

EMPEROR CHARLES V AS PATRON OF THE VISUAL ARTS

Earl. E. Rosenthal

RESUMEN

La información que poseemos sobre los encargos artísticos de Carlos V no permiten apoyar las pretensiones hechas recientemente que valoran en exceso su impacto personal sobre las artes visuales y el papel que desempeñó como patrón activo en la configuración de su propia "imagen imperial". Las obras que "mandó hacer" deben considerarse encargos "titulares" o "institucionales" más que personales. Lo normal era que el ímpetu inicial partiese de sus vasallos y que estas obras fuesen supervisadas y determinadas estilísticamente por otros. Los pocos encargos de los que tenemos la certeza que fuesen iniciados y revisados por el Emperador no revelan ni una estética personal ni el intento de crear una imagen. Este fue un asunto que se dejó en manos de sus súbditos.

SUMMARY

The art commissions of Charles V about which we have some detailed information do not support recent claims that he was an active patron who had a personal impact on the visual arts and used them to fashion his own «imperial image». The works «he ordered made» can often be described as «titular» or «institutional» rather than personal commissions. The initial impetus usually came from vassals and the works were almost always supervised and determined in style and in specific form by others. The few commissions he clearly initiated and supervised do not reveal a personal aesthetics nor an image-making intent. That was left to his subjects.

For students of art patronage, Charles I of Spain and V of the Holy Roman Empire is an irresistible subject, because hundreds of works of art and architecture were made in his name throughout his two empires. Some recent scholars have accepted virtually all these works as equally representative of his taste and «ideology», without recognizing markedly different levels of his involvement in their inception, supervision and final approval. We can not extract a «cultural biography of the emperor» or define his «impact on the visual arts» from this disparate array of works¹. Those inclined to this holistic approach have even claimed that Charles and his advisors controled the fashioning of his imperial image in works commissioned by others all over Europe. In my view, these assumptions misrepresent Charles V as a patron and as a person.

In this short paper, I can not discuss every work of art associated with Carles throughout his life, but I shall select representative commissions about which we know enough to determine the level of his involvement as well as his attitude toward the visual arts and the fashioning of his imperial image.

Charles' first seventeen years were spent in Flanders where he was raised by his formidable Aunt

Margaret, regent of the Lowlands for her father, Emperor Maximilian I, who guided Charles' training from distant Bavaria. Both Maximilian and Margaret were active patrons of the arts and early proponents of their use for political purposes. Perhaps it was his aunt's enthusiasm for art patronage that caused Charles to defer to her, even after he came of age in 1515 and, of course, after he left for Spain in 1517.

Charles' youthful indifference to the arts is suggested by an incident that occurred when he returned briefly to the Lower Rhineland for his coronation as King of the romans at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1520. Albrecht Duerer, on this occasion, traveled from Nuernberg to Antwerp to petition the renewal of the annual income that had been assigned to him by the previous emperor. Duerer followed Charles from Antwerp to Aix and on to Cologne before his petition was accepted, and then Carles did not receive him. Meanwhile the painters' and the Goldsmiths' guilds of Antwerp honored Duerer with banquets, and these artists and the merchants of the city eagerly bought drawings and prints the German artist had brought with him. The most striking contrast with Charles' indifference is provided by his brother-in-law, Christian II of Denmark, who stopped in Antwerp on his way to Aix for the coronation. Upon learning that Duerer was in town, he asked him to make a portrait. Christian was so pleased with the preliminary drawing that he invited the artist to accompany him to Brussels where the portrait could be executed in oil.

Charles' passivity in matters of patronage in the Lowlands makes surprising his appointment of a Spaniard to the post of «pintor del rey» in 1518, a year after his arrival in Spain at age seventeen. The artist was, of course, the eccentric and talented Alonso Berruguete, who returned from Italy in 1517 with a style we would now classify as Mannerist. The only commission Charles is known to have given Berruguete was a task entrusted to the supervision of Juan Rodríguez de Fonseca, bishop of Burgos and one of the early proponents of the Renaissance style in Sapin. That was the painting of the sails and banners of the fleet that was to take Charles and his entourage from La Coruña to Antwerp for the coronation at Aix in October 1520. In view of Fonseca's involvement, it is reasonable to assume (as many have) that he recommended the appointment of Berruguete as «pintor del rey». Although the artist remained a member of the royal household throughout Charles' reign and retained a sinacure as notary of the criminal section of the Chancillery in Valladolid, there is no evidence that Charles ever made further use of Berruguete as a painter or a sculptor.

In Spain Charles soon discovered that Castilian kings were sometimes petitioned to assign funds for the construction or renovation of ecclesiastical buildings, especially cathedrals. One well-documented case is the cathedral of Segovia, for which Ferdinand the Catholic had approved a project in 1510 and then failed to provide the funds. By 1522 the canons seem to have abandoned the earlier project and petitioned Charles to assign an annual income for the building of the cathedral on the basis of a new design. In a letter indicating his willingness to provide funds, he ordered the three main authorities in Segovia, that is to say the bishop, the mayor and the first councilman, to select a site and to clear it and then to oversee the design of the cathedral with its cloister and administrative buildings. These officials were then to interview masons for the post of chief architect and to select «the one most competent in your consciences and opinions»². There is no evidence that Charles was consulted on their choice of the experienced Gothic-style mason, Juan Gil de Hontañón, or that he had anything further to do with the construction of the cathedral, begun in 1525. He simply funded the work and turned over all decisions to local authorities, and I suspect this was true of most other ecclesiastical works for which Carles provided an income.

The cathedral of Granada might have turned out to be a similar case if the cabildo had requested funding before Charles' 1526 visit to the Andalusian city. But, upon seeing the Royal Chapel for the first time, Charles realized that he could not be buried there as his grandparents had decreed. To avoid a total

negation of their wishes, he designated the sanctuary of the future cathedral as his burial chapel. That decision required some changes in the design of the cathedral approved in 1504, along with that of the Royal Chapel. In little over a year there was a new archbishop, Pedro Ramírez de Alava, who decided that the change in the function of the sanctuary required a new project and, as a convert to the Renaissance style, he selected Italian-trained Diego Siloe to design a new cathedral in the «Roman» style and to provide places for imperial sepulchres. While Charles clearly had a personal interest in the cathedral of Granada, he seems to have left its design in the hands of the new bishop, whom is likely to have known as the prior of the Convent of San Jerónimo, since the empress had installed her house-hold there in 1526.

Charles was required to make a decision on the new style when the canons of the Royal Chapel protested the change from «moderno», meaning «gothic», to «Romano», meaning the Renaissance style. This is evident from Charles' letter of 23 December 1528 to the archbishop of Granada³. The pertinent part reads: «...yo he sido informado que el hedifiçio de la yglesia mayor desa dicha cibdad se quiere labrar al modo romano estando acordado desde el tiempo que se traçaron las obras de la dicha yglesia e la capilla Real que entramos se labrasen al modo moderno, e como la capilla esta edificado a aquel proposito ha pareçido e paresçe a oficiales e maestros que en la juntura de la postrera nave de la dicha yglesia que vema a juntarse con la dicha capilla e paredes della avra tanta cargazon de edifiçio que la capilla podria reçibir detrimento por no estar labrado ni edificado a aquel proposityo e porque no es justo que del dicho edifiçio resulta daño e perjuizio a la dicha capilla yo os encargo e mando que no deve lugar a que se haga edifiçio de que pueda subceder al dicha perjuizio...»

First, it would seem that Charles was not consulted on the transformation of the sanctuary into a domed rotunda following the model of an imperial mausoleum, and thus that he had nothing to do with this important step in the «Romanizing» of his imperial image. Secondly, it seems to me that the emperor was expressing not one but two concerns. The first is a change of style, using the well-established terms «moderno» and «romano». They are essentially style designations, not structural terms, though admittedly the kinds of supports and vaults characteristic of each style are structurally different. Damián Bayón understood these designations as references to style, and he believed that Charles had taken the side of the Gothic masons. Bayón contrasted the progressive attitudes of nobles such as the Mendoza with the reactionary position of the emperor. But Charles was simply recognizing that a project for both the cathedral and the chapel in the Gothic style had been approved by his grandparents and, since the chapel had already been completed, the cathedral should also be executed in that style. He was making a judgment in a particular circumstance, rather than expressing a preference for the Gothic over the Renaissance style.

The second concern was for the structural compatibility of Siloe's Renaissance cathedral and Egas' Gothic chapel, as Manuel Gómez-Moreno and José Antonio García Granados have pointed out. We must assume that Egas had designed his chapel to withstand the thrust of the vaults of his Gothic cathedral's outer aisle; but it is possible that Siloe's outer aisle was taller than the one intended by Egas and that the disparity in height gave rise to concerns for the structural stability of the chapel. We know that mason-architects of the Gothic tradition mistrusted the structural knowledge of the designer-architects of the Renaissance style, and the masons consulted by the Royal Chapel belonged to the former group. While Charles' reference to structural concerns is clear, I believe it is a mistake to equate structural and stylistic concerns. An entry in the *Actas Capitulares* of the cathedral in January 1529 records the decision to send Siloe to court to respond to the emperor's order that «desta Santa Iglesia no se haga a lo romano por el perjuicio de la Capilla Real». If the cathedral's cabildo had understood the objections in purely structural terms, they are not likely to have used established style designations.

Since Charles did not require a return to the Gothic style in the cathedral, Siloe must have allayed both structural and stylistic concerns. I suspect he convinced the emperor that the domed rotunda designed for the sanctuary-mausoleum was highly appropriate for the burial chapel of the imperial family because it had been used by Charles' predecessors, the ancient Roman emperors. Siloe may have been more successful in his claim for the symbolic appropriateness of the classical orders and the Roman prototypes than for the aesthetic superiority of the Renaissance style.

The palace on the Alhambra may be the first commission initiated by Charles himself and his first encounter with the design principles of the Renaissance style. Evidently enchanted with the exotic Nazaride palace during his six-month visit in 1526, he made known his intention to return. But, since his wife, Isabel of Portugal, was so dissatisfied with her quarters on the Alhambra that she moved her household to the Convent of San Jerónimo down in the city, he knew that modern quarters would have to be provided before their next visit. Suddenly, three days before his departure, income was available for a modern residence as a result of his acceptance of the tribute of 80,000 ducats from the Moriscoes of Granada in exchange for their right to reinstate Moslem customs banished by the Catholic Monarchs. Without providing typological guidelines or even an indication of the precise location he had in mind, he turned over the task of preparing designs to the governor.

The governor chose Pedro Machuca, the Italian-trained painter whose two triumphal arches for the imperial entry into Granada Charles is likely to have remembered. Several projects for villas that would accommodate the imperial households were sent to Charles in spring 1527. While the central symmetry and geometricity of these groundplans must have puzzled Charles and the Castilian masons he consulted, the main corrections seem to have come from administrators such as Charles' secretary, Francisco de los Cobos, who would have remembered the complaints of ambassadors that their entourages were badly housed and that there were few stable facilities. These advisors recommended the addition of the forecourts surrounded by stables and surmounted by lodgings. And, since Machuca's plans did not indicate the function of any of the halls and none were large enough for an audience hall or court chapel, they stressed those facilities and the necessity of locating them in the front wing. Charles ordered the addition of these forecourts to the villa with a round courtyard, apparently without realizing that these emendations violated the central symmetry and geometricity of the plan and the rhythmic discipline of its stilar facades. Characteristically Charles did not make these changes in Castile but, instead, instructed the governor to make them.

The governor was obviously dismayed by the emperor's insensitivity and, rather than making the changes, he attempted to dissuade the emperor from mutilating the geometricity of the original project. He pointed out, somewhat condescendingly, that the «grace and proportion» of the design would be more readily seen in the wooden model, which would be made as soon as the project were approved. No accustomed to having his instructions challenged, the emperor sent a court architect, Luis de Vega, to insist on the added courtyards and the other changes. Two distinct approaches to architectural design are evident. The Italophiles on the Alhambra were inclined to start with the abstract geometricity of the groundplan without indicating the functions of the various parts, while the Castilian masons and administrators began with the practical needs of an imperial residence. Charles, given his northern background, more readily understood the approach of the Castilians. The dispute represents a classic confrontation of the functional and the aesthetic approaches. In Vitruvian terms, Charles gave *utilitas* precedence over *dispositio*.

Another important architectural work of the late 1520s often associated with Charles V is the Ayuntamiento in Seville. The author of the best-documented study on that building, Alfredo Morales, believes that

Charles was the «verdadero inspirador del empresa»⁴. Without supplying any supporting documentation, he assumes that Charles approved the *trazas* and might even have selected the maestro mayor, Diego Riaño, because that mason was also in charge of the Colegiata in Valladolid, which Fernando Chueca speculated had been begun at Charles' behest in June 1527. Chueca's speculation arises primarily from the fact that the cornerstone of the Colegiata was laid «days after» the birth of Prince Philip in Valladolid on May 21, 1527⁵. There is, however, nothing in the published documents for the Colegiata in Valladolid or the Ayuntamiento in Seville to support the claim for an initiatory role of Charles on those buildings.

It was the cabildo of the city of Seville that decided early in 1526, while preparing for the reception of Charles, that the old Mudéjar structure they shared with the cabildo of the cathedral was, as Rodrigo Cavo said, a «moderíssimo lugar para la grandeza que allí se juntaba»⁶. The cabildo chose a new site on the Plaza de San Francisco where major civic festivals were normally celebrated and they arranged to acquire it from the convent. In all the available documents it is the Cabildo that made decisions on the design and construction of the Ayuntamiento. Charles V is not mentioned. Nor can one even claim a direct impetus from the triumphal arches made for Charles' entry in May 1526, because the earliest parts of the Ayuntamiento, begun in 1528, were designed in the Late Gothic or Isabelline style. Descriptions of the triumphal arches suggest that they were in the «Roman Style», as it was conceived at that time in Sevilla. Only in 1535 do we find clear references to the handsome stylar facade in the Plateresque style, and that is nine years after those ephemeral arches were set up in Sevilla. Furthermore, the initial design for such a project usually delineated the general configuration of the building, leaving specific working drawings for component parts, such as the staircase, vaults, windows or doors, for the time when the construction reached that part of the building. For these reasons, I doubt that the stylar facade was designed in 1528 or that it was directly inspired by the classical decoration of 1526, and those assumptions have been cited as the link between Charles and the Ayuntamiento. Incidentally, the presence of his arms and emblems in the interior and on the facade does not necessarily signal his patronage. They were there to recall the recent honor that he bestowed on the city and also to proclaim that the imperial visit had validated the civic authority of the cabildo.

From several royal residences in Castile commissioned during the 1530s and 1540s, we can garner additional evidence of Charles' patronage habits. Even though he ordered the design for the Granada residence as early as 1526, he waited more than a decade before renovating those of Castile, where he spent most of his time in Spain. The first notice is the joint appointment of Alonso de Covarrubias and Luis de Vega as co-architects of the *alcázares* of Toledo and Madrid in December 1537, but there was little urgency, since no projects were approved until March 1543, when Covarrubias was assigned to Toledo and Vega to Madrid.

Certainly Charles approved the original project for each, provided the funds, and appointed the architects, but the only notice of further involvement is an ambiguous statement by Cean-Bermúdez that «unas notas» in the archives at Simancas refer to the emperor's having discovered that «Covarrubias habia errado las trazas» for Toledo⁷. It would be interesting to know if the «error» was structural, functional or proportional, perhaps even «aesthetic». All available documents indicate that, after Charles approved an initial general project, decisions on specific working designs for successive individual parts were made by local officials, the veedor, mayordomo (and pagador) and the architect.

A new figure of considerable importance to royal patronage entered into the works at Toledo and elsewhere in 1545. He was Prince Philip at age eighteen. Initially, the prince was asked to look in on several royal works during his father's absence, but because he displayed such enthusiasm for the task,

Charles came to depend increasingly on him in Spain, as he did on his Aunt Margaret and then his sister, Mary of Hungary, in the Lowlands. From 1545 Philip also took an active role in the rebuilding of the old hunting lodge known as El Pardo, which Charles initiated in 1543, because its environs provided the best hunting preserves in Spain. It would seem that the enthusiasm for art patronage exhibited by Maximilian and Margaret had skipped a generation, reappearing in the youthful Prince Philip.

From the well-studied works Charles commissioned in Spain, it would appear that he was inclined to leave questions of style to the local authorities. That is evident in the contrast of the contemporary cathedrals of Segovia and Granada and the varied versions of the Renaissance style in the palace on the Alhambra, the *alcázares* of Toledo and Madrid, and El Pardo. We can not extract a personal taste, not even an «ideology», from these varied works. The range increases if we add the essentially Gothic and Mudéjar renovations in the polychromed and gilded interiors of the medieval castle at Segovia and the accommodation of the Renaissance style of Luis and Gaspar de Vega to the Mudéjar *alcázar* at Seville. Flexibility of this range is rare among sixteenth century patrons of art. It suggests that Charles himself was not committed to any style.

Some scholars have claimed that the «Romanizing» of Charles' imperial image began in Italy late in 1529 in the decorations for his entries into cities from Genoa to Bologna, where he was crowned in February 1530 as Holy Roman Emperor. While we have only fragmentary written and graphic records of the triumphal arches and related decorations for Charles' entries during his nine trips to Italy, it is reasonable to assume that the classical elements employed by the Italians were more correct archeologically and iconographically than those used earlier for Charles' entries elsewhere; but the classicizing of his image was not begun by Italians in 1529. We must remember that his grandfather, Maximilian I, began the process when he depicted the Habsburg dynasty in the context of a triumphal arch and a triumphal procession in 1512-1519, and in 1515 various guilds and institutions in Bruges, under the guidance of Charles' Aunt Margaret, set up twelve ephemeral triumphal arches for his entry as the new duke of Burgundy. The crude woodcuts that record those arches reveal how little was known about classical forms in the Lowlands at the time, but the intended reference to ancient Roman architecture is obvious. By the turn of the century in most of western Europe, classical forms became increasingly associated with rulership. For this reason, Charles' Flemish entourage was critical of the modest decorations set up in the cities of northern Spain during his first visit to his new kingdom in 1517-1520.

By 1526 the Andalusian city of Seville provided the most elaborate and apparently «Roman» decoration for the entries of Charles and Isabel on the occasion of their marriage there in May. The responsibility for planning the decorations was assumed by the cabildo of the cathedral with an observer from the cabildo of the city sitting in on the discussions. For the program they depended primarily on Francisco de Peñalosa, a poet and musician who had spent many years in Rome and was familiar with classical allegories and formal motives appropriate to rulership. The overall program was a plea by the people of Seville for good government on the part of the emperor. The first four arches displayed the cardinal virtues of rulership: Fortitude, Clemency, Justice and Prudence; and the next two presented the fruits of good government: Peace and Abundance; while the seventh was devoted to «Gloria» or the fame that rewards the good ruler. The program was not conceived from the emperor's point of view, though in this special case it is likely that he was advised of the general theme in advance; rather, the program exhorts him to rule virtuously and wisely for the benefit of the governed. The nature of the theme as well as the available documentation assure us that the program was conceived in Seville, and the marked differences in sophistication of entry decorations in cities all over Europe convinces me that the programs were conceived locally, not by Charles and his advisors.

Charles' first significant encounter with the Renaissance style and its resolute association with the imperial dignity seems to have occurred in the late 1520s in Andalusia, most notably in the triumphal arches in Seville and Granada in 1526, the projects for the palace on the Alhambra and the cathedral of Granada in 1527-1528, and, of course, Siloe's fervent defense of the style at court in 1529. That initial experience in Andalusia was enriched during nine trips to Italy, beginning in 1528. Clearly, Charles did not select the Renaissance style as the one suited to his rulership but, rather, vassals in his many realms drew on a common and expanding repository of allegories and architectural and decorative motives. The commonality of revived classicism in sixteenth century Europe, not the ideological control by Charles, accounts for the similarity and consistency of programs in praise of the emperor.

Among the artists with whom Charles is associated in Italy, several presented uncommissioned works in the hope they would gain his patronage. Perhaps the first was the Florentine Baccio Bandinelli, from whom he accepted a bronze relief of the «Deposition» in 1529, and Charles must have been pleased because he appointed the sculptor knight of the Order of Santiago. Later, during the 1536 trip, Bandinelli presented the emperor with a marble statue of Venus, but there is no evidence the sculptor was ever given a commission. That also seems to have been the fate of Parmigianino, who in 1530 presented Charles with an allegorical portrait in which the emperor was crowned by Fame and handed the world by Hercules. In the same year he was pleased by a portrait in gold inlay on steel by engraver Giovanni Bernardi da Castelbolognese. Not only did Charles give one hundred pieces of gold but he invited the engraver to come to Spain, an invitation which was declined. Although a crystal medalion of the capture of Francis I at Pavia by Giovanni Bernardi was later in the emperor's collection, it seems that it had been ordered by the bishop of Trent, Bernardo Clesio, and presented to Charles. Most artists who worked for him in Italy were fostered by Italian vassals. This was true of the sculptor Leone Leoni, who was in the service of Ferrante Gonzaga, the emperor's governor of Milan. He seems to have commissioned Leone to do an equestrian portrait of Charles but it was never realized. Then in 1549 Leone began the bronze portrait of Charles (with removable armor) quelling tumult, now in the Prado. The motive was probably meant to recall Vergil's praise of Augustus as the ruler who brought peace to a tumultuous world, because during the several years following Charles' victory at Muehlberg in 1547 it seemed that he had finally subdued the princelings of his Germanic empire. Leone's works honoring Charles in the 1540s led to imperial commissions for several bronzes and marbles destined for the chapel at Yuste, and Leone's son Pompeo continued to work for Philip II at the Escorial.

Titian was, of course, the most famous of the Italian artists fostered by Charles' Italian vassals. It was Federigo Gonzaga, duke of Mantua, who reasoned that the emperor should be served by the greatest artist of his day, as Alexander the Great had been served by Apelles. At the first meeting of the emperor and the artist, probably in 1530, Charles had no time to sit for a portrait, and in 1532 he provided a recent portrait by Jakob Sisenegger for copying. Finally in 1533, Charles permitted Titian and sculptor Alfonso Lombardi to sketch his likeness, and on that occasion Titian did a lost portrait of Charles in armor, while Alfonso did a bust relief in wax which the emperor challenged him to do in marble. Several titles were bestowed on Titian and also an annual income, which he never received, and during later trips to Italy, Charles usually sat for portraits. In 1539 he invited Titian to come to Spain, but the Venetian artist pled previous commitments. Clearly, the emperor, after his initial indifference, gradually came to value Titian's talent, but it was only during his 1548-1551 stay in Augsburg that he fully occupied the artist, primarily in the making of family portraits.

We should mention two categories of works in which Charles displayed exceptional interest: fortifications and tapestries depicting his major victories. We are best informed on his role in the 1540s series of

tapestries representing his personal victory over the Turks at Tunis in 1535. Since he took with him on that campaign two Flemish artists, Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen and Pietre Coecke, painters in the service of his sister, Mary of Hungary, by then regent of the Lowlands, he clearly intended to order tapestries. It is noteworthy that Mary signed the contract for the cartoons in 1546 and that it included the specification that the draftsmen «follow closely the sketches provided by the emperor». It seems he had made corrections in the delineation of the forms of the various ships used in the attack as well as their armament and banners. His concerns were clearly technical and historical. Again, when the contract with the tapestry weaver was made in May 1548, it was Mary of Hungary who signed. Her active role in this commission invites the speculation that she initially suggested that Charles take her court painters to record this historic campaign. Of course, tapestries had long been carried about by itinerant monarchs to hang in audience halls and royal chambers wherever they held court. Felipe Guevara noted that Charles always carried tapestries, which the writer called «pinturas cortesanas». Among them were the famous «los Honores» series made in 1520-1523 and then those depicting the battles of Pavia and Tunis. Certainly, they reminded courtiers of Charles' victories and they must have stimulated discussions and reminiscences among old warriors and, for that reason, they got Charles' special attention.

Plans for fortifications all over Europe, from at least 1531, were reviewed carefully and confidently made corrections and wrote detailed instructions. He exhibited much less confidence in his judgments on cathedrals, palaces, statuary and painting.

Charles was also actively involved in the planning of his retirement residence in the Jeronymite monastery at Yuste in Estremadura, far from the court centers of Spain and his Germanic empire. Charles had not known Yuste but it was recommended by the Count of Oropesa and then visited and approved by Prince Philip in 1554, with construction following soon after. The location had the advantage of good spring water and forests ideal for hunting, a sport he could still pursue, though limited by attacks of gout, and he continued to enjoy wild game at his lavish dinner table. While Charles seems to have delineated the general disposition of the rooms, we know he consulted Luis de Vega, who probably made the «trazas, planta y monte de todo» sent to the prior, Fray Juan de Ortega. Referred to simply as an «aposento», never as a «palacio», it consisted of two stories, each with four equal-size rooms, 20 by 25 Castilian pies (5.50 by 6,80 meters). All the rooms on the upper floor had fireplaces and were hung with tapestries, because they served as winter quarters, while the lower floor was for summer. These relatively small suites were planned for Charles alone. His household of about fifty people and visitors were housed elsewhere. The surrounding citrus gardens were also planned by Charles and they included plants from all parts of his empire. He could have called on the greatest architects and designer of gardens in Europe but he preferred his own utilitarian plans. They betray no sensibility to Renaissance design principles or even an appreciation for the symbolic potential of architecture, by then so widespread in Europe, especially among rulers. Fray Ortega, when he received the emperor's plans, thought the residence was too small and too modest for a royal personage, but Charles did not seem to share that sense of decorum. No support can be gained from his residence at Yuste for the claim that Charles was involved in the Romanizing of the imperial image. Also, we should note that most of the objects brought to Yuste seem to have been chosen for sentimental and devotional rather than aesthetic reasons.

Among the several religious paintings and family portraits he chose to take with him to Yuste, the most interesting for our purpose is Titian's «Holy Trinity», because Charles seems to have been intimately involved in the conception of its unusual iconography⁸. This painting of over three meters, intended for a location now unknown, was probably discussed when Titian was working for Charles in Augsburg in 1551. By the time it was completed in October 1554, it was, of course, sent to Yuste. Called «The Trinity»

by Titian, Aretino, Vasari and Francisco Vargas, the emperor's ambassador in Venice, it was designated «The Last Judgment» in the codicil to Charles' testament in September 1558, and since 1600 it has usually been titled «La Gloria». Two equal images of God and Christ, together with the Holy Ghost, clearly represent the Trinity, a subject rarely found at the time in Spain and Italy, though it was favored in northern Europe. Also transalpine is the context of the celestial court, a format that persisted in the north since the twelfth century. For these reasons it has been suggested that Charles himself proposed the subject and the celestial court format, and also that he had personal reasons for affirming his belief in the Trinity. That dogma, long unquestioned, had been challenged in his realms, first by Luther and his followers and then by Charles' confessor's assistant, Michael Servetus in 1531. We know he regretted not having executed Luther and he must have been embarrassed to have the second major challenge come from his own entourage. A personal sense of guilt may explain his affirmation of his belief in this unusual painting. That explanation is reinforced by the depiction of a Dominican friar praying in a landscape at the base of the painting.

He is almost certainly the thirteenth century Saint Peter Martyr of Verona who is saying the credo before Arian opponent of the belief in the Trinity. Though one Arian was converted as he listened, the others killed Peter. This reference to the thirteenth-century challenge to the belief suggests that Charles ordered this painting because the dogma of the Trinity was again being challenged and in his own realms. Charles and members of his family are shown on the right side of the painting adoring the Trinity, and in his testament of 1554 Charles proclaimed his devotion to the Holy Trinity and his acceptance of the saints as intercessors, with Mary as the primary intercessor. These beliefs, challenged by mid-century, provide the framework of the program of Titian's «Trinity». Not satisfactorily explained are the Old Testament figures in the lower part of the painting, because the Old Testament provides little support for the belief in a Triune God. But while recognizing this uncertainty, there is ample reason to believe that the subject and the format were provided by Charles and that he was motivated by a personal sense of failure to halt the spread of this heresy in his realms. Titian's «Trinity» would seem to be a rare and perhaps unique instance in which Charles employed painting to make a personal profession.

In this paper I have tried to discover the levels of Charles' involvement in the works «he ordered made», a phrase so often used without qualification. In only a few cases does he seem to have provided the initial impetus for a commission. Most might be described as «titular» or «institutional» patronage, in the sense that custom required Charles, as duke of Burgundy or king of Spain, to approve or simply to fund certain kinds of ecclesiastic or civic works. He approved the general plan or iconographic scheme, with more evident attention to practical and functional than aesthetic concerns; and he readily relinquished to others matters of specific form and style, precisely the aspects that most interested sixteenth century patrons. Of course, Charles' peripatetic life as an itinerant ruler frequently required that he leave the supervision of a work to others.

During Charles' youth there is little evidence of an interest in the visual arts, but in the late 1520s and early 1530s he was confronted with several crucial decisions on architectural projects in the Renaissance style and on Italian artists who offered themselves or who were recommended for his service. From that time his interest in the visual arts and his acceptance of the Renaissance style seems to have increased gradually, but even in the late 1540s and 1550s he can not be described as an enthusiastic patron. Even less can he be characterized as an «aesthete», as did William Stirling-Maxwell and a series of English writers, most recently Hugh Trevor-Roper. In the absence of a personal aesthetics, that designation is unwarranted, and so is the claim for a personal «impact on the visual arts». Few of Charles' contemporaries are likely to have made these claims. In the third quarter of the sixteenth century several felt the need to explain his limited enthusiasm for the arts. Most frequently quoted is Lodovico Dolce's observation that the emperor was

«preoccupied with matters of state and war and thus he had little time for painting, the art that the emperor loved and valued». Ambrosio de Morales, Felipe Guevara and Francesco Sansovino said essentially the same.

Charles' appreciation for the metaphoric and symbolic uses of art and architecture seems to have been as limited as his aesthetic sensibilities, but Charles did not need to make propaganda for himself or to enhance his image with Roman metaphors. Since childhood others were doing that for him. His fortuitous inheritances, his victories over France at Pavia and the turks at Tunis as well as his expanding empire in America, led Europeans to believe that Charles, unlike any previous Holy Roman Emperor, could achieve their dream of universal Christian empire. In addition to his good fortune, Charles' primary contribution to his imperial image was his own personal qualities: his dignity and gravity, his moral character and Christian piety, and his sense of God-given responsibility to rule. These qualities presented a person well-suited to the Christian ideal of emperor. His «imperial image» was not fashioned by Charles himself but rather by the collective psyche of Europe. Unlike most Renaissance princes, Charles V did not have to blow his own horn. There were others to do that for him.

NOTAS

1. WILLIAM EISLER makes the most exaggerated claims for Charles as an active patron, using the arts to fashion his imperial image and to express his «ideology», in his dissertation, *The Impact of the Emperor Charles V upon the visual Arts*, published by Garland Press in 1983. Barbara von Barghahn, while less explicit, makes the same assumptions in *Age of Gold, Age of Iron: Renaissance Symbols of Monarchy*, 2 vols., Boston, 1985. CHECA CREMADES, Fernando *Carlos V y la imagen del Héroe en el Renacimiento*. Madrid, 1987, is primarily concerned with image and only incidentally with patronage. Scholars generally tend to use the phrase «Charles V ordered» a work of art or architecture, without recognizing different degrees of involvement.

2. HERNÁNDEZ, Arturo. «Juan Guas, maestro de obras de la catedral de Segovia (1475-1491)», *Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y Arqueología*, XIII (1946-47), pp. 58-61.

3. GÓMEZ MORENO, Manuel. *Diego Siloe*. Granada, 1988, p. 81. Appendix X.

4. MORALES, Alfredo L. *La obra renacentista del Ayuntamiento de Sevilla*. Seville, 1981.

5. CHUECA GOITIA, Fernando. *La catedral de Valladolid*. Madrid, 1947, p. 16.

6. LLEÓ CAÑAL, Vicente. *Nueva Roma: Mitología y Humanismo en el Renacimiento sevillano*. Seville, 1979, p. 191.

7. LLAGUNO Y AMIROLA, Eugenio. *Noticias de los arquitectos y arquitectura de España desde su restauración*. Madrid, 1829, p. 188, n. 1.

8. PANOFSKY, Erwin. *Problems in Titian, mostly Iconographic*. New York, 1969, pp. 63-71. HARBISON, Craig. «Counter-Reformation Iconography in Titian's Gloria». *The Art Bulletin*, XLIX (1967), pp. 244-246.