60. Antonio Rodríguez Villa (ed.), D. Francisco de Rojas, embajador de los Reyes Católicos. Documentos justificativos (Ali-
ark:/59851/bmk7q32. For the battle of Loja, Edwards, The Spain
ark:/59851/bmcks732. For the battle of Loja, Edwards, The Spain
61. Fernández de Córdova Miralles, ‘Diplomáticos y le-
trales en Roma’, p. 131.
62. Francisco Monedero, ‘Las armas de los Reyes Católicos’, Hidalgos. La revista de la Real Asociación de
63. The inscription is transcribed in Amelio Abel Pé-
64. Alonso de Escobar’s will for example specified the arms of Escobar, Rojas, Ribera, Guzmán, Roelas and Gade
les to be placed above the sepulchre he would share with his wife
65. British Library: Add MS 18851 (‘The Breviary of the
Queen of Castile’), fols. 436v–37r; Janet Backhouse,
66. The inscription reads: ‘El muy noble caballero Fran-
cisco de Rojas mando fundar esta capilla para reposo de sus pa-
dres y de los suscesores de sus armas en los suscesores dellos, estando en Roma por embaxador de los muy católicos Reyes y Señores Don Fernando e Doña Isabel, Rey y Reina de las Españas e de las Siçilias aquen e allende el
67. Ramírez de Arellano, Las Parroquias de T oledo, p. 12.
70. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
72. Javier Arias Nevado, ‘El papel de los emblemas heráldicos en las
74. López Pita, Fundación de la capilla de la Epifanía’, p. 141.
75. López Pita, Layos, Appendix, p. 256.
76. Very little survives of the chapel today. A detailed description is however contained in an enormous manuscript of 1644, Vicente Castañeda y Alcover, ‘Descripción del suelo 
77. Ramírez de Azcarra, Los Parques de Toledo, p. 12.
78. Juan Guas, Capilla mayor de San Juan de los Reyes, T oledo, 1485–1490, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, D00552.
79. For a more extensive discussion of the drawing’s ar-
81. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
82. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
83. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
84. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
85. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
86. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
87. Ramírez de Azcarra, Los Parques de Toledo, p. 12.
88. Juan Guas, Capilla mayor de San Juan de los Reyes, Toledo, 1485–1490, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, D00552.
89. For a more extensive discussion of the drawing’s ar-
91. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
92. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
93. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
94. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
95. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
96. ‘Capilla de la Santa Epifanía en la Iglesia Parroquial de San Andrés de T oledo. Copia autorizada de las constituciones y modificaciones en ellas introducidas en virtud de la bula de Clemente VII (23.VI.1463, ADT, especialmente Las bases de la capilla, Cómo se han de celebrar’, VIII-IX, see also the earlier regulations established by Francisco de Rojas, transcribed in López Pita, Layos, p. 109.
97. Ramírez de Azcarra, Los Parques de Toledo, p. 12.
98. Juan Guas, Capilla mayor de San Juan de los Reyes, Toledo, 1485–1490, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, D00552.
99. For a more extensive discussion of the drawing’s ar-
In January 1476, at the request of the Condestable Pedro Fernández de Velasco, and the Duke of Villahermosa, Isabella I of Castile travelled from Valladolid to Burgos to oversee the triumphant recovery of the city’s castle. She encountered a devastated city. The city had been transformed into a battlefield since the rebellion of Álvaro de Zúñiga in May 1475 and the ensuing siege on the castle by troops loyal to Isabella and Ferdinand of Aragon. During her stay, as Hernán del Pulgar relates, Isabella dedicated herself to the reorganisation of the local political and military power structures as well as the reconstruction of the castle.

Although there is no record of a visit by Isabella to the Carthusian monastery of Santa María de Miraflores at that time, it seems that the queen somehow became aware of the dilapidated state of the unfinished funerary church of her father, King John II, following twelve years of standstill at the site (Fig. 9.1).3 Isabella remained in the city until 5 February, probably visiting the monastery to pay homage to her father, just as Ferdinand did when he came to Burgos in June 1475.4 Be as that may, two months after Isabella’s stay in Burgos, when victory at the battle of Tordesillas had assured her the Castilian crown, all royal privileges to the Carthusian monastery were confirmed.5 One year later, in February 1477, a ceremony was held to lay the foundation stone of new work in the church of Miraflores.6

