antonio Salvador Carmona, Director of Engraving in the Real Academia de San Fernando who created prints of paintings in the royal palace. In 1778 Goya was commissioned to make prints after the works of Velázquez.\textsuperscript{44} Surely since Velázquez was regarded as the master of naturalism Goya was probably drawn to his work but his primary motives for executing the prints may have been financial.

By comparing Goya’s prints with the paintings by Velázquez it becomes evident that Goya made his own artistic decisions when interpreting the paintings and this exercise informed Goya’s hunting portraits of the kings. For example, his print of \textit{Don Fernando as Hunter} (Fig. 14) has a number of changes from the original. The

\\[\\]


\textsuperscript{44} Ibid, 152. Goya struggled with the technique of etching and many of the images lack variations in tone. They are also not exact replicas as Goya changed many of the figure proportions.
Perhaps more important is that the dog has been replicated on a much smaller scale. The dog sits in the same pose, but rather than his head reaching the height of Don Fernando’s right hand, the dog only reaches his knee. Perhaps Goya thought that by making the dog smaller, it would make the prince seem larger and more imposing. In addition, Goya made the shotgun substantially shorter. The barrel barely reaches the shoulder of the figure whereas in the original it reaches the height of his nose. While this could have been a compositional choice, in reality the barrels of guns were becoming shorter as technology and accuracy improved. Despite the fact these were not exact duplicates, the prints were highly praised. Ponz said, “he has clearly shown his ability, his intelligence and his zeal in serving the nation, for which those who love Velázquez and Painting should be grateful.”

Although Goya used Velázquez’s hunting portraits for inspiration, there are stark contrasts in the paintings of the kings that were in part a result of a different time and a different monarch. In *Philip IV as Hunter*, there are no trappings of royalty and as Jonathan Brown says, he appears more “like one of the beaters that the royal huntsman.” However strange this may seem, it is largely consistent with most of the portraits of Philip IV. It becomes apparent that the ascetic nature of his portrait has less to

---


do with the setting, at the hunt, than with the monarch’s desire for minimalist portraits, empty of trappings of kingship. In both Goya’s *Charles III in Hunting Costume* and *Charles IV, King of Spain* (Fig. 1) the king instead wears a combination of hunting attire and court attire. While the jacket and hat may have been suitable for the hunt, it is unlikely he would have actually worn the sashes and the Order of the Golden Fleece while out hunting. The impact of the differentiation in clothing is clear when Janis Tomlinson says, “Comparing the portraits of Philip IV and Carlos IV—the one, a portrait of the king hunting, Goya’s of the monarch posing as a hunter.” Yet *Philip IV as Hunter*, is not an image of the king hunting either. True, his clothing is more fitting for the hunt, but he lacks any other indication that he is in fact hunting. Trophies of the hunt do not surround Philip IV, there is no game visible in the background, and there is no hunting entourage with him. *Philip IV as Hunter* is not so much an image of recreation as an iconic image of the king as a hunter, just like *Charles III in Hunting Costume* and *Charles IV, King of Spain*.

Hunting at the Spanish court not only was a necessity to be a fully competent and educated ruler, but also served an important part of maintaining familial bonds and the mental health of the ruler. Often the hunt could be a private affair, where the royal family could escape the constant public life at court. In other cases the hunt served as a vital form of entertainment and a way to forge political unions. Hunting paintings and portraits

---

47 Janis Tomlinson, *Goya in the Twilight of Enlightenment* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 86. The portrait has a pendant, *Queen Maria Luisa in a Mantilla*, which is discussed in the following chapter, “The Hunting Queen.”

48 Ibid, 86.
all embodied concepts of the benefits of hunting and demonstrate that the hunt was a
crucial part of both the public and private spheres of Spanish court life. Although
relatively rare, the Spanish royal hunting portrait was rejuvenated under the Bourbon
dynasty to back their propagandistic agenda, enacted to preserve their throne in Spain. By
moving the once-private Habsburg portraits to a very public space, commissioning
engravings of Velázquez’s works that were then sold to the public, and creating hunting
portraits visually akin to Velázquez’s hunting portraits, the Bourbons placed themselves
within the tradition of hunting portraiture, securing their place in the Spanish royal
lineage. While the hunt was still a recreation for the king, hunting portraits were redolent
with various meanings and purposes.
CHAPTER III

THE HUNTING QUEEN

The primary duty of any Spanish queen was to provide an heir to the throne. In their most basic sense, portraits of queens functioned as visual manifestations of the continuity of the monarchy. No matter the court or dynasty, all queens had the same obligation; to represent the fertility and stability of the dynasty, which was “a fundamental psyche as much as a political role.” However, often a queen’s duties expanded beyond this task and her portraits needed to project an image of majesty and control.

Although hunting portraits are not as prevalent for Spanish queens as they are with kings, the few portraits that do exist exude an image of majesty and power for the queen. For kings, hunting portraits represented their military prowess which reflected on their ability to govern and protect their people. In some cases hunting portraits of queens illustrated a pastime the queen and her husband enjoyed together, but in the larger sense they also show her ability to take over the reins of the government when needed.

A hunting portrait was especially important for those queens who took more of a leading role in the government, such as Isabel of Portugal, María Luisa de Saboya, and Isabel Farnese. Faced with the stereotypes that a weaker body also meant a weaker mind, a queen needed to put forth an image of strength and stability in order to maintain her

---

authority. Although living in a privileged place in society, queens were not held in the same regard as kings.

The images of Isabel de Portugal by an anonymous artist (Fig. 15) and María Luisa by Miguel Meléndez (Fig. 8), are interesting in many ways, but the majesty of a queen as a hunter culminates in Matías de Irala's print of Isabel Farnese (Fig. 16). Although the three hunting portraits of Spanish queens have drastically different aesthetics, all provide an image of physical strength for the women that would have reflected on their mental vigor.

Even though queens were expected and often did take on a predominant role in politics, their official role was supposed to be of a more passive nature than their husbands'. Steven Orso explains the dichotomy well:

The convention that distinguished active kings from passive queens reflected a simple fact of political life. Under ordinary circumstances the king exercised power, and the queen did not. The queen’s role was that of the king’s consort, a loyal mate who would provide him with an heir—preferably a son. Although a royal daughter might inherit the throne in the absence of a male heir, that seldom happened. More often, an infanta’s destiny was to marry a foreign prince in order to cement a political alliance that benefited the regime.²

Some writers, such as, Juan Luis Vives, thought that a woman’s nature was weak and that they were unfit to rule. Vives reserves praise for those with the purest feminine virtues, not the highest intellect.³ Even those who defended women still inadvertently encouraged


³ His text De institutione feminae christiane (The instruction of a Christian woman), 1524 was commissioned by the queen of England, Catherine of Aragon, for her daughter Mary. María Cristina
some of the prevailing stereotypes. For example, in an anonymous letter published in *El pensador*, (The Thinker) the author argues that there have been successful queens in the past. Their only fault was that they did not appoint more female officials. However the author’s reasoning for this is that women can use their beauty and intelligence to glean secrets and “attract men’s hearts.”\(^4\) Although the author claims that women can make good queens, he still portrays them as sensuous beings and their physical looks are still considered to be a reflection of their character.

Queens were expected to be submissive to their husbands. As Louis XIV warned his grandson, Philip V, ‘Kings, exposed to the gaze of the public, are all the more greatly scorned when they suffer their wives to dominate...The queen is your first subject. In that quality and as your wife she ought to obey you...’\(^5\) Yet, if a queen depicted herself as a huntress, it emphasized her power and strength. Huntresses were subject to the same physical benefits of the hunt and their portraits encourage these associations. In addition women were not exempt from the dangers associated with hunting. Women who hunted also took risks and some tragic accidents did occur as what happened with the first two

---

\(^4\) *El pensador* was a periodical by José Clavijo that ran from 1762-1767. There were many articles on women’s issues and many of them promoted sexist stereotypes on the nature and duties of women. Sally-Ann Kitts, *The Debate on the Nature, Role and Influence of Women on Eighteenth-Century Spain* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), 91-93.

wives of Maximilian of Bavaria who were killed while hunting.\(^6\) Thus a portrait of a woman also showed her bravery and not just her physical aptitude.

Although providing an heir was her most important task, a queen also had to maintain a peaceful household, which ultimately reflected the king’s control over his family. The effects of a good wife are explained by the Franciscan priest and moralist, Juan de la Cerda, “It is a known fact that when the wife tends to her duty, the husband loves her, the family functions well, and the children learn virtue, and peace reigns, and one’s wealth grows.”\(^7\) In many cases a queen’s duties expanded far beyond the realm of the household and she had to take a primary role in political matters.\(^8\) This happened when the king was traveling for extended periods of time, became ill, or died unexpectedly, leaving an heir too young to rule.

The use of masculine terms provided legitimacy to women’s actions. For example, Empress María of Austria (the daughter of Charles V), was praised for her piety and faith that she used as her weapon to fight the Turks in the east as her sons performed the same fight on the battlefield. Her valiant efforts were described in masculine terms,

---

\(^{6}\) Maximilian was a forebear of Philip IV. Svetlana Alpers, *The Decoration of the Torre de la Parada* (New York: Phaidon, 1970), 102.

\(^{7}\) Quoted in, Magdalena S. Sánchez, *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun: Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 66.

\(^{8}\) Fortunately there does exist impressive scholarship on Spanish queens and their political role is becoming more understood. There are texts that discuss the roles of specific Spanish queens. See: Theresa Earenfight, ed., *Queenship and Political Power in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2005). This series of essays focuses predominantly on the role of medieval queens, but there are three essays that deal with Renaissance queens. See: Weissberger, *Isabel Rules*. The chapter entitled “The Neo-Gothic Theory and the Queen’s Body” is particularly interesting. See: Sánchez, *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun*. The chapter, “Fashioning Female Models from Royal Women: Posthumous Accounts” is interesting in that it gives a picture of the legacy that former queens had.
'She fought in a manly fashion from the monastery, from the choir, with squadrons of heroic virtues.'\textsuperscript{9} In these terms, her masculinity is a compliment as it emphasizes her strength in prayer; strength being an attribute that typically only men are described having. However in many cases a woman’s masculinity counted against her, especially if her appearance was less feminine than that of other women. Isabel Farnese, the second wife of Philip V was often described as being too masculine and unconcerned with her physical appearance. Although the insults criticized her physical appearance, the slanders were really directed towards the government, in which she asserted a certain amount of control. In his complaint that the Spanish government was really under the influence of Isabel’s fellow Italians, Saint Aigan, the French Ambassador, denounced the queen saying she was ugly, and dressed and spoke badly.\textsuperscript{10} However, as will be discussed in further detail in this chapter, Isabel uses these masculine standards to her advantage in her hunting portrait to project an image of strength and control.

The earliest female hunting portrait of a Spanish Habsburg queen is the anonymous sixteenth-century portrait of Isabel de Portugal (1503-1539), a pendant portrait with one of Charles V (Fig. 17).\textsuperscript{11} In the painting Isabel stands in the immediate

\textsuperscript{9} Said by Jerónimo de Florencia, court preacher to Philip III and quoted in, Sánchez, \textit{The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun}, 63.

\textsuperscript{10} Teresa Lavalle Cobo, \textit{Isabel de Farnesio: La reina coleccionista} (Madrid: Fundación Caja Madrid, 2002), 59.

\textsuperscript{11} There are other portraits that show kings and queens hunting together. In some cases queens are presented in a standing double portrait with their husbands as if they are about to leave for a day of hunting or are already in the act. For example, Adriaen van de Venne’s \textit{Frederick V of the Palatinate and his Wife Elizabeth Stuart on Horseback} (1628) depicts the couple on horseback surrounded by their dogs and hunting party. Daniel Mijtens’ \textit{Charles I and Henrietta Departing for the Chase} (1630) shows the couple outside with their horse and groom, surrounded by small dogs that run, eager for the hunt. The king and
foreground. Her right hand rests on the barrel of an upright gun and her other hand loosely holds the leash of the dog who sits by her side. The queen wears a high-collared hunting dress and feathers in her hair. Her expression is solemn, consistent with her other portraits, such as Titian’s *Portrait of Empress Isabel de Portugal* (1548) (Fig. 18) where the queen, despite the vibrant and detailed rendering of her dress and jewels, maintains a serene disposition. In her hunting portrait, a tree in the center of the composition serves as the backdrop, underscoring the height of the figure, already elongated by the barrel of the gun and the vertically-oriented canvas. Charles V’s pendant portrait also shows him full-length in the field. His left hand rests on his waist as his right hand holds his shotgun which stretches the width of the canvas.

Isabel de Portugal played a prominent role in the Spanish government, often ruling while her husband was traveling through his vast territories. An avid collector of art, jewelry, clothing, and furnishings, Isabel was also able to concentrate power into her own hands.12 The majority of her portraits were painted by artists outside of Spain, often without contact between the artist and sitter.13 Unfortunately, since the artist of her hunting portrait is anonymous, the nature of the commission is unknown. As a huntress in this portrait, the queen is calm and reserved but is in control both of her powerful queen, dressed in sumptuous hunting garb, hold hands and gaze at the viewer. Although it is a hunting portrait, it retains aspects of formal royal portraiture with the classical architectural background and in particular, the cherub who flies above, sprinkling flowers over the queen’s head. While the king has a sword by his side, there are no other visible weapons that allude to what kind of hunt they are going on. However, the typical royal portrait setting and the presence of the dogs and entourage in the background demonstrate that the hunt was not just a pastime for the royal family, but a means of power and court ritual.


13 Ibid, 149.
weapon, and her hunting dog, which stands patiently by her side. While the hunting dress marks her as a female, she is shown as her husband’s equal at the hunt. The queen has the same attributes as her husband in his pendant portrait, the dog and the gun, thus showing she hunts in the same manner as her husband.

This is not the only example of hunting pendant portraits in Spain. Miguel Meléndez’s *Maria Luisa de Saboya* (1712) shows the queen as a hunter along with her husband in his pendant portrait, *Philip V*. The bust-length figure of the queen is close to the picture plane. The queen wears sumptuous clothing and jewels, and carries a gun upright. Philip V’s portrait also shows him in the field, dressed in opulent clothing. He cradles his gun, and gestures with his right hand towards the field behind him. In some ways María Luisa’s portrait attests more to her material wealth than it does to her skill as a hunter. However, it conforms to the predominant French style of the time in which rich trappings contribute to the majesty of the sitter. Although the queen’s clothing is fancy and she wears jewels, the shotgun and the outdoor setting signal that she is at the hunt.

Like Isabel of Portugal, María Luisa is seen as a companion to her husband more so than a hunter in her own right. However, these portraits are still exceptional in that they cross the usual boundaries for portraits of queens, replacing feminine objects such as flowers or fans, with powerful weapons. María Luisa de Saboya became queen at age

---

14 There are other examples of solo female hunting portraits. Paul van Somer painted *Anne of Denmark* in 1617. The queen stands full-length, dressed in an elegant emerald-green riding dress and accompanied by a black groom, a horse, and five greyhounds. She lacks a weapon of any kind. Anthony van Dyck’s portrait of Charles I’s queen, *Queen Marie Enriquetta with Jeffrey Hudson* (1633) shows the queen in full-length, dressed in a sumptuous satin riding skirt, accompanied by her dwarf Jeffrey Hudson. Particularly in Henrietta’s case the hunt seems far from a reality considering the formal setting complete with a column, drapery, and a crown. Furthermore the lack of a horse or weapon makes it seem as if she is wearing a hunter’s costume rather than preparing to embark on an actual hunt. These are just two examples,
thirteen and acted as regent when Philip was away fighting in Italy in 1702.\(^{15}\) María Luisa was adored by her people who called her \textit{la saboyana} (the Savoyard) and was often considered a model queen, particularly in comparison to Philip V's second wife Isabel Farnese, who was widely disliked.\(^{16}\) Although María Luisa was favored by her subjects, there were many diplomats who thought she was overstepping her queenly duties, meddling in affairs that were not her business.\(^{17}\) The king was inseparable from his wife and was utterly dependent on her companionship. She often accompanied him on his frequent hunting outings. As a companion portrait to that of her husband, it depicts the close relationship between the king and queen.

Often in outdoor pendant portraits, queens are not shown on equal footing with their husbands. For example, in the equestrian portraits painted in 1635 by Diego Velázquez, \textit{Philip IV on Horseback} (Fig. 19) and \textit{Isabella of Bourbon on Horseback} (Fig. 20), the differences are clear. Philip IV is clothed in armor and staring forward. The horse rears as if about to gallop towards the battlefield. In contrast, the queen is shown posed in a more passive manner.\(^{18}\) She sits on a horse in a richly embroidered gown. The horse

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \cite{Noel}
\item Isabel was initially praised for dismissing the Mme des Ursins. Ursins was María Luisa's \textit{camarera mayor} (mistress of the robes) but wielded incredible power, often working on behalf of French interests, thus she was seen as an oppressor of the Spanish people. However, many positions at court that were formerly held by the French began to be replaced by Italians. Those who were displeased with the change in the composition of the court blamed the queen for trying to “Italianize” the court. \cite{Ibid}
\item Kamen also argues that part of the resentment projected at María Luisa was because of the intense bond she shared with her husband. According to tradition, his advisors felt he should not be so publicly infatuated with his wife. \cite{Kamen}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
delicately raises its left leg as if trotting. The blanket that covers the horse impedes it from any quick physical motion. While Philip IV charges towards the battlefield, Isabella of Bourbon seems to be taking a pleasurable ride.

In some ways, the clarification of gender roles through portraiture was carried on into the eighteenth century. In 1765 Mengs painted Portrait of King Charles IV as Prince of Asturias (Fig. 12) and Portrait of Queen María Luisa as Princess of Asturias (Fig. 21). Thirty four years later Goya painted another pair of portraits for the couple, Carlos IV, King of Spain (Fig. 1) and Queen María Luisa in a Mantilla (Fig. 22). Both pairs depict the king and queen in outdoor settings but the locations differ so that each figure is confined to a space according to gender roles of the time; the women stand in gardens, and the kings in wooded areas.

In Mengs’ Portrait of King Charles IV as Prince of Asturias (1765) the king stands at three quarter length. He holds a shotgun in his left hand and a hat in his right. The background is a wild landscape complete with deer grazing. Mengs’ Portrait of Queen María Luisa as Princess of Asturias (1765) shows the queen at a three-quarter length standing in a garden. In her right hand she holds flowers while her left hand holds a closed fan. The nature of the commission, which is generally accepted to be for the couple’s engagement, as there were numerous copies made, provides insight as to why the queen is not depicted as a hunter. These two portraits delegate the official duties for each gender. The future king stands strong, in command of his weapon, his hound, and because of his hunting prowess, the government as well. The future queen on the other

---

18 Orso, Praising the Queen, 61-62.
hand, holds flowers, emblematic of fertility, her closed fan demonstrates her chasteness and purity, and her bracelet with a miniature of her future husband symbolizes her fidelity. Even if the queen enjoyed hunting, showing the queen as a hunter would not have demonstrated her duties as future queen. The setting is significant as well. The king stands in a vast landscape that is untamed. The queen stands in a controlled setting where potted plants sit and maintained roads wind into the background. The gate behind the woman keeps her within the grounds of the palace, as her duty remains inside the royal household.

Goya’s *Queen María Luisa in a Mantilla* and *Carlos IV, King of Spain* were part of a series of royal portraits commissioned in 1799 to replace the former official portraits of 1789. In *Queen María Luisa in a Mantilla* the queen stands full-length, clothed in a black mantilla and *basquía*. Her left hand hangs loosely at her side and her rings glitter against the black of the dress. Her right hand holds a closed fan and crosses her chest. In his portrait, Charles IV also stands full-length, but dressed as a hunter. Although the king wears the jacket and boots of a hunter, he also wears his monarchial sashes, formalizing the portrait. The king holds a shotgun by his side and a dog sits on the other. The previous official portraits, also by Goya, showed the sovereigns indoors; the king wearing formal court attire and sword, and the queen wearing an elegant dress and holding a fan. The background of each painting is the familiar court portrait type. It consists of a table with a crown and flowing drapery which envelopes the background. Perhaps to depart from these earlier portraits, the monarchs chose an outdoor setting for their new commission. However, because the 1799 portraits still functioned as their official images,
the portraits needed to encode the monarchs’ official roles. The king needed to be depicted as the leader in control of his land, and the queen needed to show her feminine virtuousness.

The setting is not the only departure from the previous portraits. Situations had changed significantly since the king and queen ascended the throne in 1789. Most importantly was the French Revolution. In 1793 Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were executed. Perhaps in order to separate her identity from the ill-fated French monarchs, María Luisa wears a *basquía* and mantilla, a traditional Spanish form of dress.\(^{19}\) As the monarchy was fostering a more solid national identity, showing the queen in traditional “Spanish” clothing encouraged the concept of a Spanish nation. The queen’s clothing served an important political function. As the monarchy was fostering a more solid national identity, showing the queen in traditional “Spanish” clothing encouraged the concept of a Spanish nation.\(^{20}\) By the same token, showing the king as a hunter placed him within the tradition of other Spanish kings. In particular with Goya’s homage to


\(^{20}\) This idea of a national dress was begun under the Habsburgs during the seventeenth century when Spanish fabrics and styles were promoted and there was an attempt to ban French fashions. Aileen Ribeiro, “Fashioning the Feminine: Dress in Goya’s Portraits of Women,” in *Goya: Images of Women*, ed. Janis Tomlinson (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 2002), 77. *Maria Luisa in a Mantilla* departs from Velázquez’s portraits of queens. Instead Goya uses his portrait of the Duchess of Alba from 1797 as his compositional model. See: Valentin Sambricio, “Los retratos de Carlos IV y María Luisa, por Goya,” *Archivo español de arte* 30 (1957): 85-113. During the French Revolution the resistance to foreign influence grew and the nobility began to model their dress on *majos* as they were typically figures of resistance. Although *majismo* was initially associated with bohemian life, it gradually spread across classes and embodied a Castilian spirit along with other “Spanish” concepts such as bullfighting and flamenco. Inspired by the growing popularity of *majos* as national characters, and the desire to create a Spanish identity separate from France, María Luisa was attracted to the fashion. This was not merely a costume put on for the portrait as the queen actually imposed the costume upon her ladies at court. Although the costume was worn by commoners, the lace, coming from France or Holland, was so expensive that the ladies of the court complained of the cost. Dorothy Noyes, *La Maja Vestida: Dress as Resistance to
Velázquez in the execution of this portrait (discussed in the prior chapter, "The Hunt at Court: Princely Education and Court Ritual") the concept of Spanish nationalism was encouraged.

Although not an official court portrait, Matías de Irala’s 1715 engraving of Isabel Farnese would have had a public audience as well. Because it is a print, there is the possibility that it was circulated and even more people would have been exposed to it than Goya or Mengs’ portraits. Of all the portraits of Isabel Farnese, perhaps none is as intriguing as her hunting portrait.

After the unfortunate death of María Luisa at the young age of 26, a new queen was needed to accompany Philip V. It was imperative that the queen be educated and faithful due to the delicate condition of the king, whose depression could send him into isolation at any random moment. The Italian Isabel Farnese had an impressive education, spoke various languages, and was a talented painter. This new queen, although deemed unattractive by many because of her smallpox scars, was an intelligent and savvy woman with whom the king became enamored immediately, rarely leaving her side. The arrival of the queen marked a change in the king’s disposition and the fine arts flourished.

---

21 Matías de Irala (1680-1753) was a prominent engraver during this period. His most famous work *Método sucinto y compendioso en cincosimetrias apropiadas a los cinco órdenes de arquitectura adornada con otras reglas útiles* (Concise Method and Compendium in Five Proportions Appropriate to the Five Orders of Architecture with Other Useful Rules) was a manual for painters, engravers, and architects. His print of Isabel Farnese was published in the exhibition catalogue for the 2007 show *Tesoros de Fuego, Arcañería madrileña del Siglo XVIII* (Alvaro Soler del Campo, *Catálogo de arcañería madrileña (1687-1833)*) (Madrid: Real Armería de Madrid, 2006). Unfortunately aside from the print’s appearance in the catalogue, there was no discussion of the print, its artist, or the nature of the commission.
Isabel’s character, art collecting, and participation in state affairs was to give her a lasting legacy.

In her portrait the queen stands in the center of the composition, on a stage-like setting. At her feet is a cartouche with an inscription that reads, “The Queen of Spain. Isabel Farnese Princess of Parma born 25 October 1692 and married to Philip V, King of Spain 16 September, 1714.” Isabel wears a hunting dress and holds a shotgun in her left hand, like a staff. Her right hand touches her gloves and hat which rest on a table. Also on the table are a book, musical instruments, a palette and brushes, and a portrait of her husband Philip V. Mathematical texts and tools and slain animals rest at Isabel’s feet. Behind the queen is a curtain, reminiscent of the typical backdrop of a royal portrait. However, it takes on a theatrical function, pulled aside to reveal a hunting scene taking place in the background. In this scene, the queen (surrounded by an entourage of groomsmen, horses, and dogs) shoots at birds overhead.

The print pays homage to Philip V by including his portrait; the figures of the king and queen mirror each other. Their heads reach the same height and the matching wigs visually link them. With the hunt’s inherent connection to the battlefield, the queen’s hunting costume does in fact mirror the king’s armor. However, the queen as a
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22 Francisco Javier Casaos Leon and Cecilia Valverde Fernandez, “Coleccionismo y gusto artístico de la reina Isabel de Farnesio (1692-1766) a través de los inventarios de sus bienes” in Murillo: Pinturas de la colección de Isabel de Farnesio en el Museo del Prado (Sevilla: Fundación fondo de cultura de Sevilla, 1996), 38.

23 “La Reina de España. Doña Isabel Farnesio Princesa de Parma nació a 25 de Octubre de 1692 y casó con Don Phelipe Quinto Rey de España 16 de Septiembre de 1714.”
dutiful wife serves as only a fraction of the portrait’s meaning, unlike other queenly portraits of this time period where it is often the main subject. For example, Miguel Meléndez’s *Portrait of Isabel Farnese, Queen of Spain* (1727) (Fig. 23), commissioned for the Royal Library shows the queen as a supportive wife. In the painting the queen holds a book opened to a page with her husband’s portrait. Isabel gestures to his image, praising her husband for the establishment of the Royal Library.24

Isabel’s two great loves, hunting and art, are effectively intertwined in the image. She once wrote, “The king and I go hunting daily, afterwards I have time to dedicate to one of my greatest passions: painting. I have painted a portrait of Philip and various heads of saints in pastel.”25 Her love of art is shown by the palette, and the portrait of her husband. Apart from her own artistic efforts, Isabel’s collecting achievements are well known.26 The construction of the palace of La Granja de San Idelfonso provided the queen with the opportunity to purchase new works of art to decorate the palace. Numerous documents attest to an active network of artistic relations between the Spanish court and Italy.27 The 1746 inventory demonstrates the dominant role the queen held as collector for the court. The king had collected 790 paintings, but that number was

---

24 This work was part of a series of six paintings that were to hang in the library. The pendant, *Portrait of Philip V, King of Spain* shows the monarch with his hand resting on a book. The other four paintings are portraits of the monarchs’ children. The Royal Library was Philip V’s first cultural establishment of his reign. More commentary on this commission can be found in, Ronda Kasl and Suzanne L. Stratton, eds., *Painting in Spain in the Age of Enlightenment, Goya and His Contemporaries* (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Museum of Art, 1997),132-135.


26 Isabel Farnese comes from one of the most esteemed families of Renaissance and Baroque artistic patronage. For an example of art from the Farnese court see, Nicola Spinosa, *I Farnese: arte e collezionismo* (Milan: Electa), 1995.
overshadowed by the 995 of a wider and more sophisticated variety that the queen added to the royal collection.28

Although Irala’s print conveys Isabel’s interest in art, above all the queen is portrayed as a hunter and hunting imagery takes on the predominant role in the composition. Not only is the queen holding a shotgun, but she wears a hunting dress and jacket and a slain boar, deer, and rabbit lie at her feet. Isabel grew up hunting and continued to do so when she came to the Spanish court, much to Philip V’s delight. Often the king, accompanied by his wife, would take refuge in the Palace of San Idelfonso when he was suffering from his depression to seek spiritual solace and spend time outdoors hunting.29 The writings of the Duke of Saint-Simon of 1721-22 are a somewhat dramatic rendering of Isabel’s life, but are often trusted as the most faithful of contemporary accounts written about the queen. According to Saint-Simon, “the most feminine virtue she has is her love of birds and animals.”30 Although other queens hunted, so noted by their portraits and surviving firearms, Isabel seemed to have a stronger passion for it than most queens. She even continued to hunt despite discovering that she was in the early weeks of pregnancy.31

---

27 Casaos Leon and Valverde Fernandez, Coleccionismo y gusto artístico, 39.
28 Ibid, 41.
29 Casaos Leon and Valverde Fernandez, Coleccionismo y gusto artístico, 38.
30 Ibid, 36. Although hunting became increasingly a sport that was also suitable for queens, the use of masculine terms in hunting manuals and the relative rarity of female hunting portraits implies the sport was predominantly a male sport. Judging by the surviving documents of Isabel Farnese’s life, she seemed to be particularly fond and apt at the hunt more so than most queens. Both María Luisa and Isabel Farnese have firearms that survive today in the Royal Armory, signifying they actually did hunt. Guillermo Quintana Lacaci, Armería del Palacio Real de Madrid (Madrid: Editorial patrimonio nacional, 1987).
In comparison to María Luisa, Isabel is depicted in a less feminine manner. The clothing itself is different—Isabel’s jacket and scarf share more with the male fashions of the time. Isabel does not wear any jewelry, save for a ring on her right hand. The most obvious difference is the wig Isabel wears, which is identical to the one her husband wears in the canvas next to her. As Edward Armstrong wrote in his book on Isabel, “...she spoke openly of her defects of appearance and character, and had none of the ordinary retinance of ladies in such matters...made no concealment of her preference for men’s society. It may be concluded that her character, like that of her great English namesake, was somewhat masculine.”

Although Armstrong was writing in the late nineteenth century and his remarks may be somewhat exaggerated, the hunting portrait does in fact exclude many of the normal objects found in a female portrait, such as jewelry, handkerchiefs, flowers, or fans. Isabel is depicted in a masculine manner, as is Christina of Sweden in her hunting portrait. Although compositionally the portraits differ greatly, the masculine costume of the sitters is comparable.

Sebastian Bourdon’s *Christina of Sweden on Horseback* (1653-54) (Fig. 24) was part of the Spanish royal collection as it had been given as a gift to Philip IV. In 1666 it was hung in the Alcázar and then in 1772 was recorded in the Buen Retiro, among
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31 Lavalle Cobo, *Isabel de Farnesio*, 60.

32 Edward Armstrong, *Elisabeth Farnese “The Termagant of Spain”* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892), 141. Elisabeth and Isabel are cognate names. The ‘English namesake’ to whom Armstrong refers is Elizabeth I.
damaged paintings. It is possible that Isabel was familiar with this painting while it hung at the Álcazar. In the portrait, Christina sits side-saddle on a horse that is posed similarly to those in traditional equestrian portraits. Behind the horse stands a young groom with a raptor and three dogs. The portrait differs dramatically from other hunting portraits of women in that the queen is dressed in a realistic hunting dress, something she may have actually worn in the field.

Apart from the portrait’s presence in the royal collection, Isabel had other significant ties to this great queen of the past. In 1724, Isabel Farnese made one of the biggest purchases for the royal art collection, the sculpture collection of Christina of Sweden. While the collection was impressive and made a significant contribution to the Spanish royal collection, this purchase also had its symbolic significance as it linked Isabel Farnese to one of the most powerful queens in history who was enamored by Isabel’s own people, the Romans.

Although the masculine rendering of Isabel is akin to Christina’s portrait, the composition of the Irala engraving differs from Bourdon’s painting and is instead more similar to an allegorical portrait. Often in an allegorical print the figure is placed in an architectural setting. In Irala’s print the queen stands on a raised platform. Below is an
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33 Museo del Prado, Catálogo de las pinturas (Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, 1996), 40.

34 Lillian H. Zirpolo, “Christina of Sweden’s Patronage of Bernini: The Mirror of Truth Revealed by Time,” Woman’s Art Journal 26, no.1 (2005): 42. In 1634 Christina became queen at the age of six, but to the surprise of many abdicated the throne in 1654 and moved down to Italy. Known to Italians as the Minerva of the North, Christina was a political genius and highly educated woman who spoke eight languages. Contemporary accounts attest to her indifference to fashion, reporting that she took little time dressing and often left her hair down, rather than pulling it up into an elaborate hair style like most women of high status. As if her indifference to an ideal feminine persona was not already evident on her clothing and hair in the portrait, she has also depicted herself riding on Bucephalus, Alexander the Great’s horse, so identified by the white star on his forehead as described by sources.
elaborately-framed cartouche with an inscription, also common in engravings. The cherubs crowing the queen are often found in victorious allegorical portraits. Furthermore, Isabel is surrounded by symbols that illustrate her education and achievements. The desk and floor are littered with musical instruments, palettes, and tools that illustrate her well-rounded education that includes both scientific and cultural aspects. These symbols that surround the queen are also prevalent in other examples of allegorical portraits.

Queens were sometimes shown in the guise of Classical goddesses as in the painting by Frans Floris of Queen Elizabeth I, *The Goddess Diana*, c.1560 (Fig. 25). Although this could be considered a hunting portrait, Elizabeth is shown not as a hunting queen, but as the ancient goddess hunting. A contemporary example to the engraving of Isabel Farnese is Nicolas de Largillierre’s *Countess of Montsoreau and her Sister as Diana and an Attendant* (1714) (Fig. 26). The painting shows the Countess seated, clothed in classical flowing drapery. She pats her dog while her attendant reaches up for her bow and quiver that hang in the tree.

Apart from portraits, Diana served as an important theme for the decoration of hunting lodges. For example, in the Venaria Reale, the hunting lodge of the Dukes of Savoy, the entire decorative scheme of the lodge revolved around the story of Diana.

---

35 For discussion of this portrait and other allegorical portraits of Queen Elizabeth see: Roy Strong, *Gloriana, The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1987).


The central hall of the lodge had a depiction of the goddess on the ceiling and the female members of the Savoy court were painted in hunting portraits on the wall beneath, showing the relationship between the mortal huntresses and the goddess.  

Spanish queens however, depicted themselves not as goddesses, nor in relation to them. With the public audiences that these portraits had, people would have seen the relationship and bond it brought between them and their husbands. In addition, they would have seen a physically capable queen, in control of a powerful and modern weapon.

A hunting portrait, by having associations with the physicality of the activity, portrayed a woman as a capable figure. The three Spanish hunting portraits of queens all give a sense of power to the sitter, but in very different ways. Isabel de Portugal is shown as a huntress in command of her dog and weapon. As a pendant to a portrait of Charles V that shares a similar composition and palette, the portrait shows Isabel as her husband’s companion, not his subordinate. Similarly the portrait of Maria Luisa shows her as her husband’s equal, but the painting is executed in a drastically different style from the earlier Habsburg pair, presenting an extravagant display of their wealth through rich fabrics and jewels. Isabel Farnese’s portrait however, is a portrait of a queen who is powerful in her own right. Rather than a rich display of jewels and clothing, Isabel takes on a masculine image with her clothing and wig and instead flaunts attributes of her

---

38 Castellamonte’s book of engravings devoted to Carlo Emmauele II of Savoy’s hunting palace of Venaria Reale, depicts a double equestrian portrait of Françoise –Madeleine d’Orleans and Maria Giovanna Battista of Savoy-Nemours at the hunt. Although the two women are depicted at the hunt, they are put in a Classical guise, as if resembling the goddess Diana. The decaying classical architecture behind the women reinforces this reference. Ibid, 116.
intellect with the objects in the portrait. Through the musical, mathematical, and artistic objects, one can understand her well-rounded education. Above all, however, the queen is shown as a powerful huntress. Even if a woman was considered to be exceptionally smart, she was still held back by her gender and could never be completely equal in Spanish society of the early modern period. Showing a woman as a hunter in some ways allowed her to push beyond her gender restrictions.
CHAPTER IV

THE FIREARM IN SPANISH HUNTING PORTRAITS

Man with this knowledge made the arquebus, and other instruments where powder demonstrates its rigor and strength, and there is nothing that has a more exact resemblance to lightning: for as in it are found fire, wind, and thunder, and the effects of great rigor, the same as are experienced in the arquebus, in whose din, and violent thunder, we see the effects of its force, for it hurls from it that which it has within its body; so that wherever it reaches, its effect is like lightning.¹

Alonso Martínez de Espinar’s book, *Arte de ballestería y montería* (The Art of Archery and Hunting) (1644) was published at a time when the firearm as an instrument of both hunting and war had been in use for many decades. Although traditional weapons like the crossbow were still popular in the hunt, the face of war was changing rapidly as the technology of firearms became more precise. The sheer force of gunpowder weapons sparked many debates on the ethical issues for its use on the battlefield and the safety issues regarding its application at the hunt. The gun’s prevalence in Spanish hunting portraits however demonstrates the royal affection for the firearm. Each hunting portrait of a Spanish king or queen included the figure with the latest gun; guns that had practical use in the field, not fancy arms. As the employment of firearms increased, their symbolism in portraits began to evolve. The skill required to safely hunt with a weapon so powerful that Espinar likened it to lightning, demonstrates the physical strength of the

hunter. Furthermore, the sitter's marksmanship would have also been admired. During the eighteenth century in particular, the presence of the firearm in a hunting portrait not only followed the portrait tradition, but also reflected Spain as a major firearms production center, thereby fostering nationalistic tendencies.

The firearm as a symbol has not been given its due attention in art historical scholarship. The majority of research on firearms has been by curators of arms collections or by historians tracing the development of firearm technology. While their contributions have been invaluable, they do not adequately address what it means to represent guns in royal hunting portraits. Because of its prevalence in Spanish hunting portraits, the gun represented not only a weapon of the hunt, but also symbolized a desire for Spain to keep up with the prevailing technology of the time. Despite some people's resistance to the weapon, defining it as a cowardly one, guns continued to play an essential role in hunting portraits. If the sword and generals' baton in a royal portrait symbolized victory in war and the king as a protector, then the firearm represented the king's victory in the hunt and his dominance over nature. Guns were becoming the predominant weapon in war, especially by the eighteenth century. Curiously, royal military portraits continued to follow the tradition of showing the king with a baton and sword. In the larger sense the gun also symbolized the associations between hunting and warfare that were stressed by court traditions and the writers of hunting manuals.

A royal collection of arms and armor represented the military might of a nation, a symbol of victory. Like other collections such as paintings, books, or tapestries, an arms
collection served as a visual manifestation of wealth. Monarchs with otherwise unsuccessful reigns could construct a positive legacy for themselves through a collection.

While many arms of the royal collection remained permanently housed in the Real Armeria (Royal Armory), limiting the audience dramatically, their presence could be circulated through their representation in painting, reinforcing this message of triumph and affluence. Often specific suits of armor were depicted in paintings. For example, Titian’s *Charles V at Mühlberg* (Fig. 27) shows the king in his armor that is still on display at the Real Armeria. In Lucas Cranach’s *Staghunt in Honor of Charles V in Torgau* (1544) (Fig. 5), Charles V carries an ivory crossbow that one can see today in the Alcázar in Segovia. People could see the craftsmanship of the armor and weapons in the painting without ever viewing the object in person. Hunting portraits followed the suit of military portraits of representing arms of the royal collection, but instead of armor and swords, they were firearms. Such loving attention is paid to the firearms in paintings that in some cases the gunsmith or the actual gun can be identified. For example, the gun that Philip IV carries in Velázquez’s *Philip IV as Hunter* (Fig. 2) is of the type made by the followers of Simón Marcuarte, the famous gunsmith from Germany who relocated to Spain during the reign of Charles V. In addition, the gun that Baltasar Carlos carries in his hunting portrait by Velázquez has been positively identified as the same gun his father used as a child.

---


When Philip IV came to power in 1621, there were a number of gun manufacturing centers in Spain, and there were already a substantial number of firearms in the royal collection begun by Charles V. Many pieces in the collection were fancy arms, arquebuses that were decorated with gilt engraving and kept in bags of colored velvet. Although fancy arms continued to be produced, they are not represented in hunting portraits. Instead, the firearms depicted in paintings are functional weapons, accurate representations of the kind actually used in the field. The three hunting portraits by Velázquez for the Torre de la Parada each portray the figure with a gun. Like Philip IV’s other portraits, Philip IV as Hunter demonstrates that the king did not rely on lavish accoutrements to show his majesty. The sitter does not carry a bejeweled or elaborately engraved weapon; even the barest shotgun was a mighty weapon. The gun itself almost stretches the entire width of the canvas, and actually had done so before it was shortened by Velázquez in which the pentimento is clearly visible.

By the time Velázquez painted Philip IV as Hunter in 1635, the firearm already had a significant and controversial impact on the world. Firearms were not always socially acceptable weapons for hunting, especially in the fifteenth century, when their production and use began to rise significantly. Even their use in war caused discord. The concept of military bravery was challenged by this new weapon that could easily be used by an infantryman to kill a skilled officer on horseback. With this technological

---

4 Howard L. Blackmore, Hunting Weapons (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1971), 218. This book provides a very detailed account on hunting weapons used from antiquity to the present. While his focus of the early modern period is mainly on England, many of the guns he discusses would have been popular throughout Europe.

5 Stephen V. Granscay, “A Wheellock Pistol Made for the Emperor Charles V,” The Metropolitan
development, popular romances spread that lamented the loss of knighthood, the most famous of these being Cervantes’ *Don Quijote*:

Those were indeed blessed times which knew nothing of demoniacal cannonading’s ghastly fury, the inventor of which must be in Hell, receiving his due reward for so fiendish an invention, which allows a vile, cowardly arm to pluck the life out of a brave knight, who without knowing how it happens, or from whence it comes, and in the full sway of that courage and energy which burn in brave hearts, is struck by a wandering bullet, fired, perhaps, by someone who fled in panic at the roar and glare when he touched off his cursed machine, thus cutting short and forever ending every thought, and indeed the very life, of one who deserved to live through all the long ages.  

There were other figures that accepted the growing use of gunpowder weapons in war, but preferred to keep the traditional weapons for the hunt. Emperor Maximilian I (1459-1519), considered to be a great master of hunt, banned the use of the ‘devilish fireguns’, and passed regulations against the use of firearms for hunting.  

Of course, Maximilian could not control the excitement over the technology that was becoming progressively more advanced.

Although crossbows were still being used, by the sixteenth century guns became popular hunting weapons. With the publication of Pablo del Fucar’s *Ballestas Mosquetes y Arcabuces* (Crossbows, Muskets, and Shotguns) (1535), enthusiasm over gunpowder weapons grew. However, some efforts remained even into the seventeenth century to

---


preserve hunting traditions. Several hunting manuals, such as that by Alonso Martínez de Espinar who held the post of “he who carries the arquebus for his Majesty,” describe how to hunt with firearms yet warn the reader of their safety, praising the traditional crossbow instead. Apart from being cleaner, cheaper, and quieter, the author also deems the crossbow to be a nobler weapon than a gun. In addition, laws were enacted to limit the use of firearms in hunting. For example, in 1613 the Spanish Netherlands issued an edict concerning hunting practices, many of which had been violated during the chaos of war. With the Twelve Years’ Truce in order, there was an effort to reinstate hunting regulations that not only preserved certain species, but also defined the aspects of a “noble hunt.” This hunt was for recreation and allowed hounds, a hunting horn, and a sword, but firearms and nets were prohibited. Susan Koslow describes how, “the noble hunt embodied conservative values: the old ways over newer fashions.”

Even into the eighteenth century, there was a certain amount of discord over the firearm in the hunt and regulations were passed against the common people’s use of guns. When Charles III was the king of Naples, he issued laws banning the use of firearms in hunting as the number of pheasants dwindled. He declared that only he himself was allowed to hunt with a firearm and others could use one not in hunting, but only in the

---


case of invasion. Although Charles III was fond of firearms, which will be discussed in
detail momentarily, he understood the consequences that came with allowing the firearm
during a hunt. By his time guns were more advanced and had greater accuracy, thus
making hunts more successful. Therefore many species of animals had to be counted
regularly and restrictions needed to be tighter in order to maintain game population. The
king’s regulation had a more symbolic significance—the curbing of firearm use was
intended to make the gun a royal privilege.

The Real Armería had been in place for centuries. It was founded during the reign
of Charles V during which he accumulated a substantial collection of arms and armor.13
The next important step for the armory was in 1559 when Philip II transferred his father’s
collection from Valladolid to the new capital of Madrid. Only second to tapestries, armor
now became the most admired part of the royal collection.14 In order to inventory the
collection, Philip II commissioned original watercolor drawings of the armor. Sarah
Schroth claims this documentation shows that the armory was inventoried more
meticulously than the royal collection of paintings.15 Throughout Philip II and Philip III’s

---


13 Granscay, *A Wheellock Pistol*, 117. The collection still contains eleven firearms that belonged to
Charles V.

14 Sarah Schroth, “Veneration and Beauty Messages in the Image of the King in the Sixteenth and
Seventeenth Centuries,” in *Spain in the Age of Exploration 1492-1819*, ed. Chiyoko Ishikawa (University of
Nebraska Press, 2004), 125.

15 Ibid, 125.
reigns, gunsmiths were employed to keep and maintain the guns of the collection, ensuring the safety of the royal family.\(^{16}\)

During the reign of Philip II there were two official positions, *Arcabucero de Su Majestad* (Gunsmith to His Majesty) and *Ayuda de Arcabucero* (Assistant Gunsmith). Each was provided with a salary, a house, medicine and was even exempt from taxes.\(^{17}\) Philip IV added an extra position of royal gunsmith but it was eventually eliminated due to the declining economy.\(^{18}\) When Charles II reigned only one active gunsmith was recorded at court.\(^{19}\) Likely this had to do more with the economy of Spain at this time than with Charles II’s personal desires.\(^{20}\) Hunting was still popular at court, evidenced by a new text that was published under Charles II’s reign which outlined the legislation of the hunt.\(^{21}\)

With the new Bourbon dynasty in control, there came a renewed interest in arms production under Philip V. Previous royal gunsmiths were not terribly restricted in their


\(^{17}\) Lavin, *Spanish Firearms*, 94.

\(^{18}\) Ibid, 95.

\(^{19}\) Ibid, 95.


\(^{21}\) Gaspar de Bujanda, *Compendio de las leyes expedidas sobre la caza, nuevamente defendida e ilustrada, practica civil y criminal en la material de reales bosques y sitios, y su expedicion en los tribunales* (Madrid: 1691). In addition, there is an anonymous hunting portrait of Charles II when he was a child that is in the Museo del Prado. He stands indoors in hunting clothes, holds a gun, and is accompanied by a dog.
work for outside clients. However the gunsmith to Philip V was paid a generous salary so that he would devote his work solely to His Majesty. Under the patronage of this monarch, an increasing number of guns were commissioned. During the decades that spanned the reigns of Philip V and Charles IV, Madrid became one of the principle centers of firearms production in Europe, supported regularly through royal patronage.\footnote{Soler del Campo, \textit{Arcabucería madrileña}, 26.}

It was Charles III who had the greatest impact on the \textit{Real Armería}, pushing Madrid as a major manufacturing center of firearms, which revolved around his own personal dedication to the hunt. Charles III kept the royal tradition of the hunt active through many ways. In 1760 he bestowed the honor of a uniform for his arcabuceros, or gunsmiths.\footnote{Lavin, \textit{Spanish Firearms}, 111.} In addition, Alonso Martínez de Espinar’s famous book, \textit{Arte de ballestería y montería}, originally published in 1644, was republished in 1761 under the patronage of Charles III.\footnote{Ibid, 20.} Evidently hunting methods had not changed significantly as this book was still useful a century later.

By the eighteenth century the gun was an essential element in a hunting portrait, but its symbolism was evolving. Although the hunt still involved traditional and sometimes even ancient methods, the gun took on a more prevalent role. Improved technology led to the production of smaller guns that could be used in the hunt. Considering Charles III’s drastic reorganization of the royal armory, it becomes evident that the guns in his hunting portraits carry on the long tradition of the Spanish hunting
portrait, but also represent the ingenuity and capability of Madrid as an arms production center.

Charles III divided the royal arms collection into two parts—the *Armería de la Real Ballestería* consisted of mostly locally-produced eighteenth-century hunting weapons while the *Real Armería* housed the historical weapons of the royal collection. As a manufacturing center, it was always under the protection of the court. The separation of the royal armory was a way that followed the hunting tradition of the Habsburg kings, but simultaneously separated the Bourbons from the previous dynasty by placing the older Habsburg weapons in one location and the modern Bourbon ones in another.

As discussed in a previous chapter, Goya’s *Charles III in Hunting Costume* (Fig. 13) followed earlier Habsburg artistic traditions. Goya had various motives for looking back to the Habsburgs. While some were artistic and political, they were also nationalistic. During Charles III’s reign, the pride in Spanish manufacture was burgeoning. Perhaps Goya’s homage to Velázquez was in fact a praise of the manufacture of Spanish painting, just as the gun’s presence in the painting praised *madrileña* firearms.

---

25 Soler del Campo, *Arcabucería madrileña*, 11. The *Armería de Real Ballestería* roughly translates as a royal hunting armory. *Ballesta* means crossbow and *ballestero* means huntsman. The collection had more guns than crossbows so the word likely evolved to encompass all hunting weapons.

The royal collection also paid tribute to the Spanish past by displaying historic arms, but also emphasized the continuity of Spanish arms manufacture by showcasing the new modern weapons that Madrid was producing. This collection achieved wide acclaim throughout Europe. It was only with the recent scholarship of the exhibition that took place in Madrid Tesoros de Fuego, Arcabucería madrileña del Siglo XVIII in 2007 that the prestige these arms gained in Europe has been recognized or that the Armería de Real Ballestería has really been discovered and researched.

The manufacture of guns was not merely to earn money for the state but it also had a necessary implication. Spanish arms were known for their high quality, decoration, and particularly for their safety. The royal hunt was so integral to court life that it was fundamental to have reliable guns as the lives of the royal family were at stake when using firearms. If one reads hunting manuals such as Arte de ballestería y montería it becomes apparent how necessary quality guns were as the survival of the king who used them depended on it, “Many unfortunate deaths have occurred from firearms; some from vengeance, others by accident, and others by the malice from the maker and seller of the gun.”

During the eighteenth century arms production thrived and the market grew outside of the court. No longer were all gunsmiths restricted to royal servitude: advertisements for the sale of shotguns and pistols were printed in the Diario de Madrid. An average person could purchase a shotgun from various locations, shops, houses,

---

27 Soler del Campo, Arcabucería madrileña, 11.

28 Ibid, 11.

29 Martinez de Espinar, Ballestería y montería, 26.
bookstores, or jewelry and watch stores. A very personal account about the purchase of guns appears in Francisco Goya’s letters to his friend Martin de Zapater. Goya often worked as an intermediary with the purchase and sales of guns to his friend. Just one example of this exchange is demonstrated in this letter from 1785:

The other day I was with the same gunsmith who told me what your gun might fetch, and after examining it again he pointed out the wear inside the barrel which he said would make it lose much of its value, but he would do what he could to sell it (and I believe him since I told him that if he manages to make a good deal he could make me a barrel and flint-lock, and this was agreed).31

Although firearms were more readily available, royal hunting land was still exclusive and it was a grand honor for anyone to get permission to shoot on royal land. In another letter Goya writes, “I have been serving the Infante Don Luis. It would take a long time if I were to tell you all the kindness and expressions of appreciation I have received from him. He has given me permission to shoot on his estate, and I shot many partridges recently.”32 It is apparent that at least in Goya’s opinion, the right to shoot on the prince’s land was the most gracious gift he was given as that is the only one he specifically lists in his letter. Goya was the most prominent Spanish painter of the time and an avid hunter himself; his letters and paintings provide valuable insight into the excitement of Spanish arms at this time.

30 Soler del Campo, Arcabucería madrileña, 26.


32 Goya to Zapater, 13 October 1784. Ibid, 151. Contrary to the quotation, the letter is not about hunting. Immediately after the quotation Goya laments that he had to leave the Infante in order to complete his paintings in the Church of San Francisco. This painting cycle is the actual subject of the letter.
Goya’s *Charles III in Hunting Costume* is one such example of the artist’s meticulous rendering of firearms. Apart from providing a key element in the compositional arrangement, giving a strong vertical that balances the diagonals of the sashes, dagger, and gloves, the gun has been rendered in painstaking detail. In particular the lock of the gun has been emphasized. The gleams of light and the dark metal that contrasts with the white fur of the dog make the lock stand out.

Because portraits functioned as part of his public image, showing Charles III with a *madrileña* firearm would reflect the success of the industry on the king who promoted it. Its obvious debt to Velázquez’s portraits of the Habsburg family places Charles III in the long history of the Spanish monarchy, legitimizing and stabilizing his reign. However, at the same time, the clothing and sashes distinguish the king from in predecessors in the Habsburg dynasty. The gun’s presence marks the tradition of the Spanish hunting portrait while simultaneously promoting the changes that Charles III created when he separated the royal armory. Because of the changing face of Madrid as a production center, the symbolism of guns in portraits changed, promoting both Spain’s past and present just as the separation of the royal armory did.

The history of Madrid as a chief firearms production center is relatively unknown and research into its significance has only just begun. The story of what exactly happened to the armory has only been recently published. The War of Independence marked the decline of Madrid as a key manufacturing center and instead operations were put into
place to save the most valuable pieces of the collection. With the destruction of the Real Armería de Ballestería by Napoleon’s troops in the last month of occupation, much of Madrid’s significant history of arms production was lost. During Fernando VII’s reign (1814-1833), the number of royal gunsmiths dwindled. Eventually under Isabel II (1833-1868) the post of a royal gunsmith was abolished. Although the War of Independence had hurt production, perhaps so badly it could not recover, the changing face of industrial production and factory-produced objects likely would have made the abolishment of a royal gunsmith inevitable. There were some gunsmiths who remained at court, but their duties consisted of mainly restoration and repair of the arms in the collection, or as inspectors of military arms. Catalogues of the collection continued to be published, such as José María Marchesi’s Catálogo de la Real Armería that was published in 1849 and again in 1854.

Although the firearm faced much scrutiny, it became the dominant weapon in war and a favorite of the kings in the hunt. Legislation against the use of firearms was enacted for the safety of people but it had a more symbolic significance for the royal family keeping the use of the firearm exclusive. As an essential accoutrement in hunting

33 Soler del Campo, Arcabucería madrileña. An entire chapter is dedicated to explaining the efforts put in place to save the royal arms collection. Many of the fancy arms were saved and sent to Cadiz for safe-keeping. Unfortunately most of the functional arms did not survive. Most of the Habsburg weapons were saved since being historical weapons, they were not priorities for looters.

34 Lavin, Spanish Firearms, 118.


36 Don José María Marchesi, Catálogo de la Real Armería (Madrid: 1849). Apart from recording the objects in the collection, the author credits Philip II for the establishment of the armory by moving the arms from Valladolid to Madrid, and Charles III who was responsible for the greatest increase of the collection.
portraits, the gun symbolizes many elite concepts. Skill at marksmanship is automatically implied with the presence of the gun. The king’s strength and bravery with his control over such a powerful weapon is present. In addition, there is a sense of patriotism, particularly for the eighteenth-century portraits where the guns serve as part of the hunting portrait tradition while praising Madrid’s modern manufacturing center. Despite the many lamentations for the loss of chivalry, the firearm persisted as a visual symbol of royal power and authority.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has shown that hunting portraits, with their varying functions and audiences reflected an image of monarchic power. Some were created for private purposes while others were redolent with propagandistic intentions. Although kings were expected to be skilled hunters, for the Habsburgs, hunting portraits were private, self-reflective images that would have only been seen by family and close members of the court. The Bourbons instead used hunting portraits in more public settings as a means for securing their place within the Spanish royal line. By transferring the Hapsburg hunting portraits to the Royal Palace and using them as the compositional model for their own portraits, Charles III and Charles IV attempted to show themselves as an extension of the Habsburg rule.

Although stylistic tendencies for portraits evolved throughout the decades, hunting portraits maintained their iconographic elements, which almost always included dogs and guns. Dogs were a source of pride for the king and reflected ownership and control. Just as the function of the portraits changed, so did the symbolism of the gun. As a symbol in Habsburg portraits it reflected the skill and power of the monarch. While it retained this meaning in Bourbon portraits, the gun also grew to represent the increasing nationalistic sentiment of the late eighteenth century, endorsing madrileña arms.

---

1 Guns are always present in the portraits but dogs are not included in Miguel Meléndez’s portraits of Philip V and María Luisa.
The hunt at court had many purposes that ranged from private recreation, to a public display where the king could show off his skills. Today hunting remains part of the royal regimen, acting as both sport and a means of diplomacy. Naturally as time progresses people’s ideas of what a king should be evolve, as do their expectations of his official portrait. In particular, when a king functions in a more symbolic role, as the Spanish king Juan Carlos does today, he is expected to carry on the traditions of his predecessors and be a symbol of stability, and a symbol of the nation. While today hunting is not necessarily considered training for the battlefield, it remains an admired skill and one that creates a bond between families and maintains relationships between rulers of different courts.

Royal hunting imagery is not unique to Spain or to the early modern period. Images of the royal hunt are documented in relief sculptures from ancient Assyrian palaces, Mycenaean palace frescoes, Imperial Roman decoration, medieval manuscripts, and modern day photography. All demonstrate that the hunt has remained firmly in the royal canon of iconography and representation. Although the hunt’s presence is stable, its meaning and function for rulers continues to evolve.

---

2 Adrian Blomfield, “Bear ‘hunted’ by King of Spain was Drunk on Vodka,” Telegraph, October 21, 2006.

3 Victoria Burnett, “Rumblings in Spain Over Royal Family,” The New York Times, October 14, 2007. Today Spain has a constitutional monarchy, where the king has little power over the parliament. While the royal family is popular in Spain, the institution of the monarchy is not, according to popular opinion.
Figure 1: Francisco Goya, *Charles IV, King of Spain* 1799
Figure 2: Diego Velázquez, *Philip IV as Hunter* 1636
Figure 3: Diego Velázquez, *Don Fernando as Hunter* 1636
Figure 4: Diego Velázquez, Baltasar Carlos as Hunter 1636
Figure 5: Lucas Cranach, *Staghunt in Honor of Charles V in Torgau* 1544
Figure 6: Diego Velázquez, La Tela Real 1636-1638
Figure 7: Miguel Meléndez, *Philip V* 1712
Figure 8: Miguel Meléndez, *Maria Luisa Gabriela of Savoy* 1712
Figure 9: Francisco Goya, _A Hunter Loading His Shotgun_ 1775
Figure 10: Francisco Goya, *A Hunting Party* 1775
Figure 11: Francisco Goya, *The Wild Boar Hunt* 1775
Figure 12: Anton Raphael Mengs, *Charles of Bourbon, Prince of Asturias* 1765
Figure 13: Francisco Goya, *Charles III in Hunting Costume* 1786-88
Figure 14: Francisco Goya, *Don Fernando as Hunter* 1778
Figure 15: Anonymous, *Isabel of Portugal* 16th c.
Figure 16: Matías de Irala, *Isabel Farnese in Hunting Dress* 1715
Figure 17: Anonymous, *Charles V* 16\textsuperscript{th} c.
Figure 18: Titian, *Portrait of Empress Isabel de Portugal* 1548
Figure 19: Diego Velázquez, *Philip IV on Horseback* 1635
Figure 20: Diego Velázquez, *Isabella of Bourbon on Horseback* 1635
Figure 21: Anton Raphael Mengs, *Portrait of Queen Maria Luisa as Princess of Asturias* 1765
Figure 22: Francisco Goya, *Queen María Luisa in a Mantilla* 1799
Figure 23: Miguel Meléndez, *Portrait of Isabel Farnese, Queen of Spain* 1727
Figure 24: Sebastian Bourdon, *Christina of Sweden on Horseback* 1653-54
Figure 25: Frans Floris, *The Goddess Diana* c. 1560
Figure 26: Nicolas de Largillierre, *Countess of Montsoreau and her Sister as Diana and an Attendant* 1714
Figure 27: Titian, *Charles V at the Battle of Mühlberg* 1548
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