1997 was an important year for Sint Janskerk in Gouda, as the Museo del Prado in Madrid asked to borrow the cartoon of the King's Window by Dutch glass painter Dirck Crabeth for the exhibition Felipe II. Un príncipe del Renacimiento. Inspired by this event, it was decided to compile an anthology about the so-called seventh window.

In this volume the King's Window is placed at the center of the 1550s as a crucial presentation of Philip II's Netherlandish and English years. The essays, written by an international group of twenty-one scholars from various disciplines, analyse and discuss historical, socio-economic, theological, anthropological, art-historical, iconographical, heraldic and musicological aspects revealing surprising new insights. The Seventh Window is an important step in current research into an enthralling era in European history of the second half of the sixteenth century.
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Despite the great devotion of the Catholic king, Philip II, to the empire, the fortunate saint wanted to demonstrate to the world just how much he served God in building such a sumptuous temple. In the old tradition, God expressed his approval, through the prophet Nathan, of the loyal King David’s good deed in wishing to build a temple in Jerusalem, which he promised would be offered by his son and successor Solomon, to whom God granted exceptional peace and wisdom for this purpose, and poured riches over all the kings of Israel [...]. He who wishes to fully understand what it is, will see that a second temple of Solomon has been built, which seems to have been achieved, erected, and built in so few days, with so little noise of hammers, and without being heard, that it does not seem to be work done by human hands, this saintly temple, into which the Catholic king don Philip, with so much love and devotion, would pour his riches, offering the temple like another Solomon.1

Fray Joan de la Cruz: Historia de la Orden de S. Hieronmo (1591)

Tourist guides describing the Escorial often state that the decision to build the monastery, fell on St Lawrence’s day, 10 August 1557, that the battle of St Quentin was won (fig. 74). Notwithstanding the significance of this event, which was King Philip’s first important victory, St Quentin actually fell 17 days later, and on 10 August he was in Cambrai, 40 kilometres from the battlefield. In a letter to his father dated 11 August, the king wrote, ‘Your Majesty cannot imagine how much I regret not having been present’. Philip must have felt that he was being keenly observed, not only by his enemies, but also by the emperor and his entire court. He was now king and was facing his first great battle, where he would have to prove himself and emerge from his father’s shadow.2 Yet the date of the battle had great propagandistic power in that period, recalling as it did the insult to France and serving as a pointed reminder to the Protestants that victory had been won on the day of St Lawrence, with his intervention.3 But the war was far from over. For the French, the battle of St Quentin was an expression of resistance against a superior army, which deterred Philip from advancing to Paris. In the following year, Spain lost Calais, won the battle of Gravelines, and France recovered the garrison town which led to the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis in April 1559.

1 THE REASONS FOR BUILDING THE ESCORIAL

St Lawrence and St Quentin thus became the key elements of the crucible in which the Escorial was forged. Other elements have come to light, which perhaps had greater significance: the need to create a family mausoleum ex novo, in fulfilment of Emperor Charles V’s testament; the negative image of the emperor’s itinerant court, which, after a period in Brussels, Philip decided to transfer to the heart of his dominions; the need to distinguish the emerging dynastic branch of the Spanish Habsburgs from the dispersed Spanish kings and Burgundian overlords; and the fight for political and propagandistic power and prestige over France and the papacy. These reasons, among others, formed part of the architectural and functional programme of the monastic and palatial complex.

As for the symbolic programme, everything suggests that Philip II opted for the most ambitious of models: nothing less than Solomon’s Temple, the most perfect building in the Judaeo-Christian tradition (fig. 75). In the light of this symbolic origin, the beginnings of the Escorial can be traced back to a far earlier date than the victory at St Quentin, regarding the books Prince Philip purchased about the temple of Solomon. They included none other
than the Le Livre des Merveilles du Monde by Jean de Mandeville, Liège 1356. In 1541 he acquired some basic Hebrew through the Dictionarivm trilingve, in quo scilicet latinis vocabulis in ordinem alphabeticum digestis respondunt greca & hebraica... by Sebastian Münter, Basel 1530. Two years later, in 1543, he expanded his reading on the temple with Liber chroniarum by Hartman Schedell, Nuremberg 1493; the Commentariorum in Ezechiel Prophetam by St Jerome (the Basel edition of 1540 with a commentary by Erasmus); and the Postillae by Nicolás de Lira, acquired in 1545. In 1547 he would buy the 1534 Lyon edition of Ricardo San Víctor’s commentaries on Ezekiel. Other additions to Philip II’s rich library were the Laudes Hierusalem by Charles Bovelle, Lyon 1531; the Terrae Sanctae descriptio by Jacob Ziegler and Wolfgang Vuessenburg, Strasbourg 1536; the Bible of François Vatable and Robert Estienne, Paris 1539-40; the Bibliorum by Roberti Stephani, Paris 1540; the Libro de Relatos by François Frellón, on Hans Holbein’s designs, Lyon 1543; and a Josephus in Greek. In 1545, Philip acquired the complete works of Alfonso de Madrigal ‘el Tostado’ (‘the Toasted’), including commentaries on the Paralipómenos and its description of Solomon’s Temple, and the Silva de varia lección, Seville 1543, which deals with the history of the temple; and the Libro primero del espejo del principe christiano, by Francisco de Monzón, Lisbon 1544, which was bought by Juan Cristóbal Calvete de Estrella, and contains some final chapters on the temple.

2 Philip II’s stay in the Netherlands and England (1549-1559)

The origin of the Escorial can also traced back to Prince Philip’s first trip to Netherlands in 1549, when Charles V separated the Netherlands from the empire and sent for his son in order to appoint him as his successor. On 1 April 1549 in Brussels was probably the first time that Philip was exalted by his future subjects as a new and ‘prudent’ Solomon.

In the past Emperor Charles V himself was frequently compared to King David, as in the manuscript by Remy du Puys on the joyeuse entrée into Bruges in 1515; the introduction to the Institutio principis christiani by Erasmus, Basle 1516; the manuscript Salomonis tria officia ex sacris derupte navigation Caroli Imperator, on the joyeuse entrée into Antwerp in 1520 by Pieter van Ghent, c. 1517-20; the Gestorum Caroli Quinti, Brussel 1531; and the Historia de Carlos V by Pedro Mexía, s.l. 1551. Moreover, the emperor was a great devotee of the Psalms – which are assumed to have been written by David – and in his final years in Brussels and the monastery of San Jer imo de Yuste he spent much of his time immersed in them. ‘On many occasions he [Charles V] weeps and sheds tears as copiously as if he were a child. He spends night and
day adjusting and setting his countless clocks, and does little else ... And he has spent many days reading and having read to him the psalms of David. 7

Among the various festivities that were held in Brussels to honour Prince Philip, Calvete de Estrella highlights the conventional triumphal arches and tableau vivants created by the chambers of rhetoric: ‘in the square there were live characters sporting Hebrew insignia, representing the crowning of Solomon as king of Israel with the consent of his father, King David, and displaying lines of verse that said, “You are the prudent Solomon, who by order of your just father, rule the kingdoms, which belong to you, to the great joy of the people”’. 8 This allusion would be repeated throughout the trip. The significance of Charles V’s succession was stressed in Ghent, the emperor’s birthplace: ‘On top of the arch, there was a painting of the story of Solomon, showing how he was anointed king of Israel by the Priest Zadoc and the prophet Nathan, at the request of his father, King David, and when the curtains were opened, there was King David, very old and grey, sitting on his royal throne, and beside him, his son Solomon’. 9 We come across similar texts in the entries of Bruges: ‘more powerful were the Kingdoms of David and Solomon, for they were chosen by God, just like the emperor, Charles and his son, Prince Philip’; 10 in Lille: ‘Solomon was recognised in the kingdom of Jerusalem with great popular rejoicing: because, just as the emperor resembles his father David in mercy, so you in turn, as his son, follow in the footsteps of his son, Solomon, in goodness and saintliness’; 11 in Tournaï: ‘Just as the prudent King David, divine Prophet, made Solomon king before he died, so the emperor ... grants his son his own empire’; 12 in Leiden: ‘representing, through living characters, how Solomon was anointed king of Israel, while his father, King David, was still alive’. 13 The same allusions were made in Haarlem, the next stop in the journey, through the representation of Solomon’s anointment as king and the famous scene with the boy and the two mothers. The Queen of Sheba is also represented. 14 To conclude, Calvete’s last reference concerns the city of Amsterdam, where the people are described as expressing joy in the chosen heir: ‘In times past, the people of Israel were glad that King Solomon would rule the kingdoms that his father had granted him, we should be just as glad today that, almost certainly, such a prince will succeed the emperor... Just as Israel rejoiced, seeing Solomon triumph, even while the father put him in the royal throne, at which Israel rejoiced and gladly accepted him, as ordained by David’. 15

Similar allusions were made during Philip’s second stay in the Low Countries. A few days after his father’s abdication of the Spanish kingdoms to Philip II, during the festi-
vals celebrating the 22nd chapter of the Golden Fleece held in Antwerp from 19 to 30 January 1556, a local tableau vivant performed at a triumphal arch included the following inscription: ‘Long live the king, blessed by the Lord God of Israel, who now sits on my throne as did David in another time, in his old age, with his son’ (fig. 76). Two of the representations were very similar to those seen in the first trip described by Calvete: one showing the king on his throne, surrounded by the symbols of power, and the other depicting him in bed, advising his young son.16

In England, however, unlike the Low Countries, Solomonic metaphors for dynastic succession or wisdom were unnecessary. There, religious divisions were the problem, which Mary Tudor was tackling with a tough, repressive policy. A new element would be introduced in England: Philip, not only as the peaceable and prudent prince, who would succeed his bellicose father, but also as the builder of the new temple of Jerusalem, symbolising the new religious unity. This image of Philip II was created by cardinal Reginald Pole (1500-1558), the pope’s legate in England, in his address to parliament at Whitehall in November 1554: ‘he said to the king that he had served God so well from the outset by converting and subjugating this kingdom to the true Catholic religion: and that although the emperor, a most Christian prince, had worked very hard to gather the materials to build the temple, our Lord had only permitted those used by Solomon, but with the saved souls that had previously been lost through bad example and doctrine.’17 The image presented in this speech, which the chronicler Andrés Muñoz obtained from an anonymous Spanish witness, would be repeated on more than one occasion. As various authors, including José Luis Gonzalo, have observed, the fact that this anonymous witness could recall this part of Pole’s address precisely reflects the impression that his words must have made, at least on the Spanish courtiers.18

3 Philip, king of Jerusalem

On 25 July 1554 Charles V ceded the kingdom of Jerusalem to his son Philip on the occasion of the latter’s second marriage, to Mary Tudor, queen of England.19 The title ‘king of Jerusalem’ had been added to the Spanish crown in the 13th century after a long and tortuous process. In 1227, Emperor Frederick III of Germany (1212-1250) – like Frederick I, called king of Sicily – the son of Henry VI of Germany (1165-1197) and Constance of Naples, was married through the mediation of Pope Honorius III (1216-1227) to Yolande, daughter of John of Brienne (1148-1237) and Mary of Montferrat, queen of Jerusalem and therefore heiress to the first Latin kingdom of the East (1099-1187). In 1228 Frederick III left for Jerusalem, after his excommunication by Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241), where he signed an agreement with the Sultan of Egypt reinstating Jerusalem and the Holy Places for the Christians – this was achieved without a single drop of blood being spilt. He then crowned himself king of Jerusalem. The title passed from his son Conrad IV (1228-1254), to Conradin (†1258) and, after the latter’s death, to Constance Hohenstaufen, daughter of Manfred of Sicily, and wife of Peter III of Aragon (1239-1285). The union of Aragon and Castle ushered in a long period of isolation of the East, which partly coincided with the recognition of the Catholic king, Ferdinand II of Aragon (1452-1516), as king of Naples and Jerusalem, by virtue of the papal bull of Pope Julius II (1503-1513) dated 3 July 1510.

The arms in the King’s Window in Sint Janskerk show the quartering for Jerusalem (fig. 40),20 so beloved of the Catholic kings and Charles V, but would soon cease to be used by Philip, probably due to the wave of anti-Semitism following the Council of Trent.

4 The King’s Window of Gouda

The image of The Dedication of the Temple of King Solomon (fig. 36) must have made a very marked impression, because it is represented in the upper register of the famous King’s Window, donated in 1557 by King Philip II and Queen Mary Tudor to Sint Janskerk in Gouda. In the middle register the donors are depicted, kneeling in perpetual adoration, and participating in The Last Supper (fig. 39). In general the King’s Window alludes to the real presence of God in the church and the institution of the Eucharist by Jesus Christ.

The important Latin inscriptions on top of the temple are taken from the Second Book of Chronicles, in which the consecration of the first temple of Jerusalem is described: ‘I have heard thy prayer’ (II Chron. 7, 12: God’s reply to Solomon), ‘And as for thee, if thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked ... then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom’ (2 Chron. 7:17-18) – another allusion to the succession of Charles V. On the platform of the temple below Solomon, however, the inscription ECCE SALOMO HEIC (‘Behold, Solomon is here’), the New Testament paraphrase ECCE PLVS QVAM SALOMON HEIC (‘behold, a greater than Solomon is here’, Matt. 12, 42) – which alludes to none other than Jesus Christ – is displayed in the part of the window in which Philip appears. There is also an in-
scription about the apostles, ‘Philippe, qui videt me, videt et patrem’ (‘Philip [...] he that hath seen me hath seen the Father’, John 14, 9), where the reference to this specific apostle, the king’s namesake, is clearly another reference to Philip II. He also paid homage to Charles V’s devotion to the psalms by reproducing the well-known Psalm 118, 1: ‘It is good to give thanks to the Lord, for his love endures forever’. This psalm was recited by Solomon during the ceremony of The Dedication of the Temple of King Solomon (II Chron. 7, 3).21

A curious yet important detail in relation to the dog that appears in the lower part of The Last Supper was revealed in a document discovered in the archives of the Royal Palace in Madrid by José Luis Gonzalo, indicating that in 1538, while still resident in Brussels, the prince had a dog called ‘Solomón’, after the biblical king. This noble canine, together with two other dogs of less regal appellation – ‘Rosilla’ and ‘Capitán’ – were in the care of his huntsmen Luis Martínez and Alonso Marcos. Once again we find a link between the founder of the Escorial and Solomon, this time in an indisputable fact bearing on the most mundane aspects of Philip II’s everyday life.22

Let us not forget that the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestants differed in their interpretation of the Eucharist as either an act of transubstantiation, in which the bread and wine are transformed into the true Body and Blood of Christ, or as a simple symbolic act. The doctrine of the adoration of the Sacred Form was defined in the 11th session of Trent of 11 October 1551, and instituted in the 22nd session of spring 1562. Its anti-Protestant character is unmistakable: in order to ‘repudiate the errors’, and the ‘heresies to avoid’ were added in chap. 8 of the 13th session: ‘If any one saith that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, to avoid’ were added in chap. 8 of the 13th session: ‘If any one saith that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship of latria, also outwardly manifested; and is consequently neither to be venerated with a special festive solemnity nor to be solemnly borne about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy Church; or is not to be set publicly before the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters, let him be anathema’ (Canon 6).23

5 ‘Reconstructing the ruins of the true Temple of God’

With the death of Charles V, Solomonism evidently shifted from the world of ideas to the world of action, prompting the ‘New Solomon’ to build his temple. Many authors have attached great importance to the moment in which Philip II heard of the modification of his father’s last will and testament, in which he stated his wish to be buried in a new-ly constructed building in Spanish territory. The first known chronicle of the monastery (1591), which has not yet been published, states that Philip’s ‘reason for building that sumptuous royal monastery was that Emperor Charles V ... said that there was no reason why it should not be built in Granada, in the company of such saintly and glorious ancestors, but, had considered, with reason and logic, that he could not and should not take precedence over them, as this would be rather disrespectful, and on the other hand, if he allowed them to take precedence over him, this would constitute a blatant insult to his imperial dignity’.24

Until then, Prince Philip’s artistic tastes were formed under the guidance of his aunt, Mary of Hungary, regent of the Netherlands. The young prince’s dealings with architecture had been confined to alterations to the palaces where he liked to spend his leisure time. He had never concerned himself with religious architecture, least of all with the construction of an entirely new building. It would be a challenge to find a single idea that could bring together, in a building that would be the emblem of his kingdom – the most important monarchy in Europe – all the different functions that such a building had to serve. The slate roofs of the Pardo and Escorial were among the first architectural elements that he imported from the Low Countries.