According to the author(s) of the Breve noticia de la fundacion de la Real Cartuja de Miraflores, drafted under prior Manuel de Aldea (1780–1789), it was Isabella who ordered the resumption of construction.7 This claim has consistently been repeated in subsequent studies, though it is entirely unsupported by documentary evidence.8 It is in fact unclear whether it was Isabella or the Carthusian community that ordered the resumption of construction. Lacking a proper church, the Carthusians had been using the refectory for liturgical celebrations since 1460.9 If it was the queen that ordered the works, it seems that her order was not accompanied at that time by direct financial support.10 Although the Cortes celebrated at Segovia and Madrigal in April 1476 offered Isabella a budget of 168,000,000 maravedis, the economic situation of the Castilian crown was fragile.11 Allocating resources was one thing, paying hard cash was quite another. The expenses of the conflict in Burgos alone were estimated to be 34,560,000 maravedis.12

An Unsuccessful Resumption of Works: Garci Fernández at Miraflores

In February 1477, when construction reportedly resumed, work was carried out under the direction of Garci Fernández de Matienzo. According to the Fundacion de la Cartuja de Burgos and to the Cartuja de Miraflores, drafted in the last third of the eighteenth century, Garci Fernández was appointed master of works because of the death of Juan de Colonia, the renowned German architect who began construction of the monastery in the 1450s.13 By these accounts, Garci Fernández was thus appointed while logistical reorganisation of the project was developing. Whatever the case, Garci died on 10 February 1478,14 and so any attribution of works to Garci Fernández is highly questionable. The chronicles that assert this are also contradictory. According to one version, the walls of the church were completed in their entirety under Garci’s direction and he also oversaw the closing of presbytery vaults.15 According to a second version, only the walls were built under Garci.16 This second version has been widely accepted by scholars.17 But analysis of the construction of Miraflores casts doubt on the completion of the walls in 1477. Hereafter, I will focus on three issues.
Firstly, we must take into account that in the mid-1460s, when construction of the church stalled, the walls had been raised up to different heights. According to a description of the church, recorded in the Noticia ureve and probably extracted from a report similar to the famous Memorial del plan y obras, the north wall stood at twenty feet high and the south wall at thirty-six and a half feet. Furthermore, given the joint structure of masonry at the junctions of the buttresses and walls, we can deduce that the buttresses were built in the 1460s, before the walls. Indeed, given that funding problems caused construction of the church to stall, it is likely that the buttresses had been built to a higher level than the walls. Archaeological remains of this common constructive strategy are preserved, for instance, at Astorga Cathedral (Fig. 9.2) and at Seville Cathedral, both buildings related to the Colonia dynasty.

Second, it is important to recognise that winters in Burgos are too cold to set mortar safely. Assuming that funds were ready, the workshop organised, and the supply of materials ensured, stonecutting might conceivably have started in 1476. Even if this were the case, it is unlikely that the building process was underway before the spring and summer of 1477, ‘quando est temps edificandi’, as the bishop of Burgos, Alonso de Santa María (himself a great patron and connoisseur of architecture), reminds us in his will. It is also unlikely that the building process was underway in the winter of 1477/8.

Third, there is strong evidence that the walls of the church were still under construction in summer 1484. In June, the angel holding Isabella and Ferdinand’s coat of arms was installed on the west façade, as well as a crucifix on the top of the pediment (Fig. 9.3). A year later, the installation of the window tracery was still ongoing. We can thus assume that the stained glass was not commissioned until that moment, at least for the nave windows. These three pieces of evidence suggest that little was built in the church until the 1480s. More precisely, it was under Prior Juan Temiño (1483–1487) that we can trace the building process more closely and also assess Isabella’s active role in the project.

A New Building Programme under Isabella’s Patronage

After the civil war, Isabella’s personal and political dedication to endowing her father with a sumptuous burial place led her to go beyond the funerary dispositions of John II. Under Isabella, the church at Miraflores was conceived as the pantheon for a new constellation of royal bodies, namely the first-degree members of Isabella’s family. Besides John II, it was to house the tombs of Isabella’s mother and brother: Queen Isabella of Portugal (John’s second wife) and the infante Alfonso. Petrified in alabaster, the tombs would have made tangible—in space and until the end of time—the restored prestige of the Castilian royal family (Fig. 9.4). The tombs also implied that Isabella belonged to an unbroken line of Castilian monarchs.

