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ABSTRACT

A REEXAMINATION OF EL GRECO’S VIEW AND PLAN OF TOLEDO AS A QUESTION OF SOURCES AND PATRONAGE

by

Cameron E. Quade

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2019
Under the Supervision of Professor Tanya J. Tiffany

El Greco’s View and Plan of Toledo (c. 1610, Museo del Greco, Toledo) explores multiple ways of representing space by juxtaposing a sweeping view of the city of Toledo with a trompe l’oeil map of the city’s streets. Recent scholarship has shown that El Greco probably copied the map from a plan of Toledo in the Atlas de El Escorial (1538-45), a royal commission that would have been the first complete atlas of Spain. Significantly, this atlas was likely available to the owner and probable patron of View and Plan of Toledo, the scholar and map collector Pedro Salazar de Mendoza. Although art historians have often seen View and Plan of Toledo as an expression of El Greco’s singular, “self-conscious” skill as a painter and draughtsman, I argue the painting should be read as an intellectual collaboration between the artist and Salazar. In the painting, El Greco gave pictorial form to Toledan geography, theology, history and law, themes that are likewise reflected in Pedro Salazar’s writings and post-mortem inventories. I draw from various seventeenth-century images and texts, including El Greco’s body of work, the work of Cretan icon painters, maps and books from Salazar’s collection, and texts and treatises circulating in the seventeenth century to re-orient contemporary scholarship on the painting and re-illuminate this enigmatic cityscape.
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Philip, silent still, returned to the photograph of Toledo, which seemed to him the most arresting picture of them all. He could not take his eyes off it. He felt strangely that he was on the threshold of some new discovery in life. He was tremulous with a sense of adventure. He thought for an instant of the love that had consumed him: love seemed very trivial beside the excitement which now leaped in his heart.

— Of Human Bondage by W. Somerset Maugham
Introduction

The city of Toledo appears many times in the paintings of El Greco (Spanish, born Crete 1541-1614). Especially in his later works, El Greco used the major landmarks of the city to create scenic backdrops for religious and narrative subjects. There are, however, only two surviving examples of his work where Toledo is the primary subject: *View of Toledo* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (see fig. 1), and *View and Plan of Toledo* (c. 1608-1614), in Toledo’s Museo del Greco (see fig. 2). The first of these shows only the city, displaying it in El Greco’s emotive style. *View and Plan*, however, stands out not only for its iconographic complexity, but also for how it explores multiple ways of representing the city itself. Specifically, it juxtaposes the landscape of the city with a map of the city, thus appearing to lay a critical eye on the limits of each method of representing space.

Within the city, El Greco depicted Toledo Cathedral, the Alcázar, the Bisagra Gate, and Saint Martin’s Bridge, along with a number of other iconic buildings that, though stylized, are arranged as they actually stand (see fig. 3).¹ While Toledo is the primary subject of the painting, it also acts as a backdrop for several actors in the composition. In the right foreground, a young man in green holds up a map of the city for the viewer, the trompe l’oeil handling of which stands in direct contrast to the city’s painterly buildings and exaggerated hills.² To the left, a golden allegory of the river Tágus reclines with a cornucopia, representing prosperity and vitality for the city.³ Beyond these figures and floating in the sky above Toledo, the Virgin Mary and a group of

---

¹ Fernando Marías, *El Greco in Toledo*, (London: Scala Publishers, 2001), 10. See also
² For a facsimile of this map, see Julio Porres Martín-Cleto and Bacheti Brun, *Plano de Toledo*, (Toledo: Instituto de Investigaciones y Estudios Toledanos, 1967).
angels place a chasuble on Saint Ildefonsus, a seventh-century Toledan bishop and the city’s patron saint. In the center of the painting and beneath the Bisagra Gate, an architectural model of the Hospital de Tavera, constructed in the late sixteenth century by the order of Cardinal Juan Pardo de Tavera, floats on a cloud as though about to ascend to heaven. El Greco explains his compositional decision for the hospital and the Virgin in text inscribed in the margins of the plan (see fig. 4):

It was necessary to place the Hospital of Don Juan Tavera in the form of a model because, not only did it cover the Puerta de Visagra [Bisagra], but the dome or cupola rose up over the city and so once placed as a model and moved from its location it seemed to me to show the façade better than elsewhere, and as to how it fits within the city, this can be seen in the plan ... Also in [depicting] the story of Our Lady bringing the chasuble to Saint Ildefonso, in order to adorn him and to make the figures large, I have in a certain way taken advantage of their being celestial bodies, as in the case of lights, which when viewed from afar however small they may appear to be large.

Pedro Salazar de Mendoza (see fig. 5), a patron and friend of El Greco and administrator of the Tavera Hospital, almost doubtlessly commissioned the painting. The strongest evidence of this is the presence of “otro quadro de la cuidad de toledo con su planta”

---

5 Translation, with some bracketed additions by the present author, from Marías, El Greco in Toledo, 15. Original text reads: Ha sido forçoso poner el hospital de Don Joan Tavera en forma de modelo porque no solo venia a cubrir la puerta de Visagra mas subia el cimborrio o copula de manera que sobrepujava la cuidad y asi una vez puesto como modelo y movido de su lugar me pareçio mostrar la haz antes que otra parte y en lo demas de como viene con la cuidad se vera en la planta ... Tambien en la historia de nra señora que trae la casulla a S. Illefonso para su ornato y hazer las figuras grandes me he valido en cierta manera de ser cuerpos çelestiales como vemos en las luçes que vistas de lexos por pequenas que sean no pareceç grandes.
6 I am unaware of any portraits of Pedro Salazar produced during his lifetime. Figure 5 was painted sometime between 1790 and 1800 as part of a series of portraits significant Toledan figures commissioned by Cardenal Lorenzana while he was archbishop of Toledo. See Santiago Arroyo Serrano, Miradas desde la Biblioteca, (Toledo: d. b. Comunicación, 2008), 10-13, 41-42.
7 There was some early speculation by other scholars that the painting was commissioned by the Toledo city council, since the subject matter would only have been suitable for their purposes. See Porres Martín-Cleto and Brun, Plano de Toledo, 2.
in the 1629 post-mortem inventories of Salazar’s possessions, which also included the Metropolitan’s View of Toledo and a large collection of maps and city views. His patronage is also supported by the central placement of the Tavera Hospital in the painting’s composition. Furthermore, I would note that the Tavera Hospital was in the final stages of completion under the administration of Pedro Salazar and a visual representation of his efforts at a charitable institution would have suited his commitment to the visual representation of Counter-Reformation ideals of charity.

Most scholars, foremost among them Richard Kagan and Fernando Marías, discuss View and Plan of Toledo in reference to El Greco’s genius and prowess as a painter and draughtsman. These scholars have affirmed that the juxtaposition of the view of Toledo with the plan indicate El Greco’s interest in multiple ways of representing space, as well as his skill as both artist and mapmaker. More recent scholarship has, however, begun to raise questions to the origin of the map of Toledo depicted in the painting. Antonio Crespo Sanz, a historian of geography and urban planning, recently demonstrated the plan was most likely derived from the Atlas de El Escorial. This atlas predates View and Plan of Toledo by more than 50 years. In light of this recent scholarship, I propose a reexamination of the painting, its source material, and the context of its creation. My discussion will thus not only consider mapmaking in Spain and the creation of city views, but also El Greco’s and Pedro Salazar’s intellectual interests, the ideals of the Counter-Reformation, and other possible sources of the complex iconography of the painting.

9 Marías, El Greco in Toledo, 10.
Historiography

A key early twentieth-century source in English on El Greco is Robert Byron and David Talbot Rice’s *Birth of Western Painting*, which was first published in 1930.\(^\text{10}\) Their discussion of *View and Plan of Toledo* and El Greco’s other landscapes is framed around the artist’s early mastery in Byzantine painting and how it influenced their construction. When discussing the various elements in *View and Plan*, they say: “Such an odd medley seems, once more, to recall the Byzantine landscape, and its subordination of natural features to hieratic convenience.”\(^\text{11}\) They further say that in place of strictly ecclesiastic images of the Greek style, the pictorial elements of *View and Plan* are light-hearted and frivolous. They almost seem to belittle the painting: they write that the inscription on the map is an “ironic apology” for the unusual composition and that the “beholder would laugh” were it not for the somber sky in the painting and El Greco’s old age at the time it was painted.\(^\text{12}\) Instead, Byron and Rice seem to prefer the “pure and simple” landscape of the Metropolitan Museum’s *View of Toledo* because, they argue, it avoids visual “tricks”.\(^\text{13}\)

Later scholarship moved the focus away from the Byzantine influence on El Greco and embraced the painting’s compositional strategies. In 1982, Richard Kagan and Jonathan Brown argued that both *View and Plan of Toledo* and *View of Toledo* should be viewed in light of the propaganda campaigns that the officials of Toledo undertook be-

---


\(^\text{11}\) Byron and Rice, *The Birth of Western Painting*, 197-198.

\(^\text{12}\) Byron and Rice, *The Birth of Western Painting*, 198.

\(^\text{13}\) Byron and Rice, *The Birth of Western Painting*, 198.
g inning the mid-sixteenth and until the end of the seventeenth century. Toledo had enjoyed great prosperity in the first half of the sixteenth century. At that time, the city boasted a strong manufacturing economy and was often home to Charles V’s itinerant court. After Philip II moved the court to Madrid in 1561, Toledo faced economic downturn and its population dropped significantly by 1600. Toledan officials, seeking economic stimulus, began revitalizing the city in effort to convince Phillip II to return to Toledo. Kagan and Brown thus argued that View and Plan of Toledo was commissioned as part of that campaign: as propaganda displaying the sanctity of the city and its distinctly Spanish history.

Fernando Marías disagrees with Brown and Kagan’s interpretation. In his 1997 biography and catalogue of El Greco, republished and translated into English in 2013, he argues that Brown and Kagan overplay the “emblematic and symbolic nature of such images, ignoring their naturalist intent and decorative use.” To him, El Greco may have produced both paintings of Toledo for personal use and Pedro Salazar de Mendoza may have simply acquired them out of his personal taste for city views. Marías claims both of El Greco’s views of Toledo should be considered as part of the paintings he and his studio produced for the domestic market after 1600. Borrowing the phrase “pure and simple” from Byron and Rice, he writes that these paintings combine “a pure and simple

15 According to Kagan, Toledo’s population had dropped to 25,000 individuals in 1645, down from 62,000 in 1571. See Brown and Kagan, “View of Toledo,” 22.
18 Marías, El Greco: Life and Work, 257.
description of a city and its surroundings” with various representational and symbolic images. Examples of these paintings include *Laocoön* (see fig. 6), *The Crucifixion with Toledo* (see fig. 7), and others where El Greco places a well-known subject against a backdrop of Toledan hills and buildings.¹⁹ *View of Toledo* in particular seems to fit well into this category: The composition of the city in the painting is repeated in the background of *Saint Joseph and the Christ Child* (see fig. 8).²⁰

Though all these paintings are clearly related, I argue that *View and Plan of Toledo* stands outside of Marías’s category. The main subject of the painting is not the miracle of Saint Ildefonsus, nor a boy holding a map, nor a classical river god. The subject of the painting is the city itself. Instead of being “pure and simple” and distilled to a handful of recognizable landmarks, Toledo is shown in its entirety with attention to accuracy and detail.