Yet on 29 December 1558, at his father’s funeral, Philip hit upon the idea that he needed, and that had perhaps been crystallising in his mind. He would model his father’s tomb on the foremost example of religious architecture: Solomon’s Temple. This idea, expressed in 1554 by Cardinal Reginald Pole during Philip’s trip to England, as stated earlier, was expounded at the appropriate moment in the Brussels church of St Gudula by one of the most famous orators of the period, François Richardot.25 The bishop of Arras, Granvelle’s successor, stressed the often-cited episode related by Calvete in his Jélicioso viaje: Charles V’s abdication in his lifetime, just as David had abdicated in favour of his son Solomon. Richardot then provided the key to Solomon’s wise decision regarding the temple of Jerusalem. He counselled Philip II to follow Solomon’s example and to put all his energy and resources into reconstructing ‘the ruins of the true temple of God, which is the Church’ – that is, into re-establishing the cult and single creed that the Reformation had destroyed.26

The specifications of Solomon’s Temple were known in the Middle Ages from the works of St Augustine and other Neoplatonists. Many considered them ideal for the design of Christian churches, given their divine inspiration. Yet temples such as those of St Sophia, St Denis,27 and above all the Sistine Chapel28 derived more than symbolic inspiration from the Jerusalem prototype. The fact that the temple that Jesus had known was built in the classical style, reflecting Vitruvian principles of proportion and harmony,
justified to some extent the recreation of pagan splendour in a Christian society and in a building that was intended to be a flagship of the Counter-Reformation.

6 BIBLICAL EXAMPLES OF POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS UNIFICATION

Many of Prince Philip’s first artistic commissions were based on important mythological, biblical, and of course Solomonic, themes.90 The most important example of Solomonicism, with which Philip II was already wholly identified, can be found in the painting ‘The Queen of Sheba visits King Solomon’ in the choir of St Bavo’s Cathedral in Ghent – painted by Lucas de Heere (1534-1584) in 1559 on the occasion of the 23rd chapter of the Order of the Golden Fleece (fig. 77). The painting was based on the well-known biblical episode (I Kings 10, 1-13 and II Chron. 9, 1-12), at the request of the chancellor Viglius van Aytta (1507-1577) (fig. 57). Solomon is represented with Philip II’s features: with blonde hair, a beard, a hanging lip and a pronounced chin. His attire, including a laurel crown, rather corresponds to that of a Roman emperor, in tune with the Roman temple depicted in the background. The throne leaves us in no doubt as to the painting’s intention, for it is the famous gold and ivory throne of Solomon, with two lions beside the armrests and six steps (1 Kings 10, 19, and II Chron. 9, 18). In a subtle allegory, the Queen of Sheba represents the Low Countries, which place their riches at the king’s disposal in exchange for the latter’s just and wise rule. The composition is clearly based on the same source as ‘The Queen of Sheba visits King Solomon’ (window 5, 1559) by Wouter Cra-

bith in Sint Janskerk (fig. 78). The Latin text on the frame of the painting by De Heere emphasises the parallel between Philip II and the biblical king:10 “in the same manner, another Solomon, Philip, pious jewel among kings, gave here and elsewhere amazing examples of his wisdom’.

These comparisons would continue to echo in the religious wars with the Protestants, although not always in the form of a panegyric. Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617), who collaborated with the famous engraver Philip Galle (1537-1612), made an engraving in the last quarter of the 16th century with an interesting allegory against the Inquisition. Solomon was represented as a ‘Crudelis princeps’ (the cruel sovereign), surrounded by the false mother (‘Falsa Ecclesia’ – the False Church) and the evil counsellors, who do not listen to the true mother (‘Vera Ecclesia’ – the True Church). Solomon leaves the dead child on the floor (Barrabas, the real delinquent) and, in contrast to the biblical account (I Kings 3, 16-28), slashes the living child into two (Christ). This child represents the victims of the Inquisition who, like Christ, were unjustly killed and martyred. The evil counsellors surrounding the throne personify the practices of the Inquisition. Meanwhile, the Protestants in the front demonstrate their opposition to the evil counsellors.11

As we see, the biblical parallels were not only tributes to Solomon’s building and his qualities of wisdom, prudence and pacifism, but also contained elements of religious propaganda, which had particular relevance in the Low Countries. King Solomon accomplished the great task of religious unification, as recalled by Cardinal Pole and Richardot. A highly disparate group of nomadic tribes were brought together under King David and his son Solomon. While the Israelites in the north worshipped the Ark of the Covenant, where the Tablets of the Law were kept, the Judahites of the south worshipped their God from their high mountain territory. Perhaps the most important achievement of these two kings is not that they made their kingdoms respected by powerful neighbouring countries, but that they brought about the spiritual unity of the tribes of Israel and Judah. David shrewdly placed the Ark of the Covenant in a fixed temple – with the same proportions as the movable Tabernacle, where it had been worshipped until then. This temple was situated on Mount Moriah in the outskirts of Judah’s capital, Jerusalem, a city that, though at the kingdom’s geographical centre, had not been very important until then. Thus David also succeeded in uniting the religious cults of his territories, with his power as political and religious head of the State. God himself designed and even sketched the plans for the future temple, which he handed to King David. Nevertheless, God disapproved of David’s warring past, and therefore gave the task of constructing the temple to his son, the peaceable and wise king Solomon.12
For 16th-century architects, who were influenced by the Platonic theory of ideas and musical and geometric perfection, the temple of Jerusalem’s divine measurements and plans held the secret of the harmony of the universe, the music of the spheres. Scientific humanists could not reconstruct the temple simply on the basis of biblical descriptions, which were vague and incomplete. Hebraists and philologists, however, who were influenced by Erasmianism, had access to far more heterodox sources such as the Hebrew Talmud, Bible commentaries by Panguini, Vatable and Münster, and historical sources of Judaism from the 1st century AD, such as the Roman historian Flavius Josephus (c. 37 CE – c. 100). Given that the description of Solomon’s Temple in the Old Testament only referred to its interior, the exterior was often derived from descriptions of the second temple built by King Herod in the time of Jesus, provided by the Rabbis and Josephus. This temple, built in the Roman style of the period, satisfied the humanist interest in classical antiquity and appealed to Emperor Charles V and his son, who were drawn to the attributes of imperial Rome.

The Escorial monastery would become the symbol of the political and religious unity of Philip’s kingdoms. For this reason the Royal Pantheon was placed at the very heart of the monastery, exalting the Habsburg dynasty. The architecture of the temple, as already noted, would leave a strong imprint in the architectural conception of the building, although the complexity of the task would prevent it from being fully realised.

In 1559, Philip found the architect with classical training that he was looking for in Juan Bautista de Toledo (c. 1530-1597). In 1563, construction began on the monastery, in classical Roman style, on a remote mountain at the centre of the Iberian peninsula. It would be occupied by the Jeronymite order, a mainly Castilian, courtly order that Charles V had also chosen for his retirement in Yuste. Just before the laying of the first stone, Philip transferred the capital of the kingdom to the nearby village of Madrid – which was then a simple hunting ground.

Elsewhere I have discussed the extraordinary similarity between the southern part of the Escorial – the convent proper – and the second temple of Jerusalem built by King Herod in the 1st century BC on the site of Solomon’s Temple, which had been destroyed (fig. 79). Unlike the first temple, which is barely described in the Bible, this rectangular temple was described in meticulous detail by Josephus in the Jewish War. Its dimensions and proportions coincide with those of the Hebrew elbows, as they were used by Pliny and Herodotus. The architectural scheme – the ‘Universal Plan’ – is almost identical: four courtyards arranged in the form of a cross, separated from the central courtyard by a staircase, where the monks lived. The towers were also the same, before Herrera simplified them and added the library above the entrance. The Counter-Reformation – led by the Jesuit Juan Bautista Villalpando (1552-1608) – favoured a third temple: the square temple in the prophet Ezekiel’s vision.

Medallions were placed at the entrance of the basilica to commemorate the laying of the first stone (1563), the first Mass (1586) and the consecration of the basilica (1595), in which he is referred to – merely – as the king of Spain, the Two Sicilies, and Jerusalem. And very close by stand the
The precepts obliged the templative order and, therefore, very suitable for carrying out the liturgical precepts of Trent. The precepts obliged the deceased to achieve redemption and grace through the benefit, like the living, from the blessings of the sacrament. The Jeronymites were an eminent, sacrificial of Christ’s death, and their images kneel before his ad-orare, in the meaning, in accordance with the etymology of the Latin word ad-orare, to put one’s hands before one’s mouth, in the sense of a supplication. The statues of the deceased at the sacristy, in an attitude of prayer, adoring the Eucharist displayed in the monstrance at the main entrance to the church. The inscriptions on the pedestals, written by Fray Santos in 1660, are quite significant. The inscription on David reads: ‘Operis exemplar a Domino recepit’ (I Chron. 28). And on Solomon: ‘Templum Dño [Domino] aedificatum didicavit’ (I Kings 6). According to Fray José de Sigüenza (1544–1606), the idea of the kings came from Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598), although the sketch of the text for the pedestals has been lost. He himself had prepared some biblical phrases, at Philip’s request, but after the king’s death this commission came to nothing. They are wrongly called the kings of Judah, in that they only came to be known as such after the split caused by Rehoboam, Solomon’s son, who divided his father’s kingdom into Israel in the north and Judah in the south. By a curious coincidence, Philip’s successors, like Solomon’s, would lose their northern kingdoms.

The positions of David and his son Solomon correspond to those of his Charles V and his son Philip II in the funeral monuments on either side of the altar in the presbytery, conveying a strong dynastic symbolism. The emperor and the king with their families are portrayed with the Eucharist and sacristy at its centre, as seen in the cupola, the altar above the pantheon, and the tabernacle, tive medallions – to the flat vault under the choir, the major axis of representation, which starts at the main entrance, below the library, leading through the entrance to the church – with the kings of Judah and the commemorative medallions – to the flat vault under the choir, the cupola, the altar above the pantheon, and the tabernacle, with the Eucharist and sacristy at its centre, as seen in the famous series of engravings by Pieter Perret (1555–1639) and Juan de Herrera (c. 1530–1597). Herrera, the architect of the building, emphasises this idea by drawing the Sacred Form – the host with the body of Christ – rising above the chalice, inside the transparent tabernacle (drawing IX). This was also noted by Fray Sigüenza, the third librarian of the Escorial according to Fernando Chueca Goitia compared with the temple of Jerusalem.
the monastery: ‘the principal and first [devotion] ... was rightly the Holy Sacrament, that most devout heritage of the House of Austria.’ The tabernacle of the altar was the ‘purpose and centre of the whole building, the church and the high altar’. The other medallion – in which Philip II, beneath the statue of Solomon, is declared king of Jerusalem – commemorates the date of the consecration of the temple (1595), and corresponds to The Dedication of the Temple of King Solomon depicted in the King’s Window of Sint Janskerk in Gouda. Once again, we can find echoes of the Escorial in the old motifs of Gouda. According to Fray Sigüenza, who dedicates two entire discourses to the consecration of the Escorial basilica: ‘For this reason the pontiffs have determined since the beginning of the Church (this is not a new tradition, as its enemies believe, but one followed by the apostles themselves, who embraced Jesus Christ), that churches should be consecrated ... the same Lord wished to authorise, with his presence, the feast of the dedication of the temple built by Judas Maccabeus’.

7 The Escorial and Solomon’s Temple

Chroniclers of the Escorial were still drawing comparisons between the two kings a hundred years after Philip II’s death. Nevertheless, some authors criticised the Solomonicism of the Escorial, probably on account of its Jewish associations. Indeed, five years after his numerous references to Solomonism in the Historia of the monastery (1600), Fray Sigüenza published a Descripción of the Escorial devoting an entire chapter (chapter 22) to the differences between the Escorial and Solomon’s Temple, with special reference to the budget: ‘A comparison and discussion of this temple and house with other famous buildings, especially Solomon’s Temple’. The subject was indeed at the heart of a growing polemic, as criticism began to emerge about the spiralling costs that King Philip was imposing on his subjects. The Escorial must have seemed an unnecessary extravagance during the unstable period at the end of the century.