Architecture was implicated in this new scheme, and Simón de Colonia was the architect responsible for it. Indeed, despite the claims of the Carthusian authors of the Miraflores chronicles (or the scholars who have paraphrased them), Juan de Colonia’s
original architectural drawings for Miraflores were revised and it was decided to redesign the project as well as expand it.\textsuperscript{23} This is clear not only from the plans for a narthex and new main portal, originally installed on the north side of the narthex (Figs. 9.5 and 9.10),\textsuperscript{30} but also from the fragment of a parchment drawing with six different designs or proposals for the resolution of the clearstory and the vaults of the church (Fig. 9.6).\textsuperscript{31} In fact, everything suggests that the ascetic character of the church designed by Juan de Colonia did not fulfil the queen's expectations of the architectonical decorum and magnificence appropriate for a royal foundation. In order to understand this issue, we must go back to the 1450s, when the building of the charterhouse of Miraflores was first conceived.\textsuperscript{32}

As originally planned, John II wanted to convert the palace of Miraflores into a Carthusian monastery by reforming the existing building and expanding it with the construction of his burial church. Because this plan was rejected by the Carthusian Order, the king promised to build a new monastery outside the palace's walls.\textsuperscript{33} Nevertheless, John II's original plan was not abandoned until October 1452, when the palace was destroyed by fire. It was then that the Carthusian community, which had gained major decision-making capacity, developed a building programme ‘al modo de la dicha horden’, devised by Juan de Colonia. The institutional and personal relations between Miraflores and the Sevillan charterhouse of Santa María de las Cuevas played a key role in this, as witnessed by the selection of architectural models derived from the Sevillan charterhouse for the construction of the new foundation.\textsuperscript{34} These included the church
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\caption{Fig. 9.6 Simón de Colonia (attributed), proposals for the design of the vaults and clearstory of the church of Santa María de Miraflores. Compass, stylus and ink on parchment, 33.3 x 21.2 cm. Archivo Histórico Nacional, Clero regular, carpeta 239, legajo 6.}
\end{figure}
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\caption{Fig. 9.7 Church of Santa María de las Cuevas, Seville (ca. 1410–19), plan.}
\end{figure}
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\caption{Fig. 9.8 Juan de Colonia, portal of the church of Santa María de Miraflores (ca. 1460–66).}
As recorded in the *Memorial del plan y obra*, the church was to be built in "la forma de la yglesia que fiso el adelantado pedro afán de Ribera en las cuevas de sevilla". Given that John II never visited Seville, the king could only have known about Santa María de las Cuevas from architectural drawings. That is to say that he could have only seen the archetype—as suggested in the *Memorial*—elected and proposed by the Carthusians.

As the church at Miraflores shows, Juan de Colonia closely imitated the design of Santa María de las Cuevas, adopting not only its plan but also its architectural language (see Figs. 9.1 and 9.7). This can be seen, for example, in the design for the original main portal of Miraflores (Fig. 9.8), effectively an architectural paraphrase of that at Las Cuevas (Fig. 9.9). According to the ascetic aesthetics of the Carthusian order, neither heraldic emblems nor sculpture decorate Miraflores’s portal. Its design is reduced to architectural forms. Simón de Colonia’s portal suggests, however, that Isabella and her deputies considered the aniconism and lack of heraldry in Juan’s portal to be inappropriate for a royal foundation.

Comparing the original main portal with the new one (Figs. 9.8 and 9.10), it is easy to identify the paradigm shift between Juan de Colonia’s models and stylistic parameters adopted by his son three decades later. Rejecting his father’s ascetic abstraction, Simón employed the same formal repertoire that he used in contemporary buildings in Burgos Cathedral, such as the chapel of La Concepción or the chapel of the Constable, and later in parish churches such as San Nicolás in Burgos, where the main portal follows that of Miraflores.

The clearstory and vault plan of Miraflores clearly show this new architectural orientation. The three-light windows of Miraflores and the Constable’s Chapel display the same basic design, as well as similar tracery designs, mouldings, capitals and bases (Figs. 9.11 and 9.12). By contrast, the capitals on the formerets seem to go back to the elevation devised by Juan de Colonia. The same configuration appears earlier in the choir of San Pedro de Cardeña. In the same way, Simón de Colonia retained his father’s design for the vault of the *capilla mayor*, which follows that at Santa María de las Cuevas. The young architect nonetheless introduced new designs in the nave vault that are much more elaborate than those in the nave of Las Cuevas (see Figs 9.5 and 9.7). They share only one feature: the ridge-rib.