Beyond the economic and political context of its creation, Marías and other scholars often theorize that the plan of Toledo in *View and Plan* suggests that El Greco was trained as a draftsman of maps and city views. At this period of Spanish history, to produce the map in *View and Plan* would require knowledge of ichnography, or the representation of ground plan of buildings or cities.²¹ This would also require El Greco to have been trained in *topografía*, a term derived from Ptolemy and meaning the mapping of local places, as opposed to *geografía* or the mapping of the world, and *coro-

---

²⁰ It is possible that *View of Toledo* was in fact a highly finished study for one or more of these paintings. There was also some early suggestion that it was once part of a larger composition, similar to *Joseph and the Christ Child*, and was later cut down, though examination of the canvas shows this was never the case. See Harold E. Wethey, *El Greco and His School* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962), 2:86.
Chorography has a plastic definition and sometimes overlaps both geography and topography; however, topography is overall the most local of the three terms and best describes the map in *View and Plan*.

The primary evidence that El Greco may have had training in these fields is a letter that mentions several people with whom the artist had become acquainted by the time he moved to Venice from Crete:

18 August 1568: Fanurio Scienza, commander, taking orders from the most illustrious signore Duke, and by the insistence of signore Zorzi Sideris, called Calapoda, has notified and commanded signore Manilos of Cyprus, called Mazapeta, who, under penalty of fifty hyperpyra, shall within the next three days surrender the drawings given to him in Venice by master [Domenicos Theotokopoulous], by the advice of the aforementioned signore Zorzi, after the evening he will raise the penalty, and in addition that evening will be forced to compensate him based on the appraisal of those drawings.

Of interest here is the reference to El Greco in conjunction with the man named Zorzi Sideris, known also as Georgios Sideris and Calapoda, who was a cartographer active in Venice from 1538 to 1554. He specialized in the production of portolans, a type of early nautical chart, producing these illuminated and gilded maps for luxury codices. This letter demonstrates that El Greco knew Calapoda in some capacity. Scholars have suggested that, by extension, the letter also indicates that El Greco could have trained with

---


him before he moved to Spain.\textsuperscript{25} As Marías writes: “His late \textit{View and Plan of Toledo} may thus be a unique twofold testimony to his skills in [the] genres” of nautical charts and city views.\textsuperscript{26}

In his analysis of El Greco’s annotations in Vasari’s \textit{Lives of the Artists}, Marías finds additional support for of El Greco interest in geography and mapmaking. As Marías states:

\begin{quote}
In the life of the Veronese architect, Michele Sanmicheli (1484-1559) El Greco had the occasion to underline and comment on various passages related to different Veronese artists ... He also reiterated Vasari’s compliments to [Michele Sanmicheli’s] nephew Gian Girolamo Sanmicheli, also a military architect and a good connoisseur of topography and the correct methods to draw and represent it by means of models, a subject that should be of interest to the painter of \textit{Vista y Plano de Toledo} and to whom in his youth had already been in contact with cartographers such as the Cretan "Calapoda" Sideris.\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

While this is an interesting intersection of El Greco with topography and architectural models, this evidence is still very circumstantial.

Another scholar, Juan Cervera, wrote a short article in 2012 that postulated how El Greco may have come to learn how to draft maps. In it, he went so far as to suggest El Greco might have been the only person in Toledo who could have surveyed for and drawn the map appearing in his painting “since the military engineers were excluded [from Toledo] because the city was not found among the defensive priorities [of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[25]{Marías, \textit{El Greco: Life and Work}, 36.}
\footnotetext[26]{Marías, \textit{El Greco: Life and Work}, 38.}
\footnotetext[27]{Marías, \textit{El Greco y el arte de su tiempo: Las Notas de El Greco a Vasari} (Toledo: Real Fundación de Toledo, 1992), 99. Marías’s original text reads as follows: “En la vida del arquitecto veronés, Michele Sanmicheli (1484-1559) tuvo El Greco la ocasión de subrayar y comentar diversos pasajes relativos a diferentes artistas de Verona ... También recogió los elogios de Vasari al sobrino Gian Girolamo Sanmicheli, también arquitecto militar y buen conocedor tanto del terreno como de los métodos correctos para dibujarlos y representarlos por medio de maquetas [III, 521, V-M, VI, 361], tema que podía interesarse a pintor de al "Vista y plano de Toledo' y que ya en su juventud había estado en contacto con cartógrafos como el cretense Sideris “Calapoda”.”}
\end{footnotes}
Spain].” He additionally notes that some of the anachronisms of the map, such as the rendering of the two major bridges of the city in their elevations but upside down to the viewer, may indicate the entire map was drawn by El Greco instead of by military engineers.

These scholars have thus added mapmaking to El Greco’s already significant mastery of painting in the eastern and western traditions, his knowledge of sculpture, and the construction of altarpieces and frames and suggest this broad mastery was part of El Greco’s projected persona. As Kagan, in collaboration with Marías, says about the plan of Toledo in his 2000 book *Urban Images of the Hispanic World*:

> Yet by inserting this ichnographic view at the forefront of his composition, El Greco, very self-consciously, draws attention to his own artistic virtuosity, in this instance his ability to prepare the type of city view associated primarily with architects, trained cartographers, and military engineers.

It has thus become clear that the prominent scholars of El Greco have come to be comfortable with the idea of El Greco as a cartographer.

I argue, however, that arguments suggesting that El Greco himself prepared the map of Toledo are based on weak evidence. While the letter tying El Greco to Calapoda is an interesting document of El Greco’s early career, it is not alone compelling evidence to assume that El Greco was skilled in ichnography or cartography, especially as there is no other evidence to connect El Greco to the art of mapmaking. Indeed, there are no

---

30 Manya S. Pagiavla, *Domenicus Scepticus: An Analysis of El Greco’s Autograph Marginalia on Vasari’s ‘Vitae’ (1568), on Barbaro’s edition of Vitruvius’s ‘Dieci Libri dell’ Architettura’ (1556) and on Serlio’s ‘Architettura’ (1566),* (PhD. diss., University of Essex, 2006), 118.
maps outside of *View and Plan of Toledo* that have been attributed to El Greco. Even El Greco’s marginalia in Vasari’s *Lives* do not indicate anything more than his admiration for the work of mapmakers and architects.\(^3^2\)

El Greco’s son, Jorge Manuel Theotocópuli (1578-1631), has also been put forward as the possible author of the map, but he is likewise an unlikely candidate.\(^3^3\) He was an architect as well as a painter in his father’s studio, and for a time was appointed the head architect of the Toledo Cathedral.\(^3^4\) While he would have had some of the ichnographic skills required to draft a map of Toledo, I would argue that the map is of sufficient quality that only a specialist in cartographic methods could have drafted it.\(^3^5\) As Kagan and Marías themselves acknowledge in *Urban Images of the Hispanic World*, to produce a map of this quality, generally one would need the ability to visualize the world in abstract, mathematical terms; more specifically, one would need knowledge of astronomy, surveying, mathematics, geometry, and “the artistic ability to translate field

\(^3^2\) I would make some additional comments contradicting El Greco’s skill in mapmaking: El Greco’s connection to the mapmaker Calapoda does mean that he could have had some training in the production of portolan charts, but portolans were not produced following Ptolemy’s coherent structural approach to geography and its subfields. Training in their production would thus not be sufficient to produce the ichnographic representation of Toledo on *View and Plan*. For how portolans fit into the development of maps in the Early Modern period, see Pinto, “Origins and Development of the Ichnographic City Plan,” 36. Additionally, had he asked El Greco to do it, the labor involved in producing an autograph map of the city would have increased the cost of this painting significantly for Pedro Salazar de Mendoza. See Pinto, “Origins and Development of the Ichnographic City Plan,” 50.

\(^3^3\) Porres Martín-Cleto and Brun, *Plano De Toledo por El Greco*, 5.


\(^3^5\) This view is also repeated by Antonio Crespo Sanz in his “El empleo de métodos topográficos en las primeras representaciones urbanas. El Greco y el enigma del mapa de Toledo,” *CT: Catastro* 87 (August 2016): 65.
measurements to a flat surface.”36 One would also need to be prepared for the labor involved in crosschecking field measurements and their translation to paper, as well as in acquiring first-hand knowledge of the region being surveyed.37 As Kagan and Marías claim, high-quality maps could only be the work of experts, not amateurs.38 Thus, it must be concluded that the map of Toledo on View and Plan must have been first produced by a professional mapmaker and then copied to the painting.

**El Greco’s Thoughts On Art and Architecture**

Though El Greco was interested in architecture, as demonstrated by the large collection of architectural books in his post-mortem inventories, no building was ever constructed from one of his plans.39 What is known of El Greco’s theoretical approach to art and architecture comes from the annotations he wrote in several of the books in his library. Of those that survive,40 he left marginalia in: Sebastiano Serlio’s *Archittetura* (1566), in Vasari’s *Le Vite* (1568), and in Daniele Barbaro’s translation of Vitruvius’s *Ten Books on Architecture* (1556).41 It is unknown when exactly he annotated them. As Manya Pagiavla noted, he probably annotated Serlio’s book during his time in Rome,

---

36 Kagan and Marías discuss the skills needed for making maps specifically in reference to the Escorial Atlas, which I will discuss in length later in this paper. See Kagan and Marías, *Urban Images of the Hispanic World*, 56.
40 As well as the books by Vasari, Vitruvius and Serlio, El Greco’s copies of Appian’s *Delle Guerre Civili et Esterne de Romani* (1551) and Xenophon’s *Opera Graece* (1516) are extant. These do not contain significant annotations by the artist. See Pagiavla, *Domenicus Scepticus*, 2.
41 Fernando Marías is credited with the principal investigations into El Greco’s annotations in Vasari’s *Lives* and Vitruvius’s *Architecture*. In her doctoral dissertation *Domenicus Scepticus* at the University of Essex, Manya S. Pagiavla gave additional commentary on the artist’s annotations and also tackled the task of translating them into English.
given his use of Italian and how the content of the marginalia seems to be of a student summarizing the text.\textsuperscript{42} By the same token, he probably annotated the books by Vasari and Vitruvius while he was living in Spain, given his use of Spanish\textsuperscript{43}. In his annotations on Vasari, El Greco generally casts a critical eye on Vasari and his dislike of the Venetian maniera. The annotations on Vitruvius, however, are far more substantial. They appear to be notes intended to create an expanded edition of the book. Alternatively, they may have been for the sake of educating his aspiring architect son, Jorge Manuel.\textsuperscript{44} Because they are so explicit about his theoretical approach to art and because they were written during his career in Toledo, El Greco’s annotations to Vitruvius are the most helpful in understanding the artistic ideas that would have influenced his decisions in View and Plan of Toledo.

El Greco was invested in the sixteenth-century debate around which of the three disegno-related arts – painting, sculpture, and architecture – required the most theoretical and practical knowledge. As a painter, El Greco supported the primacy of painting – with sculpture shortly behind. His belief was that the greatest of the fields would be the most difficult of the fields, and he claimed that “the imitation of colors is the greatest difficulty” as was creating the illusion of reality.\textsuperscript{45} In Pacheco’s recollections of conversations with El Greco in El arte de la pintura, where the artist’s opinion is a direct jab at Michelangelo’s paintings.\textsuperscript{46} He nonetheless couldn’t discount the merits of sculpture, as

\textsuperscript{42} Pagiavla, Domenicus Scepticus, 4.  
\textsuperscript{43} Pagiavla, Domenicus Scepticus, 4.  
\textsuperscript{44} Pagiavla, Domenicus Scepticus, 4.  
\textsuperscript{45} Pagiavla, Domenicus Scepticus, 167.  
he also seems to have trained in sculpture and because it also deals with the imitation of nature.47

In Barbaro’s translation of *The Ten Books of Architecture*, he rejected Barbaro’s assertion that architecture was itself a “pure science.” El Greco writes:

it was my idea to leave it for now, as the commentator, even if many things could be said that Architecture possesses in order to be called a science; and finding itself in an order that was born from the honest use of mortals (...) architecture; but another thing is that architecture exists to serve science, even as a first step of a ladder that is taken upwards (...) towards it; that is why one can differentiate the [sic] ... like it will be done now, [since] the mind does not know how to direct itself by lineaments, measurements and the study of drawing.48

Since the painter gives primacy to painting, El Greco here characterizes architecture as the first step on an imaginary ladder that will lead to science and knowledge. Furthermore for El Greco, science lies above the fundamental systems of architecture, which were ‘delineation, measurement and drawing.’49 It should be noted here that ichnography is a common element to both cartography and to architecture because both deal with the drafting of ground plans. If it is the case, as El Greco argues, that architecture exists to serve science and is not itself a pure science, then he may have held similar sentiments for cartography, which was similarly based upon measurement and delineation.

47 Pagiavla, *Domenicus Scepticus*, 166, 168.
48 On the margins of the Libro I, Proemio, p. 6-7: In Spanish the whole annotation reads: “era mi parecer dejarla por ahora, como su comentador, por más que muchas cosas se podrían decir sobre qué es lo que tiene la Arquitectura para que ella a solas sea llamada ciencia; y encontrándose en un orden que ha nacido del uso honesto de los mortales (...) la Arquitectura; pero otra soca es que ella esté para servir a la ciencia, incluso como el primer peldaño de la escalera que se sube (...) hacia ella; por eso se diferencia el (...) lo por el mismo esepló se (...) ir al infinito (...) pues que (...) como ahora se hará, [pues] la mente no sabrá dirigirse por lineamientos, medidas y el estudio del dibujo.” See Fernando Marías and Agustín Bustamante García, *Las Ideas Artísticas De El Greco: comentarios a Un Texto Inédito* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1981), 75-76.
49 Pagiavla, *Domenicus Scepticus*, 164.
El Greco rarely mentions cartography in his annotations. One exception is in the Proemio of the first book of architecture where, instead of providing a critical account of topography or related fields, he offers a simile likening connoisseurs to cosmographers. In it, El Greco criticizes what he calls the “promise of Vitruvius,” which is Vitruvius’s implication that by simply reading his book and recalling his name, one could become a connoisseur of architecture and design without years of study and practice. El Greco writes: “it is pleasant to hear the experts promise knowledge of things just through their names, just like the traveling cosmographer, who finds himself out at sea without knowing where (...) it serves him as refreshment to hear the names.” To El Greco, these writings like *The Ten Books* are easily consumable and pleasant, like a refreshment, but do not alone offer the substance necessary for legitimate guidance in a ‘serious’ intellectual field like art, architecture, or cosmography.

---

50 Libro I, Proemio, p. 6-7. The Modern Spanish translation reads: "bien manifesto es a los sabios que esta promesa es regalo particular para un príncipe, porque o es eliminado el arte por Virtuvio saca al emperador fuera de los límites de lo humano. Porque ¿qué arte escrita [teorizada] existe de la que, por sí misma y sin otros principios, con sólo pensar sobre ella, se puede tener el conocimiento que se requiere para juzgar? Y más para juzgar cosas públicas, que por malas que suelan ser, no por ello se ha de entender que sean tales, que un príncipe, tan ocupado por la consideración que da este arte, por sí mismo pueda dar con los preceptos y fines de Virtruvio y puedan estas cosas ser juzgadas como arte particular como asegura Virtuvio (porque juzgar y aprender los detalles del arte requiere tiempo y práctica de las cosas); y aunque Virtruvio en esto anduvo asegurando lo contrario, sin embargo semejantes promesas son como las flores en nuestra vida o como peregrinación, que con que el caminante vuelva la vista descansa, aunque no posea un conocimiento verdadero de qué fruta está viendo, o si es una fruta u otra cosa; y así, los buenos ingenios, apoyándose en facultades ajenas (aunque un hombre docto no debe se ajeno a tales facultades como ahora se cree), alivian las suyas; es agradable escuchar a los que saben prometer noción de las cosas sólo a través de sus nombres, como el cosmógrafo viajero que encontrándose en el mar y no conociendo (...) le es un refrigerio escuchar los nombres.” See Pagivla, Domenicus Scepticus, 162, and Marías and Bustamante García, *Las Ideas Artísticas de El Greco*, 75.
El Greco’s view that true knowledge of art cannot be gained through reading alone leads into his other ideas about learning and the motivations for doing so. One of his marginalia is in response to advice that an artist should be an embodiment of a Universal Man, or one who is well educated in not only the arts of disegno, but also the other Humanities, including geometry, arithmetic, history, philosophy, music, law, medicine, etc. As he writes:

this comes from the fact that everybody should devote himself to whatever is more appropriate for himself, because in it, he will feel he is worth more, and Barbaro is right in this matter; that the universal man does more, but that there are things that can be more foreign to one discipline than to others; and [what] happens [is] that by having one of them as the most important he will look down on the others.\textsuperscript{51}

El Greco makes his position clear: that it is good to embody the ideal of the Vitruvian Homo Universalis to bolster understanding of one’s chosen discipline, as well as that discipline’s limits. These studious efforts could thus lead to personal perfection and greater happiness. Nonetheless, he remains clear that one should become a specialist in a single field that is appropriate for him (and for El Greco, it would always have been a him). In later marginalia, he cautions that learning outside one’s specialization – though necessary to become a learned person – should not be used for gaining reputation:

... it will be understood that perfection is not directed toward making a reputation; but through experience one cannot be recognized unless he says [he is dedicated to] the one [art] [and] leaves aside the other, because one must dedicate himself in the first years only to one thing or the other, as these are the years in which one makes significant advances in either of the two ... therefore, friends of true art are not as greedy for reputation as they are for offering the appropriate

\textsuperscript{51} On the margins of the Libro I, Proemio, p. 8-9: In Spanish, the whole annotation reads: “esto viene de que cada uno debe dedicarse a aquello que le es más apropiado porque n ello se siente que vale más y también Barbaro tiene razón en esto: que el hombre más ajenas a una disciplina que otras; y así ocurre que teniendo alguna como la más importante menosprecia las demás ninguna maniera en razón para el resto dellas ques el tiempo.” See Marías and Bustamante García, Las Ideas Artísticas De El Greco, 77, and Pagivla, Domenicus Scepticus, 175.
and particular knowledge of their art, since the greatest reputation is to know how to appreciate one's own art...

Thus for El Greco, reputation not only requires a good amount of luck, taking advantage of opportunities, and good relations with patrons and clients, but surely reputation and financial security are also gained by excelling in one's own field and by taking special satisfaction in that field.

View and Plan of Toledo fits well into the artist's philosophical outlook. For example, El Greco's approach to studying the humanities support the claims by Marías and Kagan that he painted this image as a self-conscious expression of his own virtuosity. Even though he argued, in the annotation above, that someone early in their career must focus on a single field of study before expanding outside that field, View and Plan of Toledo shows an artist late in his career expanding well outside of his fields of mastery. Not only would this have added to his study in the arts of disegno and enhanced his personal knowledge of his own field of painting, but it also demonstrated El Greco's interest in broader, universal knowledge. The rendering of the view and the plan of Toledo

52 On the margins of the Libro I, Proemio, p. 9, “(...) es eloquencia de plaza [vox populi] ; no se puede tener autoridad alguna por medio de la industria de los estudios, pues bien podemos decir que sólo en nuestros tiempos vale esta Gracia, al poner en orden los muchos particulares de Barbaro; y llegará a ser considerado verdaderamente el entender que la perfección no está encaminada a que se gane reputación; pero por experiencia no se ve sino que el que dice que [se dedica a ] lo uno falta a lo otro, porque en lo uno o en lo otro se han de emplear los primeros años, que son en los que se hace progreso en cualquiera de los dos (...) necesarios como más adelante [se verá]; (...) esta apariencia ha atraído a algunos, si ando ya por los cincuenta años de edad; que si por aprovechar, estudiando con el dibujo, han progresad algunos en la gramática y otros por lo que parece en problemas de otro tipo, de lo cual surge que sea soca sonada el que entre los doctos entren los del dibujo; por eso, que los amigos del verdadero arte no sean tan codiciosos de la reputación como para dejar el saber propio y particular de su arte, pues mayor reputación es el apreciarla.” Marías and Bustamante García, Las Ideas Artísticas De El Greco, 77-78, and Pagiavla, Domenicus Scepticus, 177-178.

53 Pagiavla, Domenicus Scepticus, 178.

54 Kagan and Marías, Urban Images of the Hispanic World, 204.
in paint emphasizes El Greco’s lifelong mastery of painting and his opinion of the supremacy of painting over other arts of disegno. Furthermore, his literal inclusion of a map on the painted surface implies that painting itself encompasses the arts associated with cartography.

**The Allegory of the Camaldolese Order**

Before *View and Plan*, El Greco’s reputation had already gained him commissions for other landscape paintings. In 1597 the Benedictine monk Fray Juan de Castañiza petitioned Philip II for permission to establish the Italian order of the Camaldolese in Spain. As part of that campaign, Fray Juan and his sponsors commissioned El Greco and his studio to produce two paintings: the two versions of the *Allegory of the Camaldolese Order*, in the Instituto Valencia de Don Juan de Madrid and in the Museo del Patriarca in Valencia, respectively (see figs. 9, 10). Both of these paintings share a near identical composition of a bird’s-eye view of the “ideal monastery”, however the latter is on a slightly smaller canvas. The landscape contains rows of small hermitages contained within a circular wall, and at the center of the complex a communal building for group worship. In the foreground is a plinth with a tabernacle framing a poem in Latin praising Saint Romauld and text identifying the image as a “Description of the Hermetical Life”. To the left of the tabernacle stands Saint Benedict, and to the right stands Saint Romauld holding a model of the circular complex depicted above. In the distance are hills and mountains in El Greco’s expressive style. It is doubtful that El

---

Greco had ever been to a Camaldolese hermitage and he likely took inspiration from elsewhere. Byron and Rice point out that the symmetrical arrangement of the buildings in the proposed hermitage resembles the stylized depiction of holy cities like Athos and Jerusalem in Byzantine imagery (see fig. 11).\(^{58}\) Even more significantly, El Greco likely took inspiration from prints of views of order’s existing hermitage in the mountains of Arezzo, Italy (see fig. 12).\(^{59}\) Whereas the prints depict the hermitage as it actually stood, El Greco’s paintings depict a hermitage as the Camaldolese and their supporters hoped it could be.

Just as these paintings and *View and Plan of Toledo* have parallel use of extant maps and city views in their composition, there are also parallels in their patronage. It is unknown who specifically commissioned the first and largest of the two *Allegory of the Camaldolese* at the Museo del Patriarca.\(^{60}\) The second version at the Institutio de Don Juan de Madrid, however, was painted especially for Mariana de Mendoza and her husband Pedro Lasso de la Vega, Count of Los Arcos, as evidenced by their coats of arms on the painting. Mariana was the daughter of the Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, the third Count of Orgaz, and a relative of Pedro Salazar. Though they were somewhat distant cousins,\(^{61}\) they were nonetheless part of the Mendoza clan in Toledo before she and

\(^{58}\) Byron and Rice, *The Birth of Western Painting*, 196.

\(^{59}\) Wethey, *El Greco and His School*, 2:76. I would point out composition seems to have also influenced later depictions of the Camaldolese monastery, including Ceregetti Pietro Leopoldo’s view of the monastery from 1795 at the Fondazione Camaldoli Cultura Onlus, Arezzo, Italy; and a later version of this composition appearing in Igino Martorelli’s *Assisi* from 1877.

\(^{60}\) Marias suggests it may have been a gift from Mariana de Mendoza and her husband the Count of Los Arcos to the Don Juan de Ribera, the Archbishop of Valencia and future saint. See Marias *El Greco: Life and Work*, 293 note 222.

\(^{61}\) Salazar’s 3\(^{rd}\)-great grandfather and Mariana’s 4\(^{th}\)-great grandfather was Íñigo López de Mendoza (1398-1458). Pedro Salazar was a third-generation hidalgo – his membership in the Mendoza clan was though his grandmother Ursula Mendoza – from
Pedro Lasso moved to Madrid. The two are known to have owned eight original works by El Greco, the *Allegory of the Camaldolese* probably being the only one expressly commissioned. Though she and her husband’s ties to the Camaldolese are uncertain, their commission of this painting demonstrates their ongoing interest in the project as well as their continued support of the artist.

**Pedro Salazar de Mendoza as Patron**

Pedro Salazar was an ideal patron for El Greco, as he was interested in art and maintained in his writings that paintings were the most effective means to teach doctrine and church history. The two shared a professional relationship for nearly two decades, and their relationship was sufficiently close that Salazar was offered discounts on work from El Greco’s studio. The two began their relationship in 1595 when Salazar became the administrator for the Tavera Hospital. At that time, he hired El Greco to create a wooden tabernacle for the high altar in the Hospital’s chapel. In 1608, around the time that *View and Plan of Toledo* was painted, El Greco won another commission to create three altarpieces for that same chapel.

As discussed by Richard Kagan, Salazar’s writings were for the most part genealogical treatises written for “la nobleza de España”. His interest in such scholarly pur-

---


65 Crespo Sanz, “El empleo de métodos topográficos,” 62.
suits is confirmed by the inventories of his library, in which he had collected many books on noble lineages, known as nobilarios. The first of his own nobliarios, defending Phillip II’s right of succession to the Portuguese throne, was never published. He wrote the majority of his later works on Toledo’s religious history: The first, *Chrónica del Cardenal Juan de Tavera* (1603), was intended to glorify the hospital where Salazar was then administrator and which is given prominence in *View and Plan*. This was followed by a treatise on Saint Ildefonsus (1618), to whom he was particularly devoted and a miracle of whom appears in *View and Plan of Toledo*; and to Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza (1618), his own third-great grandfather. These biographies of Toledan figures represent Salazar’s interest in local history and also his interest in Church history.

In his history of Saint Ildefonsus, Pedro Salazar wrote about is interest in translating religious and scholarly interests into works of art. There, he emphasized the importance doctrinal accuracy in images in tandem with the right of the artist to represent the world as they see fit. As he wrote:

> It is true that these years ago a small picture was brought from Rome which includes the history of the saint [Ildefonsus], and shows the blessed Virgin seated in a chair, and embracing her son in front of her, putting the chasuble on Saint Ildefonsus. This is painting as [the artist] wishes, the creative license of sculptors and painters, those and the poets, says Horace, they have the power to dare as much as they wish ... Paintings are a very strong argument, and greater than that which is taken from writing, if they conform to tradition or to the histories, because painting moves and raises the spirit more than writing ... What we know, we know from writing, as from hearing, and this moves less than painting, which puts it before the eyes.66

---

66 *En esta conformidad vienen todas las estápas, y pinturas de Italia, Francia, y de los Paysesbaxos, que corren por España, y por otras provincias. Bien es verdad q estos años atras se traxo una estampa pequeña de Roma, que cótiene la historia de el santo, y trahe a la beatissima Virgen sentada en una silla, y delante a su hijo abraçado, poniendo la casulla a san Ilefonso. Esto es pintar como querer, y licencia de escultores, y de pintores, los cuales, y los Poetas, dize Horacio, tienen poder para atreverse a quanto se quieren. Las pinturas son un muy fuerte argumento, y mayor, que el que se toma de la*
This comparison of poetry to painting was common among intellectuals in the sixteenth century, and was also reflected in El Greco’s annotations in his copy of Vasari’s *Lives of the Artists.* The “creative license” in the representation of space typical of artists like El Greco fits this pattern. Both El Greco and Pedro Salazar noted the similarities between painting and poetry, a comparison frequently made among humanist intellectuals. This sentiment may be attributable to his relationship to El Greco, as both participated in Toledo’s intellectual elite.

This statement also shows Pedro Salazar’s views on the reformation of the church and the transformation of Catholic Reformation ideals into artworks. This is true not only of the emphasis on the clear depiction of the Saint Ildefonsus, but also in how Salazar promotes painting over writing as a means of teaching the gospel. Indeed, to maintain conservatism in the Church during the Counter-Reformation, those in Spain often relied on the *admiratio* of the images in churches, alongside moving sermons, rather than rational consensus.⁶⁸

Pedro Salazar was exacting as a patron and likely had a strong hand in determining the program of El Greco’s tabernacle for the Tavera Hospital in 1608. This is verified by the contract for their commission as well as in intellectual construction of the paint-

---

⁶⁷ For a discussion of this, see Paglia, *Domenicus Scepticus,* 172.

⁶⁸ Anne J. Cruz and, Mary Elizabeth Perry, *Culture and Control in Counter-Reformation Spain* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), XVI.
ings. The contract allowed for Pedro Salazar to inspect the altarpieces as often as was necessary to ensure that they were to the quality he demanded. As it stipulated:

Further, the said distinguished administrator shall be able to see and visit, and shall see and visit, the said work in order to verify how work is progressing as many times as seems necessary to him, so that if there shall seem to be slackness in it on the part of the said Dominico, he may suspend, if he so desires, the payment of fees to the said Dominico, on the account of the said work.69

The regular meetings between Salazar and El Greco would allow the two to regularly discuss the doctrinal specificity of the altarpieces.

In the altarpiece, Pedro Salazar’s influence is perhaps most explicit in The Apoc-alyptic Vision where there is ambiguity over which figures are the bodies and which are the souls of the resurrected dead. Marías attributes this ambiguity to El Greco’s artistic license, but Mann notes that Pedro Salazar was concerned with how resurrection was depicted in visual art. Specifically, he argued that such images should show the reunion of bodies and souls,70 and he seems to have found El Greco the most suitable artist in Toledo to portray this theological concept. This demonstrates, as Kagan wrote: “The complex program realized by El Greco for the chapel of the Tavera Hospital was the product of a long collaboration between artist and patron which clearly reflected Salazar de Mendoza’s own spiritual concerns, especially his interest in the value of penitence and pious works.”71

69 Iten que el dicho señor administrador pueda ber y visitar y vea y visite la dicha obra como se fuere haziendo todas las vezes que le pareciere para que si le pareciere aver remission en ella por parte del dicho dominico suspenda si quisiere el dar dineros al dicho dominico a cuenta de la chicha obra. Original text and translation from Mann, El Greco and His Patrons, 112.
70 Salazar de Mendoza, El glorioso doctor San Ildefonso, 135-139. See also Marías, El Greco: Life and Work, 272, and Mann, El Greco and His Patrons, 138.
It is then not unreasonable that Pedro Salazar’s interest in collaborating intellectually in the creation of religious artworks would extend into his other interests, such as his interest in maps and city views. His library spanned some 1,300 titles ranging in subject from classics to law, literature to art, and nobliarios to geography. Salazar’s collections show he had clear interest in the mathematical mapping of the world, made popular by the rediscovery and distribution of classical texts such as Ptolemy’s Geographia among humanist thinkers. Not only did he own three copies of Geographia, but he also owned other classical works including Strabo’s Geographia and Pomponius Mela’s De Situ Orbis alongside later works of cosmography, astronomy, cartography and navigation. Along with these texts, Pedro Salazar was one of the earliest Spanish map collectors, starting when map collecting was a fledgling pursuit in Spain. The 1629 inventory of Salazar’s art collection lists a conspicuous number of maps. The city views he gathered range from London, Babylon, Jerusalem and Naples. He even owned a copy of Braun and Hogenberg’s magnificent 1598 Orbis Terrarum, a folio of etchings of bird’s-eye city views that included a view of Toledo (see fig. 13). From Pedro Salazar’s collections and writings we can glean two things: first, we can disentangle his input into View and Plan of Toledo; and second, we can discover the origin of the painting’s map of Toledo.

---

73 Pagiavla suggests that El Greco may have owned a copy of the works of Artimidorus, a Greek geographer. See Pagiavla, Domenicus Scepticus, 12.
76 For the inventory of Salazar’s art collection, see Kagan, “Pedro de Salazar de Mendoza as Collector,” 90-91.
Mapmaking in Spain and the Escorial Atlas

In the period between 1570 and 1630, Spain undertook great pains to increase the productivity of its mapmakers. Near the end of the sixteenth century, Philip II and the Spanish Habsburg court began to take a special interest in the creation and use of maps for military might and as political propaganda. Philip’s efforts ranged from requiring local officials to provide maps when responding to official questionnaires, hiring engineers to map military sites, and encouraging mapmaking as a discipline taught at the Academy of Mathematics, which was founded in 1582. As Kagan has noted, the cartography from early modern Spain was not a homogeneous enterprise: It required many educated people and much material support to conduct the studies, which were often in short supply. Most such support was concentrated in Seville in the Casa de la Contratación under the subsidy of the crown. Spanish maps, especially those commissioned by the crown, were often considered state secrets to protect Spain’s political and spiritual hegemony over the lands both on and outside the Iberian Peninsula. The Casa de Contratación, or House of Trade, was the clearing house for all maritime trade and traffic to the new world and was responsible for producing maps and nautical charts for administrative use.

The plan of Toledo in El Greco’s painting is most likely copied from one of the maps produced by the Spanish state. Specifically, it seems to come from a map of Toledo.

78 Kagan and Marías, Urban Images of the Hispanic World, 204-205.
79 Portuondo, Secret Science, 103.
80 Kagan and Marías, Urban Images of the Hispanic World, 55.
that survives in the *Atlas de El Escorial* (see fig. 14), an atlas of Spain drafted by Alonzo de Santa Cruz while living in Toledo between 1538 and 1545. Santa Cruz was Charles V’s geography teacher and a prominent figure associated with the Casa de Contratación. Though he had good favor under Charles V, he lost funding for the project in 1554 as Phillip II came to power and thus the atlas was never completed. Despite being incomplete, the maps that were finished are, as Kagan and Marías describe, “a model of sixteenth-century European cartography.” The atlas does not today contain a finished map of Toledo, and it is not clear that a finished map of Toledo was intended for the Escorial Atlas or if it was a separate but contemporaneous project. However, on the versos of three of the atlas’s folios are preparatory drawings for a plan of the city (see figs. 15, 16, 17). These appear as intersecting arcs, circles and lines, annotated in Santa Cruz’s handwriting with the names of prominent churches and buildings in Toledo. These radial graphs show the work of a cosmographer practicing methods at the height of what was becoming the cartographic revolution in Europe. These graphs are the remaining evidence of the earliest ground-plan map of Toledo in Spain’s history.

Francisco Vázquez Maure first offered the Escorial Atlas as a possible source of El Greco’s plan of Toledo in 1982, the same year Kagan and Brown began publishing on the

---

81 The Escorial Atlas was perhaps the first index map, meaning that the first page of the atlas (fig. 18) shows the complete map of Spain divided by a grid and the following pages correspond to the spaces delineated by that grid. See Crespo Sanz and Vicente Maroto, “Mapping Spain in the Sixteenth Century,” 163.
86 Crespo Sanz, “El empleo de métodos topográficos,” 66.
painting. Vázquez’s argument was simply that the Escorial Atlas preceded View and Plan by about fifty years and, being the only ground-plan map of Toledo extant at the time, is thus the most logical source of the map. Little attention had been given to the subject, however, until Antonio Crespo Sanz began to examine the atlas for his 2008 dissertation at the Universidad de Valladolid. In a 2016 article, Crespo Sanz examines the radial graphs in the Escorial Atlas and compares them with the plan of Toledo in El Greco’s painting. The identified locations on these graphs, which include the Toledo Cathedral and other churches, align closely with the locations on El Greco’s map (compare figs. 17, 18). His analysis further examines the tools and methods Alonso de Santa Cruz would have used to make the maps in the Atlas.

As Crespo Sanz points out, there is documentary evidence that members of Pedro Salazar’s family not only knew Alonso de Santa Cruz, but that one of them physically held his maps of the province of Toledo. In a letter dated August 3rd, 1557, Santa Cruz, while thanking Phillip II for being appointed Cosmógrafo Mayor de la Casa de Contratación, also explains to the prince that he was in the court serving Charles V and that a map or atlas of Toledo was being transported by Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, II Count of Mélito:

89 Crespo Sanz, “El empleo de métodos topográficos,” 57-86. This article offers a detailed technical analysis of both El Greco’s plan of Toledo and the one in the Escorial Atlas.
...and I gave to Mélito the pintura of all the kingdom of Toledo and all the other bishoprics that are found there so that they would be taken to your Majesty, with the other astrological things that he asked of me...\(^1\)

Thus, this letter would indicate that Diego Hurtado was to deliver maps of the province of Toledo to the king, maps almost doubtlessly based on the measurements he made for the Escorial Atlas. They may have been copies of sheets from the atlas itself. Given the focus on Toledo, he may also have included a copy of his map of the city of Toledo. Regardless, given this letter, it is possible that Pedro Salazar de Mendoza had access to a copy of the maps of Alonso de Santa Cruz through his relative.\(^2\)

**The Plan of Toledo**

Like the Escorial Atlas, the map of Toledo in Pedro Salazar’s painting is an example of the skill of sixteenth-century Spanish cartographers. In the map, the streets and blocks within the city walls are rendered following strictly ichnographic approach to representing space following the high technical standards of the Casa de la Contratación. Unlike perspective views, this ichnographic plan delineates the outline of every building, city block and street as a ground plan. All of the features are on a single horizontal plane, and the quantitative relationships between sites are given priority over symbolism and the naturalistic appearance of the city.\(^3\) As Crespo Sanz has argued, this part of the map is attributable to Alonso de Santa Cruz, the only cartographer from the time who can be directly credited with measuring for and drafting such a map.\(^4\) His skills in mapping cities remain evident to this day, as most of the measurements of this

---

\(^1\) ...e yo di al de Melito la pintura de todo el reino de Toledo y todos los más obispados que están puestos a él para que llevase a vuestra majestad, con otras cosas que me pidió de astrología... See Crespo Sanz, “El empleo de métodos topográficos,” 67.

\(^2\) Crespo Sanz, “El empleo de métodos topográficos,” 67.


plan of Toledo, when superimposed over a twenty-first-century map, prove to be fairly accurate (see fig. 19). The plan furthermore takes on an encyclopedic role, marking most of the important churches, chapels, hospitals, as well as important houses and villas within the city walls, identified by numbers or letters with a list of their names on the left-hand side. The map thus gives a twenty-first century viewer a glimpse into how the city of Toledo has changed since the sixteenth century. For example, an island that once bifurcated the Tagus River at the northeast of the city, the Isillia de Antolinez, has since been overtaken by development and no longer exists; most of it is today a parking lot.95

Nonetheless, only part of the map included in View and Plan of Toledo conforms to the level of accuracy associated with Santa Cruz’s skills. As Cesáreo Bas noted in 2015, many of the elements on the margins of the city map are rendered symbolically and sometimes inaccurately.96 For example, across the Tagus River, the map places the Castle of San Servando slightly to the south of and rotated from its actual location (see fig. 20). In addition to this, there are instances where the structures of Toledo are depicted in their elevations rather than as ground plans like the rest of the map. Examples include both of the bridges, the Puente de Alcántara and Puente de San Martín, which are shown not only in elevation, but upside-down to the viewer (see figs. 20, 21). (Though the map and view of the city look from the north, the south facades of these bridges are drawn on the painting.) Nuestra Señora de la Cabeza chapel across the Tagus is also shown in its elevation, but it is drawn at a diagonal facing the northeast (see fig. 21).

95 Interesting to note is that the diagonal hatch lines within the city blocks of the city go diagonally both to the left and right. I would argue this may indicate that whoever transcribed the map was ambidextrous. It is also possible that they rotated the canvas regularly while drawing the map on the surface.
This chapel, unlike the bridges, seems to be part of the profiles of the hills surrounding Toledo, which radiate outward from the center of the city instead of standing upward.\textsuperscript{97}

These are the elements that, I argue, were added by El Greco or a member of his workshop likewise untrained in the most current ichnographic methods. Furthermore, these elements inhabit the same space in the margins of the map as El Greco’s inscription justifying his representation of the Tavera Hospital and the Virgin and Saint Ildefonsus. That both inhabit the same space suggests that both are from the same hand. Thus, there were at least two hands in the making of this map: the hand of the original cartographer, Alonso de Santa Cruz for the map in the Escorial Atlas, as well as several additions possibly made in El Greco’s studio when they later copied that map to the canvas.

Whether or not El Greco and Pedro Salazar had a more complete plan of Toledo than what survives in Escorial Atlas is uncertain, but given that Alonzo de Santa Cruz left the project unfinished, it is possible that certain parts of their copy of the plan were incomplete and that either Pedro Salazar or El Greco took the liberty of finishing the map for the purposes of the painting. This is supported by Cervera’s assertion that there may not at the time have been any trained mapmakers in Toledo who could have completed the plan for the painting.\textsuperscript{98}

\textbf{The View of Toledo}

In \textit{View and Plan of Toledo}, the view itself appears to be an original composition, one that presents the city from the north, and more specifically as seen from Salazar’s

\textsuperscript{97} The most prominent and identifiable hill on the plan of Toledo is the Cerro del Bu, an important archeological site. See Cesáreo Bas, “Plano de Toledo del Greco (1608 - 1614).”

\textsuperscript{98} Cervera, "El Greco Cartographer," 74.
Hospital de Tavera. This vantage point distinguishes the View and Plan from other views of the city. Indeed, there were several extant views of Toledo before El Greco painted *View and Plan of Toledo*, though they seem to have had limited influence on El Greco’s depiction of the city. The view of Toledo in Braun and Hogenberg’s *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (see fig. 13) and its variants depict the city from the Mirador del Valle, a famous lookout point at the south of the city that remains popular with tourists to this day. The same problem arises in comparison with the 1584 view of Toledo by Ambrogio Brambilla and Pietro de Nobilibus, which takes the same viewpoint from the southern lookout. The Brambilla view, unlike the Braun and Hogenberg, simplifies the topography of the city, giving a clearer impression of the city’s layout (see fig. 22).

The best comparison to *View and Plan* is the view of Toledo drafted by Anton van de Wyngaerde in the 1560s (see fig. 23). This Dutch view painter traveled throughout Spain at Philip II’s express “command and instruction to paint the pictures of several of my principal cities.” Philip II sent the resulting drawings to the Netherlands in 1571, upon the artist’s death, with the intention of having them published. This effort was

---

99 It has also been suggested that the view was taken from the Jewish cemetery at the Cerro de la Horca. See Julio Porres Martín-Cleto and Bacheti Brun, *Plano de Toledo*, (Toledo: Instituto de Investigaciones y Estudios Toledanos, 1967), 1.
100 One of the earliest of these views was printed in Pedro de Medina’s *Libro de grandes y cosas memorables de España* in 1548 and 1549; however, this view of Toledo is highly symbolic, depicting a generic city surrounded by the Tagus river and with the San Martín and Alcántara bridges on either side. This, alongside having been printed before the upcoming cartographic revolution in Spain, implies it likely had little bearing on El Greco’s painting.
101 This view was originally drawn by Joris Hoefnagel in 1566 and was published in *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* in 1572 and 1598. See John Goss, *The City Maps of Europe: 16th Century Town Plans from Braun and Hogenberg*, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1992), 5-7, 114-115.
thwarted by the Dutch Revolt in 1572 and possibly further hindered by the first publication of Braun and Hogenburg’s Civitates that same year.\textsuperscript{103} The Wyngaerde view takes the same view from the north as El Greco’s painting. In the case of Wyngaerde’s image, I would note that this view from the north of the city is significant because it would be the view of the city that the king – the drawing’s patron – would see when arriving on the road from Madrid. The drawing, which Fernando Marías describes as “‘objective’ though highly corrected and improved”,\textsuperscript{104} shows all the same landmarks as View and Plan and even includes the Tavera Hospital during its construction prominently before the Bisagra Gate. Even though this view was not published, it is not impossible that El Greco or Pedro Salazar saw Wyngaerde’s view of Toledo: all of his original drawings were displayed in the royal palace in Madrid until 1734 when a fire destroyed many of them.\textsuperscript{105}

In painting this cityscape, El Greco may have found inspiration in views of other cities. One possibility that Marías suggests is an engraved map depicting a view of London with two plans: Civitas Londoni or View of London from Southwark (1600) by John Norden (see fig. 24). The relationship between the two images is striking: Both city views present a “fish-eye” view, floating allegorical cartouches representing civic identity, and street maps of the city. John Norden’s representation of London is, however, a true panorama and combines multiple views into a single image while El Greco’s painting takes a true view looking south. Additionally, instead of combining multiple methods of representation, the emblems and plan in El Greco’s painting occupy the same logical space as the city.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{103} Parker, “Maps and Ministers,” 129, 148 endnote 26.
\textsuperscript{104} Marías, El Greco in Toledo, 10-11,
\textsuperscript{105} Parker, “Maps and Ministers,” 129.
\textsuperscript{106} Marías, El Greco in Toledo, 12.
The Tavera Hospital and El Greco’s Early Training

While View and Plan of Toledo thus shows El Greco participating in the new tradition of naturalistic city views, certain parts of the painting should be considered in the context of the artist’s early training in the Byzantine style. Though El Greco moved to Spain in 1577, where he would stay for the rest of his life, his early training was as an icon painter in Crete. By the age of 36, El Greco was an acknowledged master in the style, though his apparent ambition pushed him to seek additional training in the competitive art markets in Italy. He arrived in Venice in 1567 or 1568 and seemingly turned from the Orthodox communities there, instead embracing Catholicism and the upward mobility it offered artists.\textsuperscript{107} He nonetheless valued this early training to the end of his career and made it a part of his brand. This can be seen in his use of his Greek signature to the end of his life.\textsuperscript{108} Likewise, in the margins of his copy of Vasari’s Vite, he inscribed defenses of his “Greek forefathers” and the Byzantine tradition of painting.\textsuperscript{109}

Of particular interest here is how El Greco depicts the Tavera Hospital on a cloud in the foreground of View and Plan of Toledo. I argue that this choice is attributable to the artist’s training in the Byzantine style, especially given that he describes the Tavera Hospital as a “model” in the text at the bottom of the plan of Toledo:

It was necessary to place the Hospital of Don Juan Tavera in the form of a model because, not only did it cover the Puerta de Visagra [Bisagra], but the dome or cupola rose up over the city and so once placed as a model and moved from its lo-

\textsuperscript{108} A full discussion of El Greco’s use of his Greek signature can be found in Inmaculada Pérez Martín, “El Griego de El Greco,” in Toledo y Bizancio, ed. Miguel Cortès Arrese (Cuenca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2002), 178-208.
\textsuperscript{109} Hadjinicolau, “Early and Late El Greco,” 29. See also Marías and Bustamante, Las ideas artistícas de El Greco, 156-157.
cation it seemed to me to show the façade better than elsewhere, and as to how it fits within the city, this can be seen in the plan...

The artist’s choice of the word *modelo* suggests that El Greco was building upon the Byzantine convention of figures holding model churches, a visual strategy which artists embraced in his native Crete. For example, the icon depicting Saints Peter and Paul (see fig. 25), attributed to Nicalos Ritzos, shows the saints jointly holding a model of a domed church. Here it signifies the unification of the church between the East and West. El Greco may have seen and studied this particular example, which was produced during the second half of the 15th century in the Cretan-Venetian region where he became a master a century later. Furthermore, El Greco’s description of the Tavera as a “model” suggests two things: for one, it suggests that he may have painted the building not from life, but from an architectural model for the newly completed building. Secondly and more importantly, it suggests that the hospital is being offered to the Virgin, and

---

110 Translation from Marías, *El Greco in Toledo*, 15. The full text reads: *Ha sido forçoso poner el hospital de Don Joan Tavera en forma de modelo porque no solo venía a cubrir la puerta de Visagra mas subia el cimborrio o copula de manera que sobrepunjava la cuidad y asi una vez puesto como modelo y movido de su lugar me pareçio mostrar la haz antes que otra parte y en lo demas de como viene con la cuidad se vera en la planta ... Tambien en la historia de nra señora que trahe la casulla a S. Illefonso para su ornato y hazer las figuras grandes me he valido en cierta manera de ser cuerpos cèlestiales como vemos en las luçes que vistas de lexos por pequenas que sean no pareçen grandes.*

111 In the Byzantine traditions, donors are often shown standing and holding a model church, whereas after the fourteenth century, a kneeling posture became codified iconography throughout most of Europe. For a discussion of this, see Angela Marisol Roberts, *Donor Portraits in Late Medieval Venice c. 1280-1413*, (PhD diss., Queen’s University, 2007), 5-19.

112 Slobodan Ćurčić and Euangelia Chatzetryphōnos, *Architecture as Icon: Perception and Representation of Architecture in Byzantine Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Art Museum, 2010), 30. This iconography was widespread in the Eastern tradition well after the sixteenth century. For example, an eighteenth-century icon with similar imagery can be found at the Emile H. Mathis Gallery at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (Accession No. 1986.2.11).
Saint Ildefonsus above for the salvation of Pedro Salazar and, by implication, Toledo as a whole.

Slobodan Ćurčić and Euangelia Chatzētryphōnos argue in their book *Architecture as Icon* that architecture in Byzantine imagery has a number of uses ranging from the social space of religious assembly, the embodiment of God himself, the representation of heavenly cities, and even the liminal space between the earthly and the divine. Their book offers a number of Byzantine icons that can illuminate El Greco’s choices in *View and Plan of Toledo*. Take for comparison the icon depicting Saint Spyridon above a view of the city of Corfu (see fig. 26), where the saint miraculously stopped the Venetian authorities from celebrating mass in the Church over which he presided. The icon is split into two registers: At the top, an image of Spyridon enthroned and making a gesture of blessing; and below, a view of the Greek city as members of the Orthodox Church ward off the Roman Catholic Venetians. This format became increasingly popular near the end of the 15th century, where a saint, depicted in the conventions of the long traditions of icon painting, is juxtaposed with an image of the temporal world, in this case a city.113 This is not unlike *View and Plan of Toledo* where the Spanish city is juxtaposed with its patron Saint Ildefonso, though here both occupy the same space.

As opposed to Western imagery, which represents reality and “at times even betters it,” Ćurčić and Chatzētryphōnos argue that images in the Eastern traditions served as “means for spiritually crossing the divide between the earthly and heavenly domain”.114 Thus, models of churches in Byzantine imagery, when representations of actu-

---

al churches, may or may not resemble the real building they are meant to represent.\textsuperscript{115} They are usually held in the hand of a patron of the church or a saint significant to the church. Perhaps the most famous of these donor portraits is of Justinian holding the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul, an image that likewise appears on patriarchal seals granting asylum within the Great Church (see figs. 27, 28).\textsuperscript{116} We can see El Greco using this same strategy in his depiction of Saint Augustine of Hippo, now at the Museo de Santa Cruz in Toledo (see fig. 29) as well as in his depictions of Saint Romuald in both copies of the Allegory of the Camaldolese (see figs. 9, 10).

When depicting actual places, as opposed to purely invented ones, Ćurčić and Chatzētryphōnos write:

This category of objects confirms the notion that seeing what is depicted was not simply intended as visual information. The goal of each representation was to inspire associations and spiritual sentiments reaching far beyond what the given image – or even the physical reality it purports to represent – had to offer.\textsuperscript{117}

This description of architecture seems strictly opposed to the perspectival representation of Toledo in View and Plan. It is, however, much more apparent in the paintings El Greco and his studio were producing at the same time, especially View of Toledo at the Metropolitan Museum. In this representation of Toledo, El Greco rearranged the landmarks of the city to highlight the spiritual and devotional aspects of the city, not to rep-

\textsuperscript{115} They may be entirely imagined models, though some scholars argue they are depictions of actual models that were available to the artist and which no longer exist. This dispute can be characterized by the scholarship of Ćedomila Marinković, who argues they are primarily symbolic and need not look like the exact church for them to carry out their religious functions; and Ioannis Varalis, who cites examples of surviving models from the sixth through ninth centuries. See Ćurčić and Chatzētryphōnos, Architecture as Icon, 141-142.

\textsuperscript{116} Ćurčić and Chatzētryphōnos, Architecture as Icon, 15. For lead seals, see also John Cotsonis, "The Virgin and Justinian on Seals of the "Ekklesiekdikoi" of Hagia Sophia," Dumbarton Oaks Papers 56 (2002): 41-55.

\textsuperscript{117} Ćurčić and Chatzētryphōnos, Architecture as Icon, 193.
resent it as it truly stands in the landscape. The most significant and monumental landmarks in El Greco’s painting, the Alcázar and the Toledo Cathedral, are placed at the top of the composition at the transition between heaven and earth. As Walter Liedke describes the painting, “The picture is less a ‘view’ of Toledo than a vision, a dream, a revelation—like that of the New Jerusalem.” Similarly, the View of Toledo in the Metropolitan Museum includes a small group of buildings that appear to float on a cloud in the lower left of the composition. This is most commonly identified as an imaginary reconstruction of the Agalinese Monastery, where the city’s patron saint Ildefonsus was known to go on retreat (see fig. 1). Kagan and Brown argue this may represent some of the interests of Pedro Salazar de Mendoza, who attempted to identify the location of this lost site in his treatise on Saint Ildefonsus. In addition, the imagined inclusion of this complex adds spiritual meaning beyond the literal representation of the city.

As Andrew R. Casper pointed out, there was a trend beginning in the sixteenth century in Italy to create works using modern styles but using traditional compositions, a practice El Greco brought with him when he moved to Spain. The reuse of these earlier formulas during the Counter-Reformation worked to align the new compositions to

---


120 Brown and Kagan, “View of Toledo,” 26. While this identification is for Brown and Kagan only tentative, in (Kagan and Marías, Urban Images of the Hispanic World, 203), Kagan maintains that “these buildings, perched on what appears to be a cloud, undoubtedly refer to the Agaliense Monastery.” The identification is later repeated in Davies and Elliott, El Greco, 234; and in Marías, El Greco in Toledo, 10.
122 Andrew R. Casper, Art and the Religious Image in El Greco’s Italy (University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 156.
the more venerable sacred imagery. El Greco’s use of the “model” of the Tavera hospital in *View and Plan* is thus an instance of the artist using his Byzantine inclinations toward Counter-Reformation ends: the charitable donation of the building and its veneration to the Virgin and saints aligns with contemporary conversations on good works, and the noble classes of sixteenth-century Spain understood the construction of hospitals as one of the best expressions of charity. In his book on the Cardinal Tavera, Pedro Salazar writes about how the wealthy were obligated to perform charitable actions to avoid damnation. He further wrote that the foundation of the Tavera Hospital and its work on behalf of the poor would help insure both his salvation as well as Cardinal Tavera’s.

**The Virgin and Saint Ildefonsus**

Just as Pedro Salazar demonstrated his charity at the hospital, his Counter-Reformation zeal extended to his devotion to Saint Ildefonsus. His devotion to the saint is evident in his treatise on Ildefonsus’ life, as well as in *View and Plan of Toledo* where one of the miracles of the saint is depicted in the sky above the city. Saint Ildefonsus (ca. 610-667), a Visigothic theologian, was made Archbishop of Toledo in 657 and

---

124 Mann, *El Greco and His Patrons*, 118.
125 Pedro Salazar de Mendoza, *Chronica de el cardenal don Juan Tavera*, (Toledo, Spain: Pedro Rodriguez, 1603), 230-231.
remains the city’s patron saint. Though he was recognized as a saint to the entire church by the year 690, his cult was effectively limited to Hispania and its territories. Within Spain he was venerated for his charity and chastity, as well as for his theological writings. During the sixteenth century, his treatise De virginitate sanctae Mariae was regarded as an early defense of the Immaculate Conception. Today in Spain, he is considered both a Church Father and Doctor of the Church.

There are two major visions associated with the saint. The first of these, where Saint Leocadia rose out of her tomb and thanked him for his devotion to the Virgin Mary, is depicted in a print bound into some copies of Pedro Salazar de Mendoza’s 1618 history of Saint Ildefonsus. The second of the visions, and of prime importance here, is depicted in the sky of View and Plan of Toledo. Here, the Virgin, flanked by a host of angels and putti, places a chasuble on the kneeling Saint Ildefonsus, in accordance with the hagiography: it was recorded that on December 18th, 665, the Virgin Mary appeared to Ildefonsus while he was preparing to begin mass. Mary descended to sit on the episcopal throne with Ildefonsus’ treatise De Virginitate Perpetua Sanctae Maiæ emitting light in her hand. She thanked Ildefonsus for his devotion to her and gave to

---

128 Ulick Ralph Burke, A History of Spain from the Earliest times to the Death of Ferdinand the Catholic, (London: Aberdeen University Press, 1900), 63.
130 Mann, Spanish Paintings of the Fifteenth Through Nineteenth Centuries, 44.
131 Poncelet, "St. Ildephonsus."
132 A copy of this print was bound into the copy digitized by Google Books. The paper it was printed to appears to be a different size than the other pages of the book, so it may have been added and bound at the request of the original owner. Salazar de Mendoza, El glorioso doctor San Ildefonso, v.
him a chasuble from her Son’s treasury, described as being made by the hands of angels.\footnote{One of the earliest surviving records of this miracle comes from Gonzalo de Bercero’s \textit{Milagros de Nuestra Señora} written c. 1260, which, among other things, collected miracles where the Virgin either rewarded or punished men. In it, Gonzalo appears to reference an earlier Latin source. See Gonzalo de Bercero, \textit{Miracles of Our Lady}, trans. Richard Terry Mount and Annette Grant Cash (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1997), 28-31. Greco also depicted this miracle in one of his earlier polychrome sculptures for the predella of the otherwise destroyed original altar frame for the \textit{Disrobing of Christ} in the sacristy of the Toledo Cathedral (ca. 1577-79). Made a few years after the painting between 1585 and 1587, it is currently displayed in its original location in the Scarcity. See \textit{El Toledo de El Greco}, 101.}

El Greco depicted Saint Ildefonsus several times, often with the intention of elevating the importance of the saint. Some of these paintings show Ildefonsus preparing to write his \textit{De Virginitate Perpetual Sanctae Mariae},\footnote{There are two nearly identical compositions of this subject, today at the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C. and a larger version commissioned by and still housed in the Hospital of Charity at Illescas, Spain. In these, the saint is depicted at a lavish desk with expensive silver ornaments and velvet and gold tablecloth. The commission was fitting for the church as this statue, which Ildefonsus kept in his oratory and to which this church was dedicated, is still preserved in the retable of this altarpiece in the Hospital of Charity. See Sarah J. Barnes, "The Decoration of the Church of the Hospital of Charity, Illescas," in \textit{Figures of Thought, El Greco as Interpreter of History, Tradition, and Ideas}, edited by Jonathan Brown. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, (1982), 47-48.} while others lack identifying iconography associated with his sainthood.\footnote{The primary example of this is currently housed at the Royal Monastery of San Lorenzo in El Escorial alongside its companion \textit{San Pedro} (both ca. 1608-1614). Originally commissioned for the Church of Saint Vicente in Toledo, this image emphasizes the elaborate golden embroidery of his chasuble and crosier, thus relating this image to his vision of the Virgin Mary. Ildefonsus likewise holds a book in his hands, again relating to his writings on the Virgin. The paintings overall do not have many clear attributes of Saint Ildefonsus and it has in the past been misidentified as both Pope Eugene I and as Saint Blaise. See \textit{El Toledo de El Greco}, 145} These images would have appealed to the ideals of churchmen and ecclesiastical scholars, including Pedro Salazar de Mendoza, who claimed Ildefonsus merited elevation to the status of Doctor of the Church and that,
because of his writings, he should be compared with the Church Fathers.\footnote{Mann, \textit{El Greco and His Patrons}, 29. The title of Pedro Salazar’s treatise on Ildefonsus mirrors this desire. See Salazar de Mendoza, \textit{El glorioso doctor San Ildefonso}, 239-245. See also: Francisco de Pisa, \textit{Descripción de la imperial ciudad de Toledo, y historia de sus antiquedades, y grandeza, y cosas memorables} (1625; reprint, Madrid, 1974), 104r-107r.} Salazar and his contemporary Francesco de Pisa were particularly concerned with the saint’s orthodoxy because of discourse from non-Spanish scholars that Ildefonsus had spread heretical beliefs, including that Christ was not fully divine.\footnote{Mann, \textit{El Greco and His Patrons}, 29.} By depicting Ildefonsus as a Church Father, El Greco was creating propaganda to counteract these negative views of the saint.\footnote{El Greco was accepted as a saint through the entire Church pre-congregation, his cult was effectively confined to Spain and its territories. See: Mann, \textit{Spanish Paintings of the Fifteenth Through Nineteenth Centuries}, 44.}

In \textit{View and Plan}, it is significant that Virgin and Ildefonsus are not placed directly above the compositional center of the painting, which would be above the Bisagra Gate and the intersection of many compositional lines in the image. Instead, the two are directly above the spire of the Toledo Cathedral. The cathedral, on the plan, is the first institution listed on the map key. It is also physically in the center of the city. All this indicates the cathedral’s centrality to the city and its Christian past and present. This literal and metaphorical elevation of Ildefonsus aligns with Pedro Salazar’s opinions on the status of the saint within the church: Salazar claimed that by awarding Ildefonsus with the chasuble, she was recognizing the special authority of Toledo.\footnote{Pedro Salazar de Mendoza, \textit{Crónica del gran cardenal de España Don Pedro González de Mendoça}. (Toledo, Spain: María Ortiz de Sarauia, 1625), 19.} Thus, the saint’s vision is placed above the literal and doctrinal center of Toledo as well as above the center of Christendom in Spain.
I would additionally note that the inscription on the plan of Toledo aligns with El Greco’s interest in the effects of light and its use in creating religious images. The text reads:

... Also in [depicting] the story of Our Lady bringing the chasuble to Saint Ildefonso, in order to adorn him and to make the figures large, I have in a certain way taken advantage of their being celestial bodies, as in the case of lights, which when viewed from afar however small they may appear to be large.\textsuperscript{140}

In this inscription, El Greco directly compares the scene of the vision of Ildefonsus with the light of celestial bodies. El Greco’s light effects were varied: he was known to have borrowed the motif of a light-emitting Christ Child for his scenes of the adoration from Correggio.\textsuperscript{141} He is also known for dramatic lighting effects in his cloudy skies, an expressive trait for which the Metropolitan Museum’s \textit{View of Toledo} is often praised.\textsuperscript{142}

By treating the vision of Ildefonsus as a source of light, El Greco tied the image to the written accounts of the vision, including those of his patron, in which light emitted from the text in the hands of the Virgin or that the Virgin appeared surrounded by a blaze of light.\textsuperscript{143} Pedro Salazar wrote in his treatise on Saint Ildefonsus that “at one point, [the Virgin] suddenly appeared to Saint Ildefonsus, with light and brightness so excessive

\textsuperscript{140} Translation, with some bracketed additions by the present author, from Mariás, \textit{El Greco in Toledo}, 15. Original text reads: \textit{Ha sido forçoso poner el hospital de Don Joan Tavera en forma de modelo porque no solo venia a cubrir la puerta de Visagra mas subia el cimborrio o copula de manera que sobrepujava la cuidad y asi una vez puesto como modelo y movido de su lugar me pareçio mostrar la haz antes que otra parte y en lo demas de como viene con la cuidad se vera en la planta ... Tambien en la historia de nra señora que trahe la casulla a S. Illefonso para su ornato y hazer las figuras grandes me he valido en cierta manera de ser cuerpos çelestiales como vemos en las luçes que vistas de lexos por pequenas que sean no pareçen grandes.}

\textsuperscript{141} Hall, \textit{The Sacred Image in the Age of Art}, 231-232.

\textsuperscript{142} Liedke, “Three Paintings by El Greco,” 16.

\textsuperscript{143} Anna Jameson, \textit{Legends of the Monastic Orders As Represented in the Fine Arts} (Boston, MA: James R. Osgood and Company, 1875), 65.
that none who accompanied the Saint could suffer it.”

As I have already mentioned, Pedro Salazar wrote in the same book: “What we know, we know from writing, as from hearing, and this moves less than painting, which puts it before the eyes.”

Showing the Virgin appearing as a burst of light in View and Plan would have conformed to the specificity demanded by the Counter-Reformation and the intellectual interests of El Greco and his patron.

**The Allegory of the Tagus**

Because of their location outside of the church and outside the city walls, there are several elements of the composition of View and Plan that have received little attention from scholars. The golden allegory of the Tagus River, though it takes a significant role in the composition of the painting, is one of these. The form is typically classical: a nude in repose with a cornucopia and an overturned vessel out of which pours water. Such Greek and Roman references were commonplace in sixteenth-century visual culture.

Fernando Marías noted that: “This is an allegory of Toledo’s agricultural economy and its fertility and at the same time suggests the antiquity of the city, which has roots that can be traced back to Roman times”.

---

144 *pues en un punto, y con grãde presteza aparecio a san Ilefonso, con luz, u resplandor tan excesivo, que no le pudieron sufrir los que acomañavan al santo.* See Salazar de Mendoza, *El glorioso doctor San Ildefonso*, 137-138.

145 *Lo que sabemos, por la escritura lo sabemos, como de oydas, y esto mueve menos, que la pintura, q lo pone delante de los ojos.* See Salazar de Mendoza, *El glorioso doctor San Ildefonso*, 124.

146 Though several classical examples survive in sculpture and fresco, Arno the River God at the Vatican Museums is a famous example and was publicly displayed in the 16th century. See “River God (Arno),” Pio Clemento Museum, Ocatgonal Court, Musei Vat-Vaticani, accessed 3 April 2019, http://www.museivaticani.va/content/museivaticani/en/collezioni/musei/museo-pio-clementino/Cortile-Ottagono/divinita-fluviale--arno-.html

phasized the importance of the river both economically and spiritually when he wrote in his book on Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza how the first timbers for the Hopital de la Santa Cruz came to Toledo via the Tagus from the forests of Aranjuez.\textsuperscript{148}

To Maríás’s interpretation I would add that the presence of the allegory is also a nod to the presence of such figures in the margins and cartouches of maps. For example, one appears in the margins of the map of Cologne in Braun and Hogenberg’s \textit{Civitates Orbis Terrarum} alongside other classical symbols (see fig. 30). There are also examples that postdate \textit{View and Plan}, including Johannes Blaeu’s map of the Danube from 1635 where, in the bottom left, personifications and putti signify the importance of trade along the river (see fig. 31).\textsuperscript{149} Likewise, Johann Georg Vogt’s map of Bohemia from 1712 contains personifications of more than a dozen of the rivers in the region (see fig. 32). Much like in these examples, the allegory of the Tagus occupies the same marginal space in the image. By the same token, the young man in green opposite the allegory not only holds the plan of Toledo, but also acts as a figural frame to a cartouche containing texts, keys and additional information about the city.

Additionally, like ichnographic plans and chorographic views, allegories of rivers are yet another way to represent the physical world. By placing the allegory of the Tagus in the forefront of the composition, El Greco allows the viewer to see the river as integral to the city even though the river would otherwise not be visible from this southward viewpoint. It is a similar strategy to how, as El Greco wrote: “It was necessary to place

\textsuperscript{148} Pedro Salazar de Mendoza, \textit{Cronica de el gran cardenal de España, don Pedro González de Mendoza}, (Toledo: Imprenta de Doña Maria Ortiz de Sarauia, 1625), 387. See also: Antonio López Gómez, \textit{La navegación por el Tajo: el reconocimiento de Carduchi en 1641 y otros proyectos}, (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1998), 122.

the Hospital of Don Juan Tavera in the form of a model because, [it covered] the Puerta de Visagra.”150 Just as El Greco chose to move and rotate the Tavera Hospital in the composition to allow the viewer to see the Bisagra gate and to see the building’s south façade, placing the allegory in the forefront of the composition allows the viewer can see that which would otherwise be hidden. This furthermore calls attention to the limits of city views as a genre, supporting the position that Richard Kagan takes: “El Greco’s decision to incorporate into these various ways of representing a city into a single frame suggests that he understood that chorography, for of its scientific pretensions, did not by any means exhaust the ‘image of the city.’”151

The Jurisdictional Roll

A final element of View and Plan of Toledo that merits further examination stands just outside the Bisagra gate. To the left of the gate is what appears to be a small covered mercantile cart, subtly emphasizing the economic output of the city. Opposite the cart on the right is a pillar on a stepped platform. This pillar is a civic monument called a Rollo Jurisdiccional, or sometimes by the misnomer picota or pillory (see fig. 33). Scholars seem to have overlooked the roll and the cart because they are relatively small parts of the composition. The map of Toledo, however, encourages a close look at the painting to read the inscriptions therein; it is thus reasonable to assume that close inspections should also be extended to the depiction of the city and the elements outside the gate.

150 Translation from Marías, El Greco in Toledo, 15.
151 Kagan and Marías, Urban Images of the Hispanic World, 204-205.
Though one no longer exists in situ today,\textsuperscript{152} it is clear that such a roll used to stand outside of Toledo; one appears in both\textit{View and Plan} and in Wyngaerde’s view of Toledo (see fig. 34). In Wyngaerde’s drawing, the roll also happens to be surrounded by a group of covered carts like that in\textit{View and Plan of Toledo}. These rolls, which are a quintessentially Spanish phenomenon, have their origins in medieval manors. They indicate the jurisdiction, laws and independence of a municipality. According to the linguist Joan Corominas, the first documented use of the word “rollo” in reference to these pillars dates to 1405, though the rolls probably appeared earlier under a different name.\textsuperscript{153} They can take various forms and are often heavily decorated with heraldic symbols of the families in power, conical capittols, fluting and other carvings.

As Luis Miravalles demonstrated in his catalogue and essay on the surviving rolls in Spain, the rollos carry connotations of not only sovereignty and autonomy, but of justice and punishment. Thus the rolls would be useful tools not only of the municipality, but also for the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, which often used public humiliation as a form of social control.\textsuperscript{154} One could even argue that the rollo was a picot
ta made monumental: While pillories are usually not significantly taller than the aver-

\textsuperscript{152}At present there is a roundabout where the roll likely used to stand, the center of which I think would be an ideal location for one of these monuments today. Some residents of Toledo repeated this location to me in March of 2019 when I inquired if they recognized the roll. In 1813, seeing them as symbols of municipal autonomy, the Cortez de Cádiz ordered many of these rolls to be removed, a fate that may have befallen the roll in Toledo. See Museo de Cáceres, “Los árboles de piedra. Rollos y picotas de la provincia de Cáceres,”\textit{Noticias del Museo de Cáceres}, Vol. 14 (March 2004): 2.

\textsuperscript{153}Luis Miravalles,\textit{Los Rollos Jurisdiccionales: columnas milenarias de Castilla}, (Centro Etnográfico de Documentación, Diputación de Valladolid, 1989), 15. See also: Juan Corominas,\textit{Breve diccionario etimológico de la Lengua Castellana}, (Madrid: Gredos, 1967), 515.

\textsuperscript{154}For the Inquisition and punishment and torture, see Ángel Sánchez Crespo, “Picotas, Rollos, Horcas y Garrotes: Ajusticiamientos a la Española,”\textit{Clio: Revista de historia}, no. 188 (2017): 68-75.
age person, the rolls are usually several meters high. The roll of Jaramillo de la Fuente in Burgos, for example, is about five meters tall (see fig. 35). Given surviving drawings of the roll outside Toledo and given the significance of the city in the early-modern period, may have been even taller. In the view of Toledo by Wyngaerde, the size of the figures compared to the size of the roll suggests that it towered to nearly seven meters. Thus, as Miravalles writes: “The rolls are limitations of space with their own plastic and expressive values; they are monuments erected precisely in the real sphere to be seen: in crossroads, in the entrances to villas, in the plazas of markets”. An example of this can be seen in the view of Eçija in Civitates Orbis Terrarum where, opposite a mercantile cart and near the entrance to the bridge, is a jurisdictional roll labeled “El Roillo de una piedra” (see fig. 36).

The roll as a symbol would have appealed to Pedro Salazar, who was trained in canon law. He studied at the prestigious University of Salamanca and graduated as a *bachiller* in 1572. He then pursued his postgraduate study at the Colegio de la Purísima Concepción of the University of Osuna, graduating first as *licenciado* and then as a *doctor* in 1574. He briefly stayed in and taught in Osuna until 1581 when, at the request of Archbishop Quiroga, he conducted in inquiry into the affairs of the *audiencia ar-

---


156 This city view also shows a stone cross at the entrance of the city. Similar to the rolls, these crosses were placed near the entrances of cities to indicate their Christianity. I counted three of these *cruces* in Toledo today, two appearing to be made of 19th century ironwork, and the oldest, located to the west of the city across the Tagus, made entirely of stone.

157 The University of Osuna, unlike Salamanca, lacked a good reputation and could be described as a “degree mill.” The reasons for Pedro Salazar’s transfer are unknown, but were likely economic. See Kagan, “Pedro Salazar de Mendoza as Collector,” 87.
This was all before Quiroga promoted Pedro Salazar to other clerical positions, ultimately leading to his appointment at the Tavera Hospital in 1588. The association between rolls and the authority of inquisitions to examine offences against canon law is of particular interest here; given his early training in canon law, it should thus not be surprising that the roll is positioned in the true center of the painting.

Conclusion

Using the city of Toledo as a backdrop to a religious or historical subject was a common practice of El Greco and his studio toward the end of his life. The subjects of these paintings could include Christ on the cross, Saint Martin and the Beggar, Saint Louis, Saint Joseph and others. El Greco and his studio, as well as his followers and imitators, produced several copies of these compositions, many with variations in the content of the city in the distance, and all with the intent to appeal to Counter-Reformation tastes in Spain. A casual collector of pictures could commission one of these works, or may simply acquire one upon a trip to the artist’s studio. View and Plan of Toledo, however, should not be considered a part of this type of painting. While it seems to

159 Despite it’s position of prominence in View and Plan of Toledo, the roll is missing from the view of Toledo in Laocoön (see fig. 6). While most of El Greco’s later devotional works take constructed views of Toledo as their backdrop, this painting takes direct quotations from View and Plan. This is, of course, with some artistic liberties that shift some parts of the city and exclude others (see fig. 37). First of all, this would suggest at least that both View and Plan and Laocoön were painted from the same preparatory sketches. More importantly, however, these omissions and shifts from the otherwise accurate depiction of the city are some of what set View and Plan apart from the other views of Toledo done near the end of El Greco’s life and establish the city as the focus of the painting.
160 Mariana de Mendoza and her husband Pedro Lasso de la Vega, Count of Los Arcos, were such collectors who, along with owning an Allegory of the Camaldolese Order, owned seven other original paintings by the artist. They likely acquired these seven on trips to the artist’s studio rather than by expressly commissioning them. See Kagan, “The Count of Los Arcos as Collector and Patron of El Greco,” 156.
share the basic formal elements of this type, its composition and its complex iconography lacks precedent in early modern Europe.

In this thesis, I have attempted to address the wide range of sources from which El Greco likely drew to generate this new image, and the influence on the composition by its exacting and invested patron. Many of these sources are related to maps and city views, including those in that Pedro Salazar collected as well as the visual conventions of maps in general. In View and Plan, this would include not only the presence of the allegory of the Tagus in the painting’s margin, but more importantly the unusual juxtaposition of the panorama of the city with its ground-plan map. Furthermore, the presence of the map of Toledo in the painting leaves open questions about El Greco’s idea of expertise in art. The painting also demonstrates Pedro Salazar’s commitment to the ideals of the Counter-Reformation and the translation of those ideals into works of art. Themes of this can be seen in the rollo jurisdiccional outside the city gate, the inclusion of the Virgin and Ildefonsus in the sky directly above the Toledo Cathedral, and the apparent “charitable donation” of the Tavera Hospital to the Virgin by its placement on a cloud. As well as appealing to Pedro Salazar’s interest in charity as a path to salvation, the offering of the Tavera Hospital in the painting is tied directly to the tradition of donor portraits in the Byzantine style. Current scholarship discusses many of El Greco’s compositions in context of his early mastery in the Byzantine style, but View and Plan of Toledo has generally not been framed in this context.

Created by an artist who specialized in the generation of new iconographies, View and Plan of Toledo is a composition that appears to have no precedent in early modern Europe. Unlike his original iconography for Burial of the Count of Orgaz, which

---

161 Hall, The Sacred Image in the Age of Art, 233.
was celebrated immediately as a masterpiece by his contemporaries,\textsuperscript{162} I am uncertain how the wider public of Toledo received Pedro Salazar’s painting. The only evidence I have found is in W. Somerset Maugham’s description of the painting in his \textit{Of Human Bondage}: “the representation was so precise that when the citizens of Toledo came to look at the picture they recognised their houses.”\textsuperscript{163} To this end, Maugham offers another thought on \textit{View and Plan of Toledo}: “It’s a picture that El Greco painted of the city he loved, and it’s truer than any photograph. Come and sit at the table.”\textsuperscript{164}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{163} W. Somerset Maugham, \textit{Of Human Bondage} (Garden City, NY: Sun Dial Press, 1915), 488.
\textsuperscript{164} Maugham, \textit{Of Human Bondage}, 486.
\end{flushright}
FIGURE 1. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614) *Visa de Toledo (View of Toledo)*, 1596-1600, oil on canvas, 48 x 43 inches, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City
FIGURE 2. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614) *Vista y Plano de Toledo (View and Plan of Toledo)*, 1608, oil on canvas, 52 x 90 inches, Museo del Greco, Toledo.
FIGURE 3. Locations of major monuments and a descriptive passage on El Greco’s
*View and Plan of Toledo*, 1608.
FIGURE 4: El Greco’s View and Plan of Toledo (detail), 1608. The inscription appears in the lower right corner of the map.
FIGURE 5: Dionisio de Santiago Palomares (Active Toledo, 18th century), Portrait of Pedro Salazar de Mendoza, c. 1790-1800, oil on canvas, Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha
FIGURE 6. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614) Laocoön, 1610-1614, oil on canvas, 56 x 76 inches, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
FIGURE 7. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614) *Christ Crucified with Toledo in the Background*, 1604-1614, oil on canvas, 27 x 43 inches, Fundación Banco Santander, Madrid.
FIGURE 8. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614) *Saint Joseph and the Christ Child*, ca. 1600, oil on canvas, 43 x 22 inches, Museo de Santa Cruz, Toledo, Spain
FIGURE 9. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614) Allegory of the Camaldolese Order, c. 1600, oil on canvas, 49 x 35 inches, Instituto Valencia de Don Juan de Madrid
FIGURE 10. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614) *Allegory of the Camaldolese Order*, c. 1600, oil on canvas, 54 x 42 inches, Museo del Patriarca, Valencia
FIGURE 11. Unidentified painter, *Icon of the Journey to the New Jerusalem, the Ascent from Earth to the Heavenly City*, ca. 1500, tempera and gold leaf on wood, Holy Monastery of the Theotokos Platytera, Corfu. Image: Slobodan Ćurčić and Euangelia Chatzetryphonoś.
FIGURE 14. Alonzo Santa Cruz (Spanish, 1505-1567), Index map of the *Atlas de El Escorial* with delineating grid, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, Madrid.
FIGURE 15. Alonzo Santa Cruz (Spanish, 1505-1567), detail from the verso of the 4th page of the *Atlas de El Escorial* with radial graphs for a map of Toledo, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, Madrid.

FIGURE 16. Alonzo Santa Cruz (Spanish, 1505-1567), detail from the verso of the 10th page of the *Atlas de El Escorial* with radial graphs for a map of Toledo, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, Madrid.
FIGURE 17. Alonzo Santa Cruz (Spanish, 1505-1567), detail from the verso of the *tabla prima* of the *Atlas de El Escorial* with radial graphs for a map of Toledo and identifications of important buildings, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, Madrid. Image: Antonio Crespo Sanz.

FIGURE 18. Detail from the plan on *View and Plan of Toledo* with radial graphs from figure 15 superimposed. Image: Antonio Crespo Sanz.
FIGURE 20. Cesáreo Bas, Georeference of *Plano de Toledo del Greco* (detail), 2014, with the Castle of San Servando (Cerbantes), and the Alcántara Bridge. Image: Cesáreo Bas.
FIGURE 22. Ambrogio Brambilla (Italian, active ca. 1579-1599) and Pietro de Nobilibus (Italian, active 16th century) View of Toledo, 1585, etching on wove paper, 47 1/2 x 72 cm, Museo del Greco, Toledo.
FIGURE 23. Anton van den Wyngaerde (Flemish, 1525–1571). *View of Toledo Looking South*, 1563. pen and brown ink and brown wash on paper, 42 × 107 1/2 cm. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna (MS Min. 41, fol. 19).
FIGURE 24. John Norden (English, ca. 1548 - ca. 1625), *Civitas Londoni (Panorama of London from Southwark)*, 1600, engraving, 36 x 125 cm, Kungliga biblioteket, Stockholm (KoB DelaG 89).
FIGURE 27. Constantine the Great presents the city (Constantinople) and Justinian the Great presents Hagia Sophia to the Virgin, mosaic, probably 10th century, Southwestern Entrance, Hagia Sophia, Istanbul.

FIGURE 29. Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco (Spanish, born Crete, 1541-1614), *Saint Augustine of Hippo*, ca. 1595-1600, Parish Church of Saint Nicolás de Bari, Toledo on loan to the Museo de Santa Cruz, Toledo.
FIGURE 33. Detail of *Vista y Plano de Toledo* highlighting the jurisdictional roll (right) and a mercantile cart (left).

FIGURE 34. Detail of Wyngaerde’s *View of Toledo Looking South* (1563) showing the jurisdictional roll of the city accompanied by mercantile carts to its immediate left.
FIGURE 36. Georg Hoefnagel (Flemish, 1542-1601), Ecija (above) and detail (below), 1567, printed 1572, in Georg Braun and Franz Hogenberg, Civitates Orbis Terrarum vol. I no. 5, 5 1/2 x 18 inches, National Library of Israel.
FIGURE 37. Details showing where Laocoön (below) borrows elements of the composition of View and Plan of Toledo (above).
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