The treatises on the temple of Jerusalem produced during the reign of Philip II should also be considered in this context; for example, that by Benito Arias Montano and his rival Juan Bautista Villalpando, even though they were written after the conception of the monastery. Arias Montano, a confidant of the king, was responsible for the royal library that was built inside the monastery. Villalpando was a student of Juan de Herrera, and through the latter managed to obtain Philip II’s support to print his work.

According to Fray Sigüenza, the king had some knowledge of Hebrew, which seems to clash with his supposed anti-Semitism. Yet such knowledge was by no means rare in a period devoted to biblical studies, although this would be some years later. As mentioned earlier, Philip II was always referred to as king of Jerusalem, even though this was only a symbolic title. The importance that the Burgundians attached to the spirit of the Crusades and to Jerusalem as the cradle of Christendom must have carried more weight than any possible heterodoxies, which neither he...
not the Inquisition could permit.

From this perspective, we can understand some of Philip II’s actions with regard to Judaism, such as his role as godfather in the baptism of a rabbi in 1589, performed with great pomp in the basilica of the Escorial, with the Infanta as the godmother: ‘In this year [1589], a great Jew and Rabbi and learned in his faith, a most important man who had considerable wealth, converted to our Catholic faith; and the Catholic king and the Serene Infanta were his godparents. He was baptised in the church of the Escorial. A great congregation attended that day’. As we see, Philip II was not exactly anti-Jewish, but rather – like Solomon – he opposed religious diversity in his kingdoms. The king was not yet 22 years old when he was a guest of honour in the Low Countries and exalted as a new Solomon; he was 32 when the first plans of the Escorial were drawn up; 49 when Fray Luis de León (1527-1591) was imprisoned by the Inquisition, accused of being a Judaist; and when the last stone was laid in the monastery, only 14 years before his death at the age of 71. Age and experience with the Inquisition would teach the Spanish ‘Solomon the Second’ to be prudent with Jewish sources (fig. 80).

Notes

1. ‘Por lo mucho que se hizo en la deconocion el catolico Rey Philippo Segundo a aquel emperador, ha querendo bien suenturado sancio manifestar al mundo quan acetto Dios este seruicio de la fundacion de tan sump- tuous templo. En la vieja ley agradecio Dios por el profeta Nathan, el buen intento de su Señor Davide de quererle edificar templo en Jerusaleme prometio que le recibiera de manos de su hijo y suerote Sa- lomon, a quien adornaria para él con paz y sabiduria singular, y le añadio riquezas sobre todos los Reyes de Israel […]’. El que quisiere creer y saber con mas certidumbre lo que es, vealo que hallara edificado en otro templo de Salomon, que con todo ello pareciera haberse albergado, puesta, y edificada en tan poco dias, y tan sin ruido de succurril, y sin sentir, que no parece obra hecha por solas manos humanas en este santo templo, que con tanta afici- on y deconocion, mostrara y empleara en las su riquezas, el Catolico Rey don Philippo, ofreciendo como otro Salomon.’


3. According to tradition, St Lawrence (c. Huesca 230 – Rome 258) was martyred on a gridiron on 10 August. We owe the legend of the gridiron to St Ambrose and the poet Prudentius, who, in the 4th century, distorted the facts to colourful effect. The saint, one of the seven Roman deacons, was tortured on a gridiron on 10 August. We owe the legend of the gridiron to St Ambrose and the poet Prudentius, who, in the 4th century, distorted the facts to colourful effect. The saint, one of the seven Roman deacons, was tortured on a gridiron on 10 August. We owe the legend of the gridiron to St Ambrose and the poet Prudentius, who, in the 4th century, distorted the facts to colourful effect. The saint, one of the seven Roman deacons, was tortured.

4. ‘Ut quondam David procerum plaudente senatu / arce sua natum regali / dicit hominum’; ‘Vivat Rex’; and ‘Maxima regni plena ditione teneret / gaudet et ingenti nunc ergo antverpia plausa / gaudet et ingendi nunc ergo antverpia plausa / regni plena ditione teneret / gaudet et ingenti nunc ergo antverpia plausa / regni plena ditione teneret / gaudet et ingenti nunc ergo antverpia plausa / regni plena ditione teneret / gaudet et ingenti nunc ergo antverpia plausa’.

5. Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, Fols. 13v and 15r.

6. Ibid., fols. 14v and 15r.


9. Ibid., p. 100 f. ‘En el alto d’el caer se hazia una quadra, en que se representaua la historia de Salomon, como fue vingado por Rey de Israel por el Sacr- erdote Sadow, y el Profeta Nathan con voluntad d’e Reyno David su padre, y abriendo las cortinaz parecia el Reyno David muy viejo y con sentado en su real silla, y cabe el su hijo Salomon.’

10. Ibid., p. 117: ‘quain firmas los Reynos de Davide y Salomon por ser elegidos de Dios, como lo fue el Empedor don Carlos y el Principe don Philippo su hijo.’

11. Ibid., p. 137: ‘Salomon fue confirmado en el Reyno de Jerusalem con mucha alegria d’e pueblo: porque asi como el Empedor yguala en piedad a Davide su padre, asi vos siendo su hijo seguis de vuestro grado en lo Bueno y Santo las pisadas de su hijo Salomon.’

12. Ibid., p. 153: ‘Como el prudente Reyno Davide Propheta disuivo antes de su muerte hizo Rey a Salomon; asi el Empedor […] pone a su Hijo en su propio Imperia.’

13. Ibid., p. 28y: ‘representauase en el primero por personajes bius, como Sa- lomon fue vingado por Rey de Israel, biuiendo el Reyno David su Padre.’


15. Ibid., p. 288: ‘Estaua consentiendose en tiempos pasados el pueblo de Israel, de que el Rey Davide couernaua los Reynos, que su Padre le auia en- comendado, no menos nos deuemos alegar agora nosotros con tan cierta esperanza, de que vn tal princep ha de suceder al Empedor […] Asi como en Israel con regozijo se alegrò, viendo a Salomon triunphando, al qual auia biuiendo el Padre le puso in su Real silla, por lo qual con Israel con regozijo se alegrò y con alegria aprouò lo, que en esto auia ordenado.’


17. His exalted as a new Solomon; he was 32 not yet 22 years old when he was a guest of honour in the Low Countries and exalted as a new Solomon; he was 32 when the first plans of the Escorial were drawn up; 49 when Fray Luis de León (1527-1591) was imprisoned by the Inquisition, accused of being a Judaist; and when the last stone was laid in the monastery, only 14 years before his death at the age of 71. Age and experience with the Inquisition would teach the Spanish ‘Solomon the Second’ to be prudent with Jewish sources (fig. 80).
were a Man elect of God, yet, for that he was contaminated with Blood and War, he could not build the Temple of Jerusalem, but left the finishing thereof to Solomon, which was Rex pacificus. So may it be thought, that the appeasing of Controversies in Religion is not appointed to this Emperor, but rather to his Son, who shall perform the Building that his Father had begun. Which Church cannot be perfectly built, unless universally in all Realms we adhere to one Head, and do acknowledge him to be the vicar of God, and to have power from above. See The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England, 2nd ed., vol. III, pp. 319-320, London 1762.

18 For the splendid, extensive study, see J. L. Gonzalo Sánchez-Molero: "Los orígenes de la imagen salomónica de El Escorial", in La actu del Simpósium. Lituraria e imagen en el Escorial, San Lorenzo de El Escorial 1996, pp. 736f.


20 For the inclusion of the quartering for Jerusalem in the Gouda King's Window, see Andrea C. Gasson, pp. 222-223 in the present volume.

21 We can find a precedent for this emulation of the biblical king in Philip’s godfather, King Manuel I of Portugal (1469-1521), father of Emperors Isabella, the wife of Charles V, was also compared in this way: "Nuna mimesis da história de Israel: a transmissão do trono de D. João II para D. Manuel é comparada por Duarte Galvão ao episódio bíblico de Saul é David, a edificação do Mosteiro de Belem e mitemetizado, por D. António Pinheiro, ao ciclo de David y de Salomón na construção do Templo de Jerusalém, João de Barros compara D. Manuel a Salomão." See J. Muxia Gato and N. Sapieha, "Uma nova Belém fora da Palestina", in Jerónimos. Memória e lugar de Real Monte, Lisboa 1997, p. 37.

22 Archivo de Palacio, Administración General, Madrid, leg. 6724, without folio (Brussels 1558). See J. L. Gonzalo Sánchez-Molero, Regia Bibliotheca. El libro en la Corte de Carlos V (1500-1558), Mérida 2004, and also the essay by Corrie Raddershoff and Lucy Schütze, pp. 75-76, in the present volume.


24 Fray Jean de la Cruz, Libro quarto de la historia de los reys. Padre Sánchez, Historia Real Bibliothecae del Monasterio de El Escorial, ms. cod. II-10, fol. 329v: el testamento que tuvo para edificar aquel sumptuoso y Real monasterio fue que estando el Emperador Carlos V [...] dixo, que no holgara en otro nombre que pudiera ser en Granada en compañía de tan santos y gloriosos abuelos, pero que a su tiempo, porque tan poco tiempo vivió, tan poco tiempo de naturaleza no les podia ni deuia preceder, pues en cierta manera sería descaso, y que por otra parte si se deuia preceder por ellos haría notorio agravio a su dignidad imperial.

25 François Richarod (1507-1574), Burgundian instructor of the Augustinians, was tutor and confessor to Margaret of Austria, the regent of Spain, her son, following the confidence that she put in his high wisdom, & se afanaron en tal intento'. See E. Battisti, 'Roma apocalíptica y Rey Salomón', in Encuentros hispano, Turín 1966; Spanish ed. 1990, pp. 66 and 69.

26 The sermon in question, which Philip II prefixed with an apology for his poor French, said: 'Mais, vne chose diray -je toutesfois, que, comme Dauid, se mentant bient de tant de penes par lay rapporter, declara successor en son Roiaume Saummes’. Royal Library of Belgium: Le sermon funèbre, fait devant le roy par mes-


28 The inscriptions in Perugino’s frescoes on the triumphal arches of the Sixtin Chapel in Rome, in the representation of Giving of the Keys to St Peter (Matt. 16), refer to Pope Sixtus IV as a new Solomon builder of the Vatican chapel, the fourth reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple: ‘immensus[m] Salome Templun tu hoc quarte sacrat’. In Nicolás V’s political testament, he is connected with the knowledge, intelligence and doctrine of Firam, the builder of Solomon’s Temple: ‘Si Hiram quoque Tyreensem famosissimi Templi Salomonis nam Architectum, sed singularum aetatis magistrum, opificemque aerarium, de aperienda, intelligentia ac doctrina, & de sculpendi arte, statuariaque sacris Libri apprime laudatum fuisse prompter. Qui in saeculo septimo decimo beneficaopianum sub Regulari et Philippo II, Artis honore et urbe futuram, in cælo adventus’. See E. Battisti, ‘Roma apocalíptica y Rey Salomón’ in Encuentros hispano, Turín 1966, Spanish ed. 1990, pp. 66 and 69.