**Monumental Scenography: Architecture in Space**

Unlike the project of the 1450s, the creation of an impressive external view for the church played a pivotal role in the new building programme. As discussed, Miraflores became a monument to the Castilian monarchy under Isabella’s patronage, placing the queen in an unbroken dynastic line even if this status could not easily be proclaimed, given the church’s location in a Carthusian monastery three kilometres from Burgos, visited by few and partly veiled from sight.

Simón’s design did not start ex nihilo. As noted above, the church’s walls rose several metres above ground and the main portal was already installed on the west façade (see Figs. 9.1 and 9.8). Not only was the portal considered inappropriate, but so too was Juan de Colonia’s façade, which also imitated Las Cuevas. Construction of a new narthex solved these problems (see Fig. 9.5), making it possible to carve a new portal to be placed to the north side of the narthex. The monumentality of the church’s north façade was thereby enhanced, effectively becoming the church’s main façade.

In order to understand Simón de Colonia’s design, we have to take into account the position of the church within the monastery, as well as the topography of the leafy parkland around Miraflores. Simón had known the monastery and its surroundings since childhood, so was fully aware that those coming to Miraflores would travel along the so-called *camino de Burgos*. Likewise, the young architect knew that the first visual contact with the church would be from the northwest.

Although there is no documentary evidence about this precise stretch of the *camino de Burgos* at the end of the fifteenth century, it cannot have been very different from what is now known as the Camino de la Paz (Fig. 9.13). This provided the main access to the monastery until the construction of a paved road and seems to correspond to the route of the *camino de Burgos* represented in several maps and descriptions of the...
Miraflores parkland from the eighteenth century (Fig. 9.14). At that time, points of entry were opened in what remained of the boundary. Built in the time of Enrique III, the founder of the old palace of Miraflores, the Puerta Real—later known as La Vieja—provided the main entrance to the Miraflores estate from the camino de Burgos. Two other entries were provided for the roads from Cardeña and Cardeñadillo.

Crossing the Puerta Real, the camino de Burgos bifurcated at the monastery. The southern branch followed the monastery’s vegetable garden. The northern branch led to Miraflores’s gatehouse, passing through La Tejera and La Cruz. Following this branch, the visitor first had clear sight of the church from a similar perspective to the one enjoyed by those entering via the Camino de la Paz. This powerful visual experience is described by authors at the end of nineteenth century. Indeed, the construction of the paved road impacted not only the historical topography of Miraflores estate, but also the way that the modern visitor perceives the church’s exterior.

Everything indicates that this choreography corresponds to the topographical situation at the time of Simón de Colonia. In addition to the pictorial and textual sources, the ground floor of Miraflores paupers’ guesthouse demonstrates that the old camino de Burgos entered the monastery forecourt at the same point as the camino de la Paz—from the first third of the sixteenth century, at least (see Fig. 9.13). At that time, the architect was forced to adapt the ground floor of this building to the camino de Burgos, breaking with the orthogonality of the rest of the monastic complex.

Knowing that the visitor would first spot the church from the northwest, Simón conceived the elevation of the north and west façades so that they appeared from this perspective as a unitary monumental scene. This explains the unusual asymmetrical elevation of the west façade, in which the slender southern buttress dies into the wall just above the level of the rose window, but the thicker northern buttress folds round onto the north façade, rising to the base of the gable (see Fig. 9.3). Approaching from the northwest, the massive volume of the northern buttress creates a strong visual axis for the north façade and west end, like a kind of optical hinge. From an oblique perspective, the disparities in the buttresses and the uninterrupted projection of the cornice emphasise the impression of depth, an impression not visible when viewed frontally. The position of the north window of the church’s western bay offers further proof of Simón Colonia’s scenographic manipulation, for it is the only one nudged away from the centre of the bay (Fig. 9.15). On the exterior, this compensates for the projection of the buttress so that the window appears to be located at the centre of the bay (see Fig. 3).

Shaping Architectural Spaces

Simón de Colonia’s project embraced not just an update of Juan de Colonia’s architectural vocabulary, but also spatial redefinition. In addition to the relocation of the main portