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Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez (1599-1660) is considered by many to be one of the greatest artists Spain has ever produced. Velázquez’s artistic career lasted nearly 50 years, from the time he began his apprenticeship around age 12 until his death in 1660, with some 110 to 120 surviving works attributed to him. In Antonio Palomino’s (1655-1726) monumental work on the lives of Spanish artists, Museo pictórico y escala óptica (1724), the biographer clearly views Velázquez as his favorite painter for both his artistic output and for his success as a courtier. He saw Velázquez’s talent as proof that painting is a noble profession. No one could seriously argue against Velázquez’s artistic abilities. The question that can be debated is how Velázquez matured into the master painter he became and who influenced him in his development as an artist and as a member of the Habsburg court, and what evidence there is to that effect. In analyzing aspects of Velázquez’s equestrian portraiture of the family of Philip IV, circa 1635-1636, Isabel of Bourbon, Infante Baltasar Carlos, and especially that of the king himself, Philip IV, and comparing them with Titian’s (ca. 1488-1576) Charles V at Mühlberg (1548) and The Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand at the Battle of Nördlingen (ca. 1634-1640) by Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), it is possible to see stylistic similarities between the great masters (figs. 1-5). The event that proved pivotal to Velázquez in terms of the influence of Rubens and Titian on his style can be traced to a visit by Rubens to the Spanish court of Philip IV in 1628-1629. Rubens was on a diplomatic mission to Spain as a guest of the court to ascertain whether he could be of service in negotiating a peace treaty with England in order to put an end to the Thirty Years’ War. This event was significant for Rubens, as well, as it awoke in him a love of Titian that altered Rubens’s approach to his own work from then on until his death in 1640. Although Titian is profoundly important to the development of Velázquez, Rubens appears to have been the bigger direct influence, both as an artist and as a member of the court, and he
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seems to have acted as the catalyst for Velázquez to take special notice of the works of Titian within the royal collections that subsequently had an effect on his style. That being said, it is also clear that Velázquez did not abandon his own judgment and style as a painter. Despite his admiration of Titian and especially Rubens, Velázquez maintained his artistic identity. I will demonstrate that Velázquez painted the head of the horse and the face of the king in a copy commissioned circa 1645 of the now lost Rubens’s *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* of 1628 (Fig. 6). It is my contention that Velázquez modified the facial features of the horse as typically portrayed by Rubens, either for his own sense of aesthetics or to better please the tastes of the Spanish court. Velázquez was a mature and confident artist, even in the presence of the great Flemish master.

The time that Rubens and Velázquez spent together was important for both artists as it ignited Rubens’s passion for Titian (and subsequently inspired Velázquez to do the same), and created for Velázquez a mentor in Rubens. The career of Rubens became a template for Velázquez in how to become not only a successful painter, since Velázquez had already achieved recognition for his skills, but a world-renowned artist and ennobled courtier. This was the status that Velázquez most dearly wished to achieve, and it was through Rubens that he found someone with which to identify. Rubens’s influence can further be noted in Velázquez’s decision to travel to Italy for the first time (1629-1631). The equestrian portraiture by Velázquez, done after his return to Madrid, bears traits in common with both Titian and Rubens, as a comparison between the works confirms. A brief history leading up to this fateful meeting in 1628 will set the stage.

“There is hardly any noble of great name, neither prince nor noblewoman, who has not been portrayed by Titian, truly the most excellent of painters in this art.” This is a quote from Giorgio Vasari’s “Life of Titian” in his *Lives of the Artists, Le vite dei più eccellenti pittori,*
Titian was an Italian artist who exemplified the Venetian tradition of color and looser brushwork. He was famous for conveying a genuine likeness of each of his sitters. His portraits also resonated with the subject’s personality and a subtle sense of their power and authority. This is what established his reputation as one of the best portraitists to ever live and caused comparisons during his lifetime between himself and Apelles, one of the most renowned of the ancient artists, who was the painter to Alexander the Great. 

A painting that Velázquez would have known well was the life-sized *Equestrian Portrait of Emperor Charles V at Mühlberg* (1548) by Titian. This painting hung in the Pardo Palace when Philip IV came to power in 1621, and was used as the standard by which all other royal equestrian portraits would be judged. It was moved to the Alcázar’s “New Room” in 1623 to be the showpiece of that collection. Titian painted this work to commemorate the victory of the emperor’s forces at Mühlberg on April 24, 1547, when the Catholic emperor defeated the Protestant armies. Although Titian never visited Spain, he did travel to Augsburg, Germany, where he painted this canvas in 1548. Charles V was there to support the peace process between Catholics and Protestants in Germany, which unfortunately did not come about until after the decisive battle at Mühlberg portrayed by Titian.

By the time of the sitting in 1548, Charles was one of the most powerful men in the world. In the portrait, Charles V sits proudly on his cantering black horse, emerging from the tree line onto an open field. The colors of this work and the surrounding countryside are much darker than in Velázquez’s paintings. Charles is in full armor with gold trim, and wears full length black form-fitting boots. He has a mulberry-red sash over his left shoulder and wears the emblem of the Golden Fleece around his neck. His helmet is trimmed with the same color cloth, with a matching plume, as is the bridle and sheet covering his mighty steed. The horse wears a
helmet and plume in the same style as the emperor. In Charles’s right hand he carries a spear running the width of the painting at a diagonal matching the topline of the horse. The spear is meant to evoke both the image of Saint George as the Christian knight and to stand for the symbol of strength for Roman emperors. The emperor and his mount are nearly in profile.

The artist made sure to dress the emperor in the same style of armor that Charles wore in the campaign and the type of saddle and bridle worn by the horse. Titian researched everything about the day of the battle, including the weather and the breed of mount the emperor rode. The artist verified his findings with the Official Chronicle kept by Luis de Ávila y Zúñiga for the years 1546-1547. These items have been preserved in the Armory Museum at the Royal Palace in Madrid and are displayed on mannequins in much the same pose as in the portrait. Titian’s meticulous attention to detail aided the artist in creating a work with such realism. Indeed, though Titian utilizes a rather dark palette, by candle light it would have looked as if Charles was really riding along the palace walls, the light catching the glint of armor as he majestically passed.

Titian was influenced by Albrecht Dürer’s (1471-1528) print of the Christian Knight (Knight, Death and the Devil) (1513) in his depiction of Charles V (fig. 7). He likened the strength and fortitude that the knight displays while riding through a formidable countryside filled with danger to Charles’s image as a powerful and upright ruler. He also was trying to capture the essence of the Christian knight as written by the Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam in his work Enchiridion (1503). In Titian’s work the true attributes of leadership shine through his naturalistic presentation of the emperor, which retains realistic proportions between the rider and mount and depicts the great man with a neutral expression on his face. In this, he was influenced by the Roman equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius (ca. 161-180 AD)
The Equestrian Portrait of Colleoni (1481-1495) in Venice by Andrea del Verrocchio (1435-1488) and the Equestrian Statue of Gattamelata (1453) in Padua by Donatello were also works that Titian had seen and drew from for his portrait of Charles V (figs. 9 and 10). Titian was highly respected and considered to have captured both the man and the ruler in this work, thus bringing a new dimension to equestrian portraiture of the Renaissance. He was associated with the royal family of Charles V and his son and heir, Philip II, for over forty years.

The life-sized Equestrian Portrait of King Philip IV of Spain (1635-1636) by Diego Velázquez takes its simplicity of pose and powerful image of the king as calm and just ruler from Titian’s example. Before Rubens came to Madrid, Velázquez does not appear to have focused intensively on the paintings by Titian in the royal collections. Velázquez would have noted during the Flemish artist’s trip in 1628 to the Spanish court that Rubens was interested in Titian’s works. This work benefited from that influence. Like the Titian, this is a large canvas, measuring very nearly ten feet square. The king is shown wearing a classically ornate black with gold trim upper-body armor and matching pants to the knee. His lower legs are covered by form-fitting boots and appear to be natural leather, and include gold-colored spurs. The king’s face in profile is pale and he sports a jaunty, upturned mustache. On his head is a large, plumed black hat. Philip wears grey gloves and holds the reins with his left hand. In his right, the king holds the bastion signaling his power as a leader. It appears to be of wood, approximately two feet in length and held parallel to the horse, at what would be parallel to the ground if the horse were standing levelly. The saddle, breast plate, and bridle all match the gold trim of Philip’s attire, and are also richly embellished. The twin tails of the pink sash worn over Philip’s right shoulder flutter behind him, roughly parallel to the bastion. The male horse is a heavy set brown horse with black mane and tail, known as a bay. He has white markings on his legs, called
stockings, and a large white blaze running down his face. The jet black mane and tail are ample and flowing. The animal is in the advanced classical dressage pose known as the *levade*. He is balanced back on his hind legs with his forelegs lifted free of the ground. Velázquez shows the horse in the proper position, with his body at an angle slightly less than forty-five degrees. The mouth is open, indicating that the horse is working to maintain this difficult pose, but the ears are attuned to the rider and the reins are slack, demonstrating the ease with which Philip controls the powerful, willing beast. The portrait is set in the countryside, but little of that is visible as the horse and rider dominates the canvas. The background is an idealized countryside that does not draw focus away from the subject. It supports the prominence of horse and rider.