31 Although it does not directly attack Philip II, the Latin text on the right-hand corner of the engraving leaves no doubt as to its intention: ‘sede ven- it: hora ut omnis qui interfecto vos, arbitretur obscurum. Se prestarre Deo.’ (John 16, 2). It continues: ‘In multudine populi Dignitas regis: et In paucis tracta patebit Ignominia principis.’ (Prov. 14, 28). Then: ‘Principes qui loben- ter audit verbandamci omnes ministros habet Impios’ (Prov. 29, 12). And then: ‘Venite sapienter opprimamus eos, ne forte multipletur.’ (Exod. 11, 10). Finally, the lower line reads: ‘Quando obstetricabitis hebreus et partus tempus adhucern, si masculus fuerit, interficie illum si faemi- na referat.’ (Exod. 11, 16). See Deforé (1986), pp. 108-109, fig. 34.

32 I Chron. 22, 7-8: ‘And David said to Solomon, My son, as for me, it was in my mind to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God; But the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars; thou shalt not build an house unto my name.’

33 The Spanish edition of D'Iberville (History of the Jewish Wars) by Flavius Josephus was printed by Martín Núñez y Núñez in Antwerp in 1557, translated by Juan Martín Cordero, with a royal privilege and a dedication to Philip II on the cover. See The politic of the temple includes the same shape and measurements as that built by Solomon six centuries earlier, but with classical Roman decorations. In this way, a link was established between Roman and biblical antiquity, adapted in order to justify the pa- gan architecture in the Renaissance. Among the first books that Philip...
bought at the tender age of 12 was Josephus, together with the Bible and the Missal. Of the three Greek manuscripts preserved in Spain, two are presently in the monastery library. See G. Parker, Felipe II, Madrid 1984, p. 26.

34 There is no better testimony than that by the Jeronymite father, Fray José de Sigüenza, the main chronicler of the monastery, in Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo, vol. II, dedicated to the king, Madrid 1600, ed. mod. Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Madrid 1907: “No ay cosa en la Orden de San Jerónimo que no sea de la casa real, y por consiguiente grande, así me atreví a decir que no se puede enajenar, por ser de la corona […] Muchas de las Casas son fundaciones reales; los privilegios y rentas de que se sustentan, casi todas se las dieron los Reyes; los favores y el aliento con que han llegado hasta aquí, de allí nacieron; oy en día, por decirlo así, la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.”


36 The transition that produced the final scheme has been explained by F. Chueca Goitia, although from the point of view of the convent’s functional needs. See F. Chueca Goitia, Cosas reales en monasterios y conventos españoles, 1966, and revised and expanded ed. Madrid 1982.

37 The texts of the medallions refer to the dedication of the first stone of the Basilica of San Lorenzo on 20 August 1565, St Bernard’s Day, and the first mass, celebrated on the 8th of St Lawrence’s Day, on 6 August 1568. D. Lavrent Mart. / Philippt. II. Omn. HISP. REGN. / VTRIVSQ. SICIL. hier. etc. rex / Camilli Caiet Alexandr. / Patriarchae Nvin. Tii Apost. / Ministerio Hanc Basilicam / CHRISMATE CONSECRAND. / PIE AC DEVOTE CURAVIT. DIE / XXX Avg. AN. M. D. LXIII.

38 ‘He built the Temple and dedicated it to the Lord.’

39 He received the plan of the work from the hands of the Lord.

40 ‘He received the plan of the work from the hands of the Lord.’


42 ‘He built the Temple and dedicated it to the Lord.’

43 ‘He built the Temple and dedicated it to the Lord.’


45 ‘La comparación y conferencia de este templo y casa con otros edificios famosos, principalmente con el templo de Salomón.’

46 For example, in a contemporary sermon by Fray Luis de Avcevedo: ‘Quando el Rey David quiso hacer un templo donde Dios morase, junto gran suma de riquezas de oro, plata, piedras preciosas […] los principales del pueblo de Israel, de ver tanto sumo de oro y piedras preciosas, decian que con aquel caudal se podian hazer muchos templos, como dezimos aca en Herespa del templo sumptuosissimo de San Laurencio el Real del Escorial.’ See Fray Luis de Avcevedo, Moral, discursos morales, Valladolid 1664, p. 111.

47 Benito Arias Montano, Anquitatem Indiavm, libri IX. In quib praefer erudiri, Hierosolymorum, et Templo Salomonis, […] Antwerp 1593, pp. 88-99. This is a compilation of texts relating to the temple and other biblical constructions of the Biblia sacra Hebraice, Chaldaice, Graece, & Latine Philippi II. reg. cathol. pontifi. et rudis ad sacraeuvre ecclesiastum Christoph. Plantinscu excud. 8 vols., Antwerp 1569-1573, published before the work by Villalpando was due to be published, and as a counterpoint to it.

48 Juan Bautista Villalpando, S.I., De postera Ezechielii Prophetae visione Ioanni Baptistae Villapandi Cordobensi e Societate Iesu. Tomi secund. explantationem pars secunda, Rome 1605; translated by J.L. Oliver, Madrid 1991. All modern authors, including those previously cited, use the Jesuit’s theories as a model for comparing the monastery and temple of Solomon, without taking into account the great formal differences it has with the historical-Hebraistic theories championed by Arias Montano.

49 Sigüenza (1665), I. XVII, p. 187.


51 Juan Bautista Villalpando, S. I. De postera Ezechielii Prophetae visione Ioanni Baptistae Villapandi Cordobensi e Societate Iesu. Tomi secund. explantationem pars secunda, Rome 1605; translated by J.L. Oliver, Madrid 1991. All modern authors, including those previously cited, use the Jesuit’s theories as a model for comparing the monastery and temple of Solomon, without taking into account the great formal differences it has with the historical-Hebraistic theories championed by Arias Montano.

52 Sigüenza (1665), I. XVII, p. 187.


54 ‘... la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.’

55 ‘... la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.’

56 ‘... la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.’

57 ‘... la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.’

58 ‘... la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.’

59 ‘... la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.’

60 ‘... la vida que viven no tiene otro origen.’