Velázquez’s *Equestrian Portrait of Queen Isabel of Bourbon* (1635-1636) is of comparable size to her husband’s portrait and orients the queen to the left to compliment the king facing right. These works were made to face each other on the western wall of the Hall of Realms. This room was the richly decorated central hall of the new palace called the Buen Retiro, built on the eastern edge of Madrid during the 1630s by Philip IV at the urging of the Count-Duke of Olivares. It is of equal size to her husband’s painting. Isabel presumably rides sidesaddle, but little is visible beneath the yards of richly embroidered dark fabric that cover all but the head and chest of her white steed. The breast plate and bridle compliment the queen’s drapery. Isabel holds the reins with both hands. The queen wears a grey ruff collar and a feather in her upswept brown hair. Her face is in a three-quarter pose as she gazes steadily out at her audience while her mount is in profile. She, like her husband, exerts little effort in directing her mount, but unlike Philip’s horse, hers is walking with the left foreleg raised daintily in a forward walking motion. The horse appears willing and is stepping out with the high knee action that was prized in Spanish horses. The breed of Isabella’s horse appears to be either an Andalusian
or Lipizzaner. These horses were often used for royal mounts and were capable of being taught the “Spanish walk,” an exaggerated gait that emphasized a high leg action and often used in parades or ceremonial occasions. This well-behaved animal steps alertly forward. Although the queen’s mount does not appear to be animated enough to be performing that gait, it does seem to be capable of it. Its gloriously long and wavy white mane and forelock cascade down below its nose. Again, the countryside around the queen compliments the horse and rider without upstaging them.

The work that was originally hung above a door between these likenesses of his parents is the *Equestrian Portrait of the Infante Baltasar Carlos* (1635-1636). This work can still be considered near life-size, though it is smaller than his parents’ portraits, at approximately 7 feet by 6. Velázquez portrayed the young prince on a spirited pony, with both horse and rider in a three-quarter pose. The heir is approximately six years old and is dressed ornately in a costume similar to his father’s in effect, though he is not wearing armor. The *infante* is in gold with a dark green tunic. He, like his sire, wears the pink sash with gold trim over his right shoulder. In his right hand is a wooden bastion, held pointing upward. A large black hat at a rakish angle completes his outfit. One reason for the pony’s rotund appearance can be explained by the original placement of the portrait above a door, with the portraits of the king and queen to either side, so that the viewer was looking up at it. Velázquez made allowances for the angle at which the painting would be seen.25 The *zaftig* brown pony with the incredibly long and full mane and tail appears to be in a leaping pose, with rear legs extended. It is very similar to the difficult *levade* move of his father’s mount, with forelegs raised off the ground, but the animal does not seem to be balanced back and holding the pose. Instead, he is charging forward with the little prince sitting calmly astride. Everything about the pose suggests that Baltasar Carlos possesses
the traits necessary to one day lead his nation as his father before him. The painting has a military air, but it is mitigated by the posture and composure of the Prince as if he were a king holding an audience with his subjects.\textsuperscript{26} The young prince probably had been introduced to riding by age six, but would have been too young to have mastered the advanced dressage moves of his accomplished father. Velázquez was wise to not show the \textit{infante} in the \textit{levade}, but rather to imply his future mastery of it.

In a slightly later painting, \textit{The Equitation Lesson of Prince Baltasar Carlos} (ca. 1636-1638), the young heir is shown in a riding lesson, clearly executing the \textit{levade} on his handsome black pony (fig. 11). Once again, the countryside that fills out the canvas is simple and meant to shine focus on the young heir. Velázquez expert Jonathan Brown identifies the riding master in the portrait as the Count-Duke of Olivares, the king’s chief advisor (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{27} The royal parents are shown in the background on the balcony. The implication is that Olivares is the man behind the crown, and that he has been entrusted with directing the future king with the knowledge and approval of the current royal couple.\textsuperscript{28}

Work on the Palace of the Buen Retiro began in the 1630s at the urging of the Count-Duke of Olivares (fig. 13).\textsuperscript{29} It began as a small addition to the church of San Jerónimo to be used for royal lodgings and quickly became a large palace set in a beautiful and grand park.\textsuperscript{30} Olivares encouraged the conception and construction of the Buen Retiro and raised the funds necessary for its completion. He was actively involved in every phase and detail of the palace.\textsuperscript{31} The Buen Retiro was meant to be a symbol for political and social power.\textsuperscript{32} Unfortunately, the buildings of the Buen Retiro were poorly constructed and soon began to decay. By the 19\textsuperscript{th} century very little of the complex was left save for the park. As the fortunes of Spain declined, the Buen Retiro became a symbol of bad management and needless waste. The money spent on
the palace and its decoration could have been applied to help keep the monarchy strong, it was thought. War and neglect completed the downfall of the palace of the Buen Retiro. It became a symbol of the personal failure of Olivares to execute successful governmental policies during his tenure as well as for the general decline of Spain under Philip IV’s leadership.33

Velázquez was to complete the equestrian portraits of Philip IV, Isabel of Bourbon, and Baltasar Carlos, as well as those featuring the parents of the king, Philip III and Margarita of Austria, for the Hall of Realms, the most prestigious and richly decorated hall in the new palace of the Buen Retiro (fig. 14).34 The king commissioned these work from Velázquez in 1634, with completion set for 1635.35 Philip IV and Baltasar Carlos were done entirely by Velázquez, while Philip III and Margarita of Austria were paintings that were reworked from canvases previously completed. The original artists may have been the court painters to Philip III, since they would have known these royal personages. While the face of the queen and the horse in the portrait of Isabel of Bourbon was painted by Velázquez, the intricate drapery was largely completed by one or more of his assistants.36 Included in the program of the Hall of Realms were paintings depicting the battle triumphs of Spain, including Velázquez’s Surrender of Breda (1635).37 These works were meant to celebrate the triumphs of the Habsburg monarchy and to present the young Philip IV as a strong and mighty leader able to rule Spain.38

Philip IV came to power on March 31st, 1621, just shy of his 16th birthday. His father, Philip III, had died suddenly, and his son was ill-prepared to rule.39 The Spanish empire had been in decline under the rule of Philip III.40 The young monarch relied on the advice and guidance of the Count of Olivares (later elevated to Count-Duke), don Gaspar de Gúzman, for the governing of the Spanish empire.41 The Count-Duke of Olivares was a dedicated servant to the king and to Spain. He wanted to help Philip return Spain to its former glory as a leading
world power. Olivares offered numerous ideas to reorganize the way in which the realm was
governed. He also tried to reinvigorate the stalled Spanish economy. In order to carry out his
plans, the count replaced many government officials with people in whom he could trust. This
created enemies among those displaced. His aim was to recapture the time of prosperity in
Spain so that the nation would be able to defend its territories and to protect and defend the
Catholic faith. These were the traditional missions of the empire, in his view.

In addition to influencing the official policies of Spain, Olivares set himself to mold the
young monarch into a cultured and refined model of kingly virtues. Olivares encouraged Philip
to take on the persona and the pursuits of a king who would exemplify the majesty and splendor
of the great Spanish leaders of the past. The Count-Duke supported the king in developing his
love of the arts and literature. He also urged Philip to take an interest in horses and hunting. A
public perception of Philip as the embodiment of virtue and strength was central to his plan in
the revitalization of Spain. Olivares was shrewd in valuing the fine arts as a way of furthering
the glory of the monarch among his people and the world and he actively sought opportunities to
utilize visual representations to this end. The Count-Duke desired to attain the services of the
best artists Spain had to offer, which is where the young Sevillian painter, Velázquez, comes in.

Seville was the third largest city in Europe in the early 17th century when Velázquez was
born. It was a busy, cosmopolitan port city, with the Guadalquivir River connecting it to the
Mediterranean. The city also had the negative factors of a growing port city, such as narrow
streets, crime, and dirt. Still, Velázquez’s hometown was on the forefront of sophistication and
was immersed in the latest trends in art, especially the new emphasis on naturalism. The
naturalistic style met the needs of the Counter-Reformation Catholic Church, which wanted the
public to imagine themselves as present and part of the religious experiences depicted in
Spanish art of the time took into consideration a growing interest in secular themes and painters increasingly created works featuring street scenes and other non-religious subject matter. Artists were influenced by the new humanist ideas and literature that were circulating at the time.

Velázquez was born to Joao Rodríguez Silva and Jerónima Velázquez in the spring of 1599. His father was of Portuguese heritage and his mother was from Seville. He was baptized on June 6, 1599. Velázquez believed that his father’s family was of noble birth, but this claim was not substantiated by proof. His claim would come into play later in his career when the artist sought to be officially ennobled at the court of Philip IV, a quest that took a number of years but was eventually successful. Velázquez’s family was a cultured one, and the young Velázquez was exposed to all that the crowded, vital, multicultural metropolis had to offer.

The innovative technique and daring realism of Velázquez’s works reflected the influence of the new visual aesthetic and literary forms popularized in 17th-century Spain. Velázquez’s technique is sometimes likened to the innovative Italian master, Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio (1571-1610). It is possible that the Spanish painter could have seen works by Caravaggio, or by one or more of his followers, but it is more likely that Velázquez developed his dramatic use of light and naturalistic style independently. Of the known Caravaggesque paintings taken to Spain in the early 17th century, none were taken to Seville while Velázquez was living there, and travel was difficult within Spain.

Another influence on painters of the early 17th century was literature. The same forces that had influenced tastes in literature had an effect on painting. Picaresque novels looked to the peasant world for their protagonists. “Picaresque” stems from pícaro, which means “rogue.” This implied a sly and crafty person of low character and humble origins. In the sense of
novel, it came to mean someone of low birth who lived by their wits as best they could. The popularity of the picaresque novel lasted from 1554 to 1646. One of the earliest and most widely read picaresque novels was published anonymously as *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554). These novels were popular in Spain and set the stage for the acceptance of similar characters depicted in paintings. Although not specifically created to reflect picaresque novels, Velázquez’s genre paintings lent themselves to a visual representation of the lives of common Spanish peasants, as presented in such books.

A good example of Velázquez’s early style that encompasses the taste for picaresque subject matter is embodied in *The Waterseller of Seville* (ca. 1618-1623) (fig. 15). It was singled out by Palomino as one of Velázquez’s most famous works. His proof of its regard was that it was still in the Palace of the Buen Retiro when Palomino wrote his biography of Velázquez for his monumental work, *Museo pictórico y escala*, published in 1724. *The Waterseller of Seville* (ca. 1618-1623) is an example of the new classification of genre painting in 17th century Spain, called the *bodegón*. This “kitchen scene” was completely new in the world of genre paintings. As a sophisticated and innovative city, Seville was immersed in this new aesthetic. Velázquez’s *bodegones* were known for their crisp naturalism and clear presentation of subject matter. Everyday objects and common people were treated with an intense scrutiny that made every texture appear tangibly real. *The Waterseller of Seville* (ca. 1618-1623) stands out as the pivotal work between Velázquez, the young artist, and Velázquez, the mature professional.

Skilled effects in illusionism were greatly praised in the Baroque era. Before this time, Spanish painting had taken its style primarily from the classical ideal of beauty. In the 16th century and into the 17th, the Spanish greatly valued Italian and Flemish styles and preferred that the Spanish artists paint in that manner. Subsequently, many highly regarded Spanish artists
were trained in Italy, such as Gaspar Becerra (1520-1570) from Andalucía, Spain. He trained in Italy from the mid-1540s to 1557. Upon his return to Spain, he was hired by Philip II in 1562 to decorate the Alcázar and the Pardo Palace with frescoes (fig. 16). Becerra’s works utilize the colors and forms of the Italian mannerist style. Velázquez, however, preferred to use a limited palette and dazzle with his virtuosity instead of relying on a wide choice of pigments. He was also known for his adept brushwork. The artist varied the stroke length to suit the particular effect that was best for each composition. He could paint loosely or in a highly controlled manner, depending on his need.

All of the new trends in art and literature suited the young Velázquez well, as he took the intellectual and artistic training that he received from his teacher and future father-in-law, Francisco Pacheco (1564-1654), and added to it his penchant for working from nature to create a new way for the artist and the viewer to communicate via imagery. Pacheco’s household was an intellectual one and Velázquez received a good education there, in painting as well as in literature and art theory. Velázquez took his exam in Seville to become a painting master on March 14, 1617. Pacheco and Juan de Uceda administered the test. They asked that his license be valid throughout the kingdom, although this was unusual. Generally, licenses were good only on a local level. This was a testament to the high regard in which Pacheco and others held Velázquez’s talent. With his license approved and with it, his ability to make a living, Velázquez married Juana Pacheco, daughter of his teacher, when he was nineteen and she was sixteen. It was time for him to begin his professional career, and he set his goals high.

Philip II had decided to make Madrid the permanent seat of government in 1561. Before that, the court had traveled, settling itself in turns in the principal cities of the central plain. Toledo, Valladolid, and Segovia were favored with the most frequent visits by the court.
Madrid was considered a small town compared with these other cities, but it had a dry climate and a minor river, the Manzanares. It was extremely hot in summer and frozen by icy winds in winter, but it was located at virtually the precise center of the Iberian Peninsula (fig. 17). Symbolically, this would show Philip II as a king interested in representing all of his lands equally. Spain was a collection of kingdoms, with each region retaining its own individuality and identity. It was important that the king be seen as fair towards all his subjects to prevent unrest and jealousy. From its central location, Madrid was equidistant from its prosperous northern city centers and its up and coming southern regions. This was a distinct advantage for effect rule of the empire.

Madrid was close to the mountains of the Guadarrama range and had abundant game for royal hunting parties (fig. 18). Toledo was too wet for the queen’s health. The Alázar royal palace was already in place, as was the monastery of San Jerónimo, an important religious center. Madrid also had the Pardo palace just to the north of the city, which was considered a convenient country estate and good for royal hunts. The city officials of Vallodolid tried to lure the court back, as it was where the legal tribunal was situated, and it had frequently hosted the parliament of Castile. Philip II was born there, in fact, in 1527. During Philip’s rule (r. 1556-1598), however, a group of non-believers was burned at the stake in 1559 and he was offended that there were heretical sects within the city. Philip II relocated the court, never to return. Under Philip III, however, the court did move back to Vallodolid in 1601, at the urging of the Duke of Lerma, Francisco de Sandoval y Rojas (1552-1625). The Duke of Lerma was the chief advisor to the king during the reign of Philip III (r. 1598-1621). Even with the Duke’s influence, by 1606 the government was once again situated in Madrid. It was to Madrid that the
ambitious young Sevillian painter needed to go in order to attain the job he wanted: court painter to Philip IV.

Velázquez needed the sponsorship of powerful allies to be introduced to the royal court, as would any young and yet-to-be-established artist. Velázquez’s connection with the artist and teacher, Francisco Pacheco, provided him with friends willing to help in his quest for a royal appointment. Luis de Alcázar (1554-1613) and Juan de Fonseca y Figueroa (1585-1627) had belonged to Pacheco’s circle of intellectual and artistic friends in Seville and recognized the talents of the young artist.81 Fonseca y Figueroa was the first owner of Velázquez’s The Waterseller of Seville (ca. 1618-1623).82 Upon his death, Velázquez ascribed a monetary worth to this painting as the most valuable of Fonseca y Figueroa’s collection.83 Fonseca y Figueroa was especially devoted to helping Velázquez and had access to the members of the court in Madrid through his job as sumiller de cortina (chaplain of the Royal Chapel with significant ceremonial function).84 He owed his appointment to his relative, the Count-Duke of Olivares.85

The Count-Duke was an early supporter of Velázquez’s appointment to the royal court, for he recognized the talent of the young artist and how that ability could help in Olivares’ plans to establish the perception of Philip IV as a strong ruler.86 For his part, Philip wanted to be associated with his grandfather, Philip II, and especially his great-grandfather, Charles V, who were both seen as exemplary rulers who embodied all of the kingly virtues of strength, fairness, and majesty. Philip’s father, Philip III, was believed to have been a corrupt king who weakened the country and his son wanted to distance himself from that image.87 Velázquez could help with that.

Philip IV already had six royal painters in his employ when Velázquez visited the court in 1622.88 Velázquez was not offered a position with the royal court on this first visit to Madrid,
probably because it was difficult to justify adding a seventh painter. He returned to Seville for several months but returned in the summer of 1623.\textsuperscript{89} One of the court painters, Rodrigo de Villandrando, died in December of 1622. This was good news for Velázquez in that it opened up a position in the royal court for an artist.\textsuperscript{90} Pacheco chronicled the second visit to the court by Velázquez in his biography of the artist. Velázquez was to paint a portrait of the Infante first, but then it was changed to a portrait of the king. Velázquez completed this on August 30\textsuperscript{th}, 1623, to the acclaim of all and especially of the royal family, according to Pacheco.\textsuperscript{91} The portrait of the king that won Velázquez the position is possibly the \textit{Bust of Philip IV} (1623) (fig. 19).\textsuperscript{92}

Pacheco further recounted that Olivares praised Velázquez and ordered him to move his household to Madrid. When Velázquez was recalled in 1623, he brought his servant and student Juan de Pareja (1606-1670) with him.\textsuperscript{93} Velázquez would be given a position with the royal family as a court painter with favorable terms of employment.\textsuperscript{94} He was to earn 20 ducats per month as well as payment for works completed and medical care.\textsuperscript{95} Plus, he would be the portraitist to the king, the only artist allowed to paint the king from life.\textsuperscript{96} Velázquez rose very quickly through the ranks of the court painters. In short order, Velázquez was given the office of Gentleman of the King’s Wardrobe and the Key to the King’s Chambers. Eventually, he was made Gentleman of the Bedchamber in 1643, according to Palomino.\textsuperscript{97} This caused jealousy among the other artists. They had been valued more highly by the court during the reign of Philip III and did not enjoy having their prestige usurped by the young man from Seville.\textsuperscript{98}

There is ample surviving evidence that Vicente Carducho (1568-1638), Eugenio Cajés (1577-1642), and Bartolomé González y Serrano (1564-1627), the pintores del rey, had difficulty in their relationships with Velázquez.\textsuperscript{99} Velázquez received better treatment than his co-workers from the start of his employment. He had received a higher salary and he was paid for his
The newly hired artist was given a studio located near the rooms of the Count-Duke of Olivares and the king on the main floor of the Alcázar of Madrid, the primary home of Philip IV. Philip IV would visit Velázquez frequently in his studio. Palomino likens this favor to how Alexander the Great would visit the great painter Apelles when he worked. Velázquez was 24 when he was hired at the court and the king was 18. The other court painters, in their 40s and 50s, were significantly older and had been part of the court of Philip’s father, Philip II. Philip IV and Velázquez were closer in age than the other court painters and this may have been a factor in the budding relationship between the monarch and his new court painter. Philip must also have held the skills of the artist in high regard since Velázquez had access to the king for portraits, the only royal painter allowed this honor. Later on, when Velázquez left to study in Italy for a year and a half, Philip IV did not allow any portraits of himself or his infant son Baltasar Carlos to be made in Velázquez’s absence. This was high praise, indeed.

Velázquez was the first artist commissioned to create a painting specifically for the New Room of the Alcázar (fig. 20). He painted the now lost *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (1625), which hung as a companion work to *Equestrian Portrait of Charles V at Mühlberg* (1548) by Titian. Under Philip III, the southern façade of the Alcázar in Madrid had been redone with a screen façade that hid the old irregular facade of the palace. Architect Juan Gómez de Mora created a large two story room above the main entrance, referred to as the “New Room.” It needed to be decorated by the mid-1620s from the royal collection. Sometime after May 18, 1623, the *Equestrian Portrait of Charles V at Mühlberg* (1548), among other works, was brought to the New Room of the Alcázar from the Pardo palace, a royal residence on the outskirts of Madrid to the north. It was most likely hung there around September 11, 1624.
Pacheco reported how Velázquez’s painting was praised by the court but awakened the jealousy of the other court painters. This stirred up the rivalry, and Carducho, Cajés, and González each painted works that were also hung in the New Room by December of 1626, although none of them have survived. All were of comparable size with the Velázquez and the Titian. This failed to settle the question of artistic superiority, so Philip ordered a competition between Velázquez, Carducho, Cajés, and Angelo Nardi (1584- ca. 1663/65), who was a painter to the king since 1625 but not on salary. All four would paint as their subject “Philip III and the Expulsion of the Moriscos” so that they could be judged in a direct comparison. Velázquez won, though none of the works have survived. His painting was hung in the New Room as a prize for winning the competition. Velázquez was appointed to the position of pintor de cámara on September 18, 1628. The former holder of the senior post, Santiago Morán the Elder, had died in 1626 but the position had remained open until the king chose to fill it. This was an official acknowledgment by Philip that Velázquez was the painter of the court that he held in the highest regard.

Peter Paul Rubens visited the palace in Madrid at the invitation of Philip IV, and remained there from mid-September, 1628 until April 29, 1629. He spent approximately eight month at the Alcázar. Philip wanted to ascertain whether Rubens could aid in negotiating peace between Spain and England. The war had been going on since 1625. Rubens had a number of connections with high level English officials of which the king wanted to make use. Rubens was regarded as one of the foremost courtiers and artists of his day and he was successful in bringing about the Anglo-Spanish peace of 1630. Still, he was first and foremost an artist. Rubens wrote to his friend Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc on December 2, 1628:
Here I keep to painting, as I do everywhere, and already I have done the equestrian portrait of His Majesty, to his great pleasure and satisfaction. He really takes an extreme delight in painting, and in my opinion is endowed with excellent qualities. I know him already by personal contact, for since I have rooms in the palace he comes to see me almost every day.\footnote{117}

Rubens had visited Spain in 1603, but the works of Titian did not have the same seductive power over him as on this trip in 1628.\footnote{118} The Flemish artist painted five portraits of Philip IV, including the equestrian portrait mentioned above and meant to hang opposite Titian’s \textit{Charles V at the Battle of Mühlberg} (ca. 1548) in the Alcázar.\footnote{119} Rubens copied many works, as well. Copying was considered to be the best way to study and learn, and he had done this practice throughout his career. Subsequently, Rubens had created a wealth of works from which he could draw for inspiration for the rest of his career.\footnote{120} Francisco Pacheco wrote in his \textit{Arte de la Pintura} (published 1649) that Rubens copied every work by Titian in the Spanish Royal Collections.\footnote{121} This may be overstating things a little, but several of the copies of Titian by Rubens have survived. Twenty-eight paintings by Rubens after Titian were recorded in the Flemish artist’s estate, painted during his 1628-1629 trip to Madrid.\footnote{122} In all, twenty-one portraits after Titian were mentioned in the estate inventory, but not all of these were done during his visit in 1628-1629.\footnote{123}

Rubens did not always create faithful copies, however, but instead displayed what he was focusing on in his attempt to understand the technique of the artist he was copying.\footnote{124} \textit{Adam and Eve} (1628-1629) by Rubens is a case in point (fig. 21). This work is a copy of a work by Titian. Rubens copied Titian’s \textit{Adam and Eve} (ca. 1550) during his stay in Madrid but made a number
of changes (fig. 22). Titian’s original was painted for Philip II. The Flemish master used a brighter color palette than Titian. Rubens based his figure of Adam on the Belvedere Torso (ca. 1st century BC) by Athenian sculptor Apollonios (fig. 23). The painter was well acquainted with the sculpture from the Vatican Museum in Rome. The torso had been unearthed in Rome in the late 15th century and had been added to the collections at the Vatican sometime between 1530 and 1536. Rubens’s Adam is larger and more muscular, reflecting the influence of the Belvedere Torso. Another change is that Titian’s Adam is leaning back farther than the Rubens’s figure. Also, Rubens included a parrot to his composition, to symbolize goodness and redemption, whereas the original by Titian only includes a fox, representing lust and evil. Philip IV bought Rubens’s copy sometime after the artist’s death in 1640 and it currently resides in the Prado Museum in Madrid, as does the Titian original.

As a famous artist, Rubens had a freedom of movement that allowed him to be an effective negotiator, intermediary, and spy. He was comfortable dealing with powerful people, as well, making him a valuable diplomatic tool. Rubens quickly won the trust of Philip IV, the Count-Duke of Olivares, and Don Diego de Messia, Philip’s chief minister. Philip IV and Rubens shared a love of painting and a love of their children. Rubens wrote of Philip IV to his friend Jan Gaspar Gevartius (1593-1666) on December 29, 1628: “The King alone arouses my sympathy. He is endowed by nature with all the gifts of body and spirit, for in my daily intercourse with him I have learned to know him thoroughly.” Philip IV sent Rubens to London in order to negotiate peace with the British. Philip wrote to his aunt, Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia (1566-1633), regarding his plans on April 29, 1629. She had co-ruled the Netherlands with her husband (and cousin), Archduke Albert VII of Austria (1559-1621), and was a patron of Rubens. After Albert’s death, Isabella confided in and trusted Rubens more
than any other courtier. Philip sent Rubens to London two days after his letter to Isabella. Rubens first delivered paintings to Isabella in Brussels and then arrived in London on June 3, 1629.

Velázquez was aware of the high regard Philip IV had for Rubens, as an artist and as a diplomat. This, in turn directly influenced Velázquez to model himself on Rubens as a courtier. By example, Rubens showed Velázquez what was possible if an artist wanted to become a highly respected member of the court beyond his artwork. Rubens was an accomplished courtier, trusted with an advanced level of responsibility. Velázquez aspired for the same. Contact with Rubens likely helped to shape the ambitions of Velázquez on a social and a professional level.

While the great artist was visiting, Rubens had a studio and rooms in the Alcázar, where the king visited him nearly every day. Rubens painted several portraits of the royal family, including the *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV*, completed on December 2nd, 1628. The artist was allowed to paint the king from life. Apparently, the monopoly on Philip’s likeness that Velázquez had enjoyed was suspended for the duration of Rubens’ visit. Rubens used items from the royal armory and the stables as models to complete his work. This was the most important of the paintings completed by Rubens on his trip to Spain. Sadly, the painting was lost to fire at the Alcázar in 1734.

Rubens’s *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (1628) was hung in place of one by Velázquez, his *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (1625) (now lost), and across from Titian’s *Equestrian Portrait of Charles V at Mühlberg* (1548) in the New Room. Philip may have wanted to replace Velázquez’s portrait of 1625 with one by Rubens based on the success of Rubens’s portraiture in promoting a desired public perception of the patron through a manipulation of their
image, such as the series for Marie de’ Medici at the Luxembourg Palace, and the portrait of the Duke of Buckingham on horseback (fig. 24).\textsuperscript{145} Philip already owned Rubens’\textit{s Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Lerma} (1603), painted during the reign of his father, Philip III (fig. 25). Francisco de Sandoval y Rojas, the First Duke of Lerma and Marquis of Denia, was an important figure in the court of Philip III, much in the same way that the Count-Duke of Olivares was to Philip IV.\textsuperscript{146} In the 1620s the work was located in Vallodolid rather than Madrid, probably because the Duke had been disgraced.\textsuperscript{147}

Philip was, in effect, anointing Rubens as the heir apparent to Titian by choosing him to paint his portrait in 1628. He was also showing himself to be the worthy successor to his illustrious great grandfather Charles V.\textsuperscript{148} Titian was held in high regard in Spain because he was the painter for Charles V and Philip II, two rulers who were seen as part of the Golden Age of Spain. Philip wanted to be associated with this legacy. He chose Rubens to make that happen through his \textit{Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV} (1628).\textsuperscript{149} The special significance of the \textit{Equestrian Portrait of Charles V at Mühlberg} (1548) was that it brought back the era of triumph for the Spanish crown.\textsuperscript{150} Titian’s portrait, however, commemorates a great battle whereas Rubens’\textquoteright s painting of Philip IV is an allegorical work.\textsuperscript{151} The allusions to an ideal ruler are more subtle and implied in the work by Titian.\textsuperscript{152}

With the replacement of his own work with one by Rubens and the implication that Rubens was anointed as the superior artist evidenced by the juxtaposition of his work with the revered work of Titian, Velázquez could have felt a sense of jealousy or resentment for the preferential treatment with which Philip treated Rubens. However, Pacheco maintained that the two artists were friends. Rubens was not one for associating with other painters, but he had corresponded with Velázquez prior to his visit and the two artists visited El Escorial together,
This trip to El Escorial would have been an involved undertaking, given that the monastery is located approximately 36 kilometers (28 miles) to the northeast of the palace of the Alcázar. This would indicate that the two artists did have some form of personal relationship.

Philip II was the driving force behind the building of El Escorial. Planning for the monastery began in 1561 when the king decided to make Madrid his permanent capital. Charles V had abdicated his crown from all of his territories in the years 1555 and 1556 in favor of his son and heir and had requested that he be laid to rest not in the Capilla Real (Royal Chapel) in Granada, as was traditional, but in a monastery of the order of Saint Jerome. When Charles V died in 1558, Philip II honored his father’s wishes and had his body entombed in the monastery as soon as it was built, in the vaults known as los panteones. To this day members of the royal family of Spain find their final resting place within these vaults, unless they request to be buried elsewhere. Although the monastery was built primarily as a religious retreat for the spiritual health of the royal souls, it also became a treasure trove of great art, with works by Bosch, Roger van der Weyden, and El Greco, to name but a few. It was for this reason that Velázquez and Rubens wanted to visit El Escorial.

Hopefully this trip to El Escorial is an indication that the two artists had a mutual regard for one another. Despite the potential for jealous feelings that could have arisen from the situation in Madrid, the painters shared a common love of art and they understood and made use of the visual language of the day in their works. One symbol of power often represented in the 16th and 17th centuries, and utilized by both Velázquez and Rubens in their equestrian portraiture, was to present the horse in the levade pose. The levade is the foundation for the advanced dressage moves known as the “airs above the ground,” which involve controlled jumps.
Dressage movements stem from exercises used for military mounts. Members of the royalty and the aristocracy were expected to attain the high level of equestrian skills needed to accomplish a move such as the *levade.* In the case of the *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (1635-1636), the pose would have been interpreted by a Baroque audience as representing the power and mastery of the king over adversaries, both foreign and domestic. Also, the positive attributes of the horse, especially his strength, would have been reflected onto the rider. By all accounts, Philip was an excellent rider and it is likely that he would have had the necessary ability to perform this move. *Equestrian Portrait of Prince Baltasar Carlos* (1635-1636) foreshadows the young prince’s mastery of the *levade* and his future role as king. Sadly, the *infante* died in 1646, long before he would have taken up those duties.

Classical equestrian schools were created to teach young nobles how to become excellent horsemen and women. The Spanish Riding School in Vienna is one such place, which has been teaching the ancient art of horsemanship for over 430 years. Currently, the training of a high level dressage horse at the Spanish Riding School takes approximately six years to complete and the education to become a fully qualified rider takes between eight and twelve years of dedicated training. This gives some indication as to the high skillset Philip possessed if he was able to perform the *levade.* This also explains why this pose was so popular in royal portraiture to instill respect and awe in the viewer.

The Baroque era (roughly 1600-1750) favored ornate displays in everything, including riding. The Spanish court needed horses that were both flashy and athletic, yet of good temperament. The ideal horse of the Baroque had an ample body with a strong neck and a long and distinctive head. Powerful legs with dainty feet were also in vogue. The king’s mount in the *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (1635-1636) appears to display these qualities, as does his
son’s in the *Equestrian Portrait of Baltasar Carlos* (1635-1636). Baltasar Carlos’s equine is a pony rather than a horse, however, as the smaller mount would have been more appropriate for a young child. It is not clear which breed of horse the king is riding, possibly a small draft cross.\(^{171}\) Draft horses are bred to pull heavy loads, so they have thick, muscular bodies. The horse depicted has that, but it lacks the height and the sturdier legs common to the type. Also, draft breeds often have long hair on their lower legs near the feet, called feathering. This animal appears to be cross-bred with a non-draft breed, which would account for the more slender legs and lack of feathering.

The types of horses often used in this era were the Lipizzaner and Andalusian. These breeds were a mixture of the hardy Berber horses with Spanish and Arabian lines. This produced an animal that fit the needs and tastes of the time: rounded, strong hindquarters, shapely, thick necks, and high knee action.\(^{172}\) These horses were smart and willing, with an elegance that made them perfect for royal mounts, such as evidence in the *Equestrian Portrait of Queen Isabel of France* (1635-1636).\(^{173}\) The origin of the Lipizzaner is in the town of Lipica, in Slovenia. Archduke Charles II of Austria created an Imperial Stud there in 1580.\(^{174}\) The climate and conditions in Lipica closely mimic those in Spain, which is why Charles II decided to establish the royal stud farm there.\(^{175}\) Although Lipizzaner used today at the Spanish Riding School are almost all greys, such as the queen’s horse in the portrait, in the Baroque era it was fashionable to have spotted or colored horses, such as Philip’s equine.\(^{176}\) Tradition dictates that there is always a bay horse (brown with black mane and tail) kept with the Lipizzaner stallions at the school as a reminder of this fact.\(^{177}\) The Spanish Riding School derives its name from these Spanish horses rather than from a Spanish style of riding.\(^{178}\) Available evidence does not
support the location of the breeding and training of the individual mounts in the portraits, but the Lipizzaner and Andalusian breeds would have been known in the court.\textsuperscript{179}

The \textit{levade} comes from a long tradition of classical dressage riding. Xenophon of ancient Greece wrote a treatise on equestrian training for both horse and rider based on his own observations and those of Simon of Athens (400 BC). This later became the basis of the Spanish Riding School after his writings were rediscovered around the time of the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{180} Federico Grisone of Naples was the first to apply Xenophon’s teachings in his riding academy, but the Italian employed brutal tactics in his training methods that had not been endorsed by the Greeks.\textsuperscript{181} Simon of Athens noted, “You cannot teach a dancer to dance by using whip and spurs.”\textsuperscript{182} Giovanni Pignatelli learned his methods from Grisone and later taught them to Antoine de Pluvinel de la Baume (1555-1622) of France.\textsuperscript{183} De Pluvinel refined Grisone’s methods into a more humane way to teach horses, emphasizing the need to treat each animal as an individual and to cater the training to each horse’s temperament.\textsuperscript{184} The royal Spanish family would have been taught their equestrian skills utilizing these ideas. Riding masters of this era were highly respected individuals.\textsuperscript{185} De Pluvinel also employed the pillars used in ancient dressage training to train his horses. These posts are still in use today at the Spanish Riding School in Vienna.\textsuperscript{186}

The teachings of Robichon de la Guérinière of France, in his book \textit{Ecole de Cavalerie} (1733), became the basis for the dressage methods taught to the present day.\textsuperscript{187} There are only two places today that teach classical equitation: The French Cavalry School in Saumur and the Spanish Riding School in Vienna.\textsuperscript{188} The latter is the tradition that the royal family of Spain would have been taught.
A work that was painted by Rubens and that has survived is the life-sized *The Cardinal-Infante Fernando of Austria in the Battle of Nördlingen* between 1634 and 1640. The cardinal was the younger brother of Philip IV and he was named governor of the Low Countries in 1634. The event that inspired this work was the defeat of the Protestant armies by the cardinal’s forces at Nördlingen. The cardinal sits astride his bay horse in full battle armor, with a pinkish-red sash with gold trim fluttering off his right shoulder. The saddle, bridle and breast plate all match the sash in color. His face is in three-quarter pose with a stylish black hat perched on his head at a slight angle. He holds the reins loosely with his left hand and a short bastion in his right. The horse is performing the *levade*. Rubens has stylized this horse’s face somewhat, giving prominence to a forwardly placed eye and slenderizing the already petite head on this otherwise hefty animal. The horse is frothing at the mouth, which is a common occurrence with dressage horses. Rubens appears to have taken pride in this detail as it was common for him to include it in his equestrian works. Above Fernando mythical figures swoop diagonally onto the picture plane, and including Jupiter in the form of an eagle and one of the Furies throwing lightning rods, fighting on the side of the cardinal. Below the horse’s legs can be spied the battle itself, with a line of leaping cavalry horses charging into the fray. This portrait was purchased by Philip IV and hung in the Alcázar in Madrid, to show the power of the Habsburg dynasty.

In the now lost life-sized *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (1628), represented here by the copy painted around 1645 in the manner of Rubens by the artist Juan Bautista Martínez de Mazo (ca. 1612-1667), student and son-in-law of Velázquez, Rubens has portrayed Philip as a great commander in the fight against heresy to the Catholic faith. He is surrounded by allegorical figures that personify Faith and Divine Justice, among others. In Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the royal family is not usually shown in allegorical representations. The
Spanish Hapsburgs generally preferred to have their own likenesses represent the kingly virtues without resorting to allegorical imagery. One example is the portrait Philip II (before 1582) by Sofonisba Anguissola (1532-1625) (fig. 26). The monarch is in somber black clothing, allowing only his image to represent his greatness. Two putti hold the world behind Philip’s head, while Faith holds a cross in one hand and a garland symbolizing victory in the other. The cross points to Spain on the globe. Divine Justice prepares to throw a bolt of lightning at the snake of heresy below her. By virtue of their presence surrounding Philip, they appear to support the idea of the king as a mighty and just ruler, destined to command his empire back to its former greatness. The portrait also contains symbols of the conquest and wealth derived from the New World in the form of a boy of Native American extraction holding a helmet. Philip is in the contemporary setting of the Alcázar, as evidenced by the Manzanares River seen in the background.

The copy was commissioned by the Marquis of Heliche, Don Gaspar Méndez de Haro (1629-1687), the Viceroy of Naples at the time. The Marquis ordered the painting approximately fifteen years after Rubens completed the original and the work is reflected in the inventory list of the Marquis in 1651. This inventory identifies the artist as Juan Bautista Martínez del Mazo (ca. 1612/1616-1667) but also states that the face of the monarch and the head of the horse were the work of Velázquez himself. Conservators at the Uffizi Gallery in Florence, where the painting has resided since 1753, confirmed this in a 1995 cleaning of the work. Not all Velázquez scholars accept this attribution, however, and it is often omitted from catalogues of the artist’s complete works.

There were a few noted changes made in Mazo’s copy of Rubens’s painting. Philip is older, reflecting his appearance as it would have been in the 1640s, complete with a mustache.
The white plumes have been changed to red plumes on the king’s hat. The original painting may have been larger, extending out to the left.\textsuperscript{203} I will present an analysis of the horse’s face that will support that hypothesis that Velázquez participated in this work, modifying certain details in the facial features of both horse and rider to reflect his style. I will do this through a comparison of the horses in the works of Rubens and Velázquez.

There are many similarities between Rubens’s painting of the Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand and Mazo’s copy after Rubens of Philip IV. Both feature the rider on a bay horse performing the \textit{levade}. There are a number of mythological figures surrounding Philip, including a Fury throwing lightning bolts, as in the cardinal’s portrait. Philip is in armor, wearing the red sash and carrying a bastion in his right hand. He is even wearing a hat very similar to Ferdinand’s, though Philip’s sports a red plume. There is no battle scene in the background, but the two countrysides are much alike. The clouds are oriented at a diagonal to the frames, parallel to the rise of the land. The horse, in contrast, is at a diagonal running opposite. The activity of the many flying beings serves to crowd the scene and make Philip less noticeable than in Ferdinand’s portrait, where the reds are more vibrant and the mythological figures more part of the background. The biggest difference, however, is the treatment of the horse. Philip’s mount is very similar to Velázquez’s style. The horse has an ample body and the head is much less stylized and more proportional with the size of the animal than in the cardinal’s painting. This could indicate that the copyist was influenced by Velázquez’s works or that Rubens was perhaps more realistic and less stylized in his earlier career.\textsuperscript{204}

A careful comparison between Rubens horses and those of Velázquez would seem to support the hypothesis that Velázquez painted the horse’s head in Mazo’s copy of Rubens’s painting. Looking that the faces of the horses in the two works, there is a similarity of pose (figs.
27 and 28). The horses are both agitated and both drip foam from their mouths. Their ears are forward and their nostrils flare. Their faces are in a three-quarter view. The muzzles, however, show a difference in length and in fleshiness. There is a definite bony quality visible in the nasal passage grooves of face of the Cardinal-Infante’s horse. These same grooves can be seen in the face of the horse of *The Duke of Lerma* (1603) by Rubens (fig. 29). This is not to say these grooves do not exist. Rubens has observed the horses closely and is accurate with these details, but he has placed an emphasis on certain aspects in order to further his overall artistic agenda for the painting as a whole. This sacrifices naturalism in favor of emotional impact. In the case of the Cardinal-Infante’s horse, Rubens is emphasizing the stress that the horse is under, and contrasting that with the calmness of the rider. Velázquez’s horses do not display this groove in such a sharp manner, and the faces of Philip IV’s mount and that of Baltasar Carlos are more natural in their proportions. This gives Velázquez’s horses a more realistic appearance. The Mazo horse shares this realism.

Rubens also stylizes the heads of his steeds. The Cardinal-Infante’s horse’s head is unnaturally small for its body size. This is a decision that Rubens makes in many of his equine depictions. *The Equestrian Portrait of Philip II* (ca. 1630), *The Fight of Saint George and the Dragon* (ca. 1606-1608), and *Duke of Lerma* (1603) all show horses with small, tapering heads that end in unusually large flaring nostrils (figs. 30-33). Velázquez’s horses have heads appropriate for their physiques, as does Mazo’s beast, though that animal has some issues with the proportions of the rest of its body. Since Velázquez did not participate in those areas of the painting, they will not be discussed here.

The ears of Velázquez’s horses are also more naturalistic. The positioning of Philip’s horse’s ears is more true-to-life since a horse executing a difficult move like the *levade* would
need to pay attention to his rider’s commands (Fig. 34). The ears are in exactly the right position to demonstrate the horse’s focus of attention. Rubens stylizes the ears of his horses, making them appear hard and pointy. The distinctive tear drop shape that he employs in all of the paintings mentioned is technically accurate, but Rubens makes the ears appear rigid. The ears of a horse made of cartilage, which is flexible, and covered with hair, which gives the ears a softer appearance. Velázquez does not always get the shape exactly right, such as with Baltasar Carlos’s pony, but he captures the aspect of softness and flexibility.

The eye is another case where Velázquez creates an image that is much more realistic than Rubens. Rubens has a tendency to stylize the eyes by placing them a little too far forward, giving the horse the look of a creature with true binocular vision, such as with humans. The Duke’s horse is a case in point. Predators have binocular vision to aid them in judging distances on the hunt. Horses are prey animals that require a wide field of vision to be able to spot predators. Although a horse’s field of vision is nearly 360 degrees, they cannot see directly in front of them or directly behind them. Their eye placement is closer to how Velázquez depicts it for Philip’s and Isabel’s horses. Mazo’s placement of the horse’s eye appears to be accurate while the Cardinal-Infante’s mount is more difficult to judge, given the sharpness of the features.

The use of a strong reflected light to highlight the eye of the horse also distinguishes Rubens’s work from Velázquez’s. It is not an uncommon occurrence for artists to emphasize the eye and to show its round qualities, but Rubens gives a special prominence to this light. It is especially obvious in *The Duke of Lerma* (1603) and *The Fight of Saint George and the Dragon* (ca. 1606-1608). Velázquez, in contrast, uses less reflected light yet makes the eye appear more natural. Philip’s horse shows the whites of his eye, as does Isabel’s horse in her equestrian portrait (fig. 35). The Cardinal-Infante’s horse displays both the white sclera and the reflected
light, highlighting its agitated state. The Mazo horse is much closer to Velázquez’s realism than Rubens’s dramatic presentation. There is reflected light, but the horse’s eye is soft and calm.

Lastly, a consideration of the mane is in order. The Cardinal-Infante’s horse and the Mazo horse both have a thick forelock of hair, wavy and full, flying out in front of their faces. In this they are similar. But Mazo’s forelock appears more natural and similar to Baltasar Carlos’s mount’s shock of hair (fig. 36). Velázquez was extremely proficient at creating beautifully cascading manes that nevertheless obey the laws of nature. Isabel’s horse has one of the best manes in the history of painting. Rubens tended to stylize his manes. The Duke of Lerma’s horse also has a glorious head of hair, but it is not very true to life. Horse hair is not as fine as human hair and does not flutter in the breeze in quite the same manner. Additionally, though certain breeds of horses can have the wavy, thick hair displayed in all of these paintings, only Velázquez has noted how the hair would naturally lie. Rubens wins for most dramatic mane with Saint George’s horse. It is less finely rendered than the Duke’s mount, but it still takes artistic license with naturalism to convey the motion and drama in the scene.

Along with the speculation that the head of the Mazo horse was done by Velázquez, there is evidence that the face of the king is also by the Spanish master. A comparison of the monarch’s face in Mazo’s Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV (ca. 1645) and in Velázquez’s Philip IV at Fraga (1644) reveals them to be nearly identical (figs. 37 and 38). The latter painting was done when Philip was fighting the French in Catalonia in February of 1644. Both portraits exhibit a shadow under the mustache. Also, the way the brow circles the deep-set eyes helps define them. The long oval of the king’s face coming to a point at the chin is also evident in both works. In contrast, Rubens’s face of the Cardinal-Infante is typical of his style (fig. 39).
artist favored painting pale fleshy, rounded faces. The Mazo Philip IV does not fit this description. The only similarity between the Cardinal-Infante and Philip IV is the rumpled hair.

Velázquez expert Jonathan Brown found the Philip IV at Fraga (1644) to be the very best portrait that Velázquez ever did of the king (fig. 40). Brown did not accept that the Mazo copy contained work by Velázquez, however. As stated previously, the attribution to Velázquez in the original inventory and the support of the Uffizi Gallery restoration in 1995 make for a compelling argument when combined with the similarity in depiction of the king’s features and the treatment of the horse. Despite Rubens’s influence on Velázquez, the Spaniard maintained his ability to make his own decisions regarding his style and what he found aesthetically appropriate to paint. He was perfectly capable of adjusting Rubens’s original painting in the face of the king and that of the horse to fit with his own artistic integrity.

There were a number of parallels between Rubens and Titian. In their careers, they had much contact with royalty and the aristocracy. They were both comfortable dealing with powerful patrons. In subject matter, they both loved to paint the female form, and they could bring out the beauty in a landscape. They were both well-versed in classical mythology, especially in the works of Ovid and Philostratus, and could bring the ancient stories to life through their lyrical depictions. Rubens captured the psychological dimension of his sitters in a manner similar to Titian. Rubens invented portraits that both flattered and showed off his imaginative skills with his compositions. In the end, Rubens considered Titian his favorite artist of all time, and he wanted to be more like him. Upon his death in 1640, Rubens owned eight paintings and two sketches by Titian, as well as thirty-three paintings by Rubens of copies of the works of Titian, which included works done in Madrid in 1628-1629 and works done in Italy and elsewhere.
In his earlier days, however, Titian was not Rubens’s main focus. When Rubens first visited Italy in 1600-1608, the sculpture of Michelangelo engaged him most. The young artist was employed by the Duke of Mantua, Vincenzo Gonzaga, soon after arriving in Italy. The Duke was the cousin of the regent to the Netherlands, Archduke Albert VII. Rubens visited many cities while in Italy, and studied the artists that interested him in each. He was devoted to gaining knowledge from the great artists and seems to have believed there was something to learn from each. In Venice he looked to the form and color of Veronese. Tintoretto’s lighting effects captured his attention. He looked at Mantegna in Mantua and Romano at the Palazzo del Té. It was Michelangelo and Raphael, however, to whom he dedicated his efforts, both in Florence and Rome. The influence of Raphael’s use of line and contour are particularly evident in the early works of Rubens. The artist left Italy when he went to visit his dying mother in Antwerp. Unfortunately, she died shortly before his arrival. This was the only time he was in Italy, much to his regret. Rubens was immensely popular as a young artist and was inundated with commissions.

Velázquez was already a mature artist by the time Rubens visited the court of Philip IV. It is unlikely that Velázquez would have radically changed his style at this stage of his career. He was able to maintain his own artistic ideals in the presence of the senior painter. Velázquez painted in a much more naturalistic way than Rubens. The Flemish master used idealized forms and ornate flourishes. The Spanish painter did not incorporate such imagery into his own works. Velázquez was influenced by his stay in Italy, however, which occurred on the heels of Rubens’ visit. Rubens continued to send paintings to Spain after he left. These, too, could have had an effect on Velázquez.
One aspect of Rubens’ style did seem to influence Velázquez. Rubens painted his horses with foam coming from their mouths. This was a naturalistic detail that gave an added dimension of life to Rubens’ depictions. There is a literary precedence to the foam. Roman scholar Pliny the Elder in his *Natural History* described the ancient painters Protogenes and Nealkes in their quest to realistically depict foam in the mouths of animals. Both ended up throwing a sponge at their respective paintings in order to achieve the desired effect. Rubens appears to be the first modern artist to realistically portray this foam. Velázquez seems to have adopted this practice after Rubens’ visit, adding a new dimension of realism and sophistication to his later equestrian works, connecting his artistic practice with that of the ancient masters.

It appears that Rubens’s encouragement led to Velázquez studying art in Italy. Velázquez requested permission from Philip to travel to Italy on June 28th, 1629, and received it on August 10th. The request came two months after Rubens left Spain. Velázquez traveled to Italy in the company of Captain-General Ambrogio Spinola (1569-1630) of the Spanish Army of Flanders. They traveled from Barcelona to Genoa together. This is the same Spinola later depicted in Velázquez’s famous *Surrender of Breda* (ca. 1634-1635), commemorating the triumph of the Spanish in defeating the Dutch at the city of Breda on June 2, 1625 (fig. 41). In this work, Velázquez movingly depicts Spanish might and generosity in the way triumphant leader Spinola appears to be stopping Justin of Nassau, defeated general of the Dutch forces, from kneeling in humility. Spinola, instead, treats Justin with the respect due to a worthy adversary. As an interesting side note, the horse used in this work appears to be the same mount used for the *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (ca. 1635-1636). This would indicate that Velázquez used live models for his paintings and that he studied the animal in order to be able to
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depict it accurately. The record does not reflect whether this horse was owned by Velázquez or if it was a favorite of the king, but Velázquez chose to utilize it for two important works destined for the Hall of Realms that were intended to represent the highest ideals and triumphs of the monarchy.

Velázquez was in Italy from August 1629 until early 1631. Palomino relates how Philip IV granted Velázquez permission to visit Italy after Ruben’s visit, giving the artist 400 silver ducats, the equivalent of two years’ salary, while the Count-Duke of Olivares gave him 200 gold ducats and a medal featuring the portrait of Philip IV. He also gave Velázquez letters of introduction. He arrived in Italy on September 19, 1629, at Genoa. He first set off for Milan then went to Venice, stopping in Parma on the way. Velázquez stayed with the Spanish ambassador, Count Cristóbal de Benavente Benavides, while in Venice. The count provided the artist with bodyguards due to the state of war then in effect. In Ferrara, his next stop, the Papal governor, Cardinal Giulio Sachette, hosted Velázquez. He traveled to Rome next, passing through Loreto and Bologna on the way but not stopping. He arrived in Rome in 1630 and spent a year as the guest of the nephew of Pope Urban VIII, Cardinal Francesco Barberini. Velázquez stayed in the Vatican Palace and visited the Sistine Chapel, where he studied the works of Michelangelo. The cardinal arranged for him to be able to see the Sistine Chapel at will and other rooms painted by Raphael as well. Wanting to study more works, he moved to the Palazzo Medici. He enjoyed observing the Medici Palace. Velázquez also saw the Stanza della Segnatura, where he viewed works by Raphael. Everywhere he went, Velázquez made drawings and sketches of the great works he encountered. Before departing Italy, the Spanish master spent time in Naples. He painted a portrait of the Infanta Doña María, sister to Philip IV, prior to her marriage to the king of Hungary (María de Austria, Queen of Hungary, ca.
1630). After his trip to Italy and his studies of Italian paintings, Velázquez re-made his career. He created his own style, blending his earlier technique with his exhaustive analysis of Italian art. The face of Philip IV in his equestrian portrait from the mid-1630s displays the suggestive brushwork of Velázquez’s technique as developed in Italy (fig. 42). The artist implies detail instead of explicitly painting it. It is a sort of minimalist technique, only using that which is necessary to create the desired effect. Upon close examination, the brushwork appears to be very simple, especially in the details of Philip’s armor, but taking the picture in as a whole, every detail is there and the painting looks quite intricate. Comparing this with pre-Italian works, such as the Bust of Philip IV (1623) or the faces in The Waterseller of Seville (ca. 1618-1623) one can see how the painter has moved away from painting the fully realized details of his earlier works and yet has retained their essence (fig. 43).

There was an invention and freedom in the post-Italian works of Velázquez. His Italian sojourn seems to have allowed the artist to tackle subject matter he had not extensively explored before, including Biblical and mythological themes. Fortunately for him, Velázquez had an outlet for this new creative freedom. He was put in charge of the decoration for both the Palace of the Buen Retiro and the Torre de la Parada upon his return from Italy. An example of the new style Velazquez was exploring was in the works he brought back from Italy, according to Palomino, in Joseph’s Bloody Coat Brought to Jacob (ca. 1630), currently in El Escorial, and The Forge of Vulcan (ca. 1630), now in the Prado Museum (figs. 44 and 45). Both of these works were presented to Philip IV upon the artist’s return to Spain, where they were hung in the Palace of the Buen Retiro.
Velázquez created only a few paintings with mythological subjects, one being his post-Italian work of Mars (ca. 1639-1641) for the Torre de la Parada, a hunting station on the grounds of the Pardo Palace (fig. 46). The god of war is shown not as an idealized being but as a very human man, who looks out of the canvas in a befuddled way. The setting for the figure is that Mars and Venus have just been interrupted in their love making by Venus’s husband, Vulcan. It is interesting that this theme seems to have interested Velázquez so much. Of his handful of mythological works, three of them involve these characters: The Forge of Vulcan (ca. 1630), Mars (ca. 1639-1641) and the Rokeby Venus (ca. 1644-1648) (Fig. 47). He did not paint Zeus, for instance, or any of the other popular stories of the gods that so many artists chose to represent.

Spanish writers and painters in the 16th and 17th centuries tended to treat mythological subjects with a sense of satire. This is evident in the literary works of Góngora, Lope de Vega, and Cervantes. It was a way of using the images for entertainment purposes without having them be confused with sanctioning classical religions. Velázquez appears to belong to this school of thought. It is readily evident in such works as Mars (ca. 1639-1641) and The Triumph of Bacchus or Los borrachos (ca. 1628-1629) (Fig. 48).

The Rokeby Venus (ca. 1644-1648) is another mythological work that takes from reality rather than from the idealization of forms. Velázquez does not satirize this figure as he does with Mars (ca. 1639-1641). He would have been familiar with Titian’s paintings on the goddess of love, such as Venus and Adonis (1554) and Venus with an Organist and a Dog (ca. 1550) (figs. 49 and 50). Rubens would have seen these works as well when he visited Madrid in 1628-1629. He was also inspired by Titian’s Venus at a Mirror (ca. 1555) (fig. 51). He made a copy that is in Washington and one, with a black attendant, in Liechtenstein (Fig. 52). This one
would directly inspire Velázquez to create his *Rokeby Venus*. The three master painters treated their subjects in their own distinctive manners, yet they still had a connection of inspiration. This is another example of the intertwining of lives and works of Velázquez, Titian, and Rubens.

Velázquez also painted the two philosophers *Aesop* (ca. 1636-1640) and *Menippus* (ca. 1636-1640) for the Torre de la Parada, perhaps to compliment Rubens’s *Democritus* (1603) and *Heraclitus* (1603) (figs. 53-56). While Rubens’s works are more conventional in their treatment, to reflect the respect due to such noteworthy individuals, Velázquez’s philosophers are much more down to earth and show the poverty and unkempt appearance that two such people would likely have had. This has the effect of bringing antiquity into the 17th century and making the venerated writers seem more accessible. This is similar to how Velázquez makes his mythological figures more human.

Things were not going well for the Spanish monarchy by the 1640s. Catalonia and Portugal both revolted against Spanish rule in 1640. The French held a siege at Aragon and Catalonia (liberated by the king at the Battle of Lérida). The Count-Duke of Olivares lost power in 1643 and was exiled first in Loeches and finally in Toro. Isabel of Bourbon died in 1644 and Baltasar Carlos died in 1646. There were no other sons at this time, which caused a crisis of succession for the Spanish crown. This would not be solved until the birth of Charles II, son of Philip and his second wife (and niece), Mariana of Austria (1634-1696), in 1661. This was a time of mourning for the Spanish monarchy. The personal tragedies of the king coupled with his political setbacks signaled an era of decline for Spain. Velázquez also received bad news during this time with the death of his mentor and friend, Francisco Pacheco, in 1639.

Velázquez did get to return to Italy in November 1648 at the request of Philip IV.
Philip IV wanted to redecorate the Alcázar in the 1640s. Velázquez played an active role in helping the king and his royal architect select and plan for the hanging of what was then the best collection of art in all of Europe. This led to Velázquez’s second trip to Italy from 1648-1651. The king wanted Velázquez to buy art for the royal collection, including Roman and Greek statues. He also wanted Velázquez to meet with Pope Innocent X Pamphili. All of this limited the amount of time Velázquez could devote to painting new works of art, however.

Velázquez spent a lot of time trying to become ennobled. Artists were viewed as manual laborers and painting as a craft. Velázquez decreased his artistic production, in part, to send the message to the noblemen of the court who looked down on him for working with his hands that he was a gentleman and painted only when the king specifically requested him to do so.

Philip IV went to a lot of trouble to overcome objections to Velázquez’s claim of nobility within his family line. The knights of the Order of Santiago had found the evidence insufficient and the painter would not have been admitted but for the intervention of the king. Even so, Velázquez required a papal bull from the pope to finally be admitted to the Order of Santiago in 1659. Velázquez was very pleased to finally receive his knighthood. So much so, it is widely believed that he returned to his masterpiece, Las Meninas (1656), and painted in the Cross of Santiago on his tunic to declare his status for all to see (fig. 57). Other accounts have the king ordering the addition of the cross after Velázquez’s death in 1660. However it happened, receiving ennoblement was the reward of many years of toil and the highpoint of Velázquez’s career as a courtier.

Velázquez, Rubens, and Titian are three painters who shared an artistic heritage. Titian was the grand master who was connected with the Spanish court through Charles V and his son and successor Philip II for better than four decades. He was an inspiration for all subsequent
artists who had contact with his paintings. Velázquez and Rubens both had access to works by Titian, but it was the fateful trip by Rubens to Philip IV’s palace in Madrid in 1628-1629 that spurred his interest in the Venetian and, through his example, inspired Velázquez to study the Italian master in more depth.

Artistically, Rubens and Titian were both an influence on Velázquez, but Rubens had the advantage over Titian in that he was able to share his ideas with the Spanish artist in person. Rubens’s encouragement for Velázquez to study in Italy was the beginning of the style innovations that Velázquez adopted, including his looser brush work and his wider color palette. Italy also opened up the possibilities for the Spaniard regarding subject matter. Velázquez produced the majority of his mythological works during and after his first trip to Italy. Studying in Italy also intensified Velázquez’s appreciation of Titian.

The equestrian portraiture done by Velázquez in the mid-1630s displays the influence of both Titian and Rubens. Through Titian’s example, Velázquez maintains a naturalistic treatment of the king and his family. The *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (ca. 1635-1636) by Velázquez exudes the royal virtues so prized by the Spanish monarchs, without requiring the extravagant trappings of office or the use of allegorical figures. The king himself is the embodiment of nobility, as captured by Titian in *Charles V at Mühlberg* (1548). Velázquez’s equestrian works of *Isabel of Bourbon* and the *Infante Baltasar Carlos* further support Titian’s influence, especially in the young heir’s depiction as the future king, in possession of all the strength and fairness that a monarch should have in order to be a great ruler, like Charles V had been. From Rubens, Velázquez breathes life into his horses with the foam dripping from their lips, as in Rubens’s *The Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand at the Battle of Nördlingen* (ca. 1634-1640).
Even though Velázquez was influenced by Rubens and Titian, he did not give up his identity as an artist. He maintained his ability to make his own decisions regarding his style and what he found aesthetically appropriate to paint. I have presented evidence that Velázquez painted the head of the horse and the face of Philip IV in the copy after Rubens’s now lost 1628 *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* done by Velázquez’s disciple Juan Bautista Martínez del Mazo around 1645. I suggested that Velázquez made adjustments to Rubens’s original painting in the face of the horse. Rubens’s influence did not rob Velázquez of his artistic integrity or confidence as a painter. The works of Rubens, like those of Titian, added a level of inspiration and suggestion to the Spaniard, without taking away his ability to make his own artistic judgments.

Circumstances suggest that Rubens directly influenced Velázquez as a member of the court. Rubens was an accomplished courtier, trusted with an advanced level of responsibility. By example, Rubens showed Velázquez what was possible if an artist wanted to become a highly respected courtier, beyond producing his artwork. Contact with Rubens likely helped to shape the ambitions of Velázquez on a social and a professional level. Velázquez took Rubens’s example as a template for his career, eventually achieving the ultimate goal as a member of the royal court and becoming ennobled as a knight in the Order of Santiago. Thus, Velázquez officially received recognition of the high status that he deserved. All three painters are exemplary and continue to inspire artists throughout the world.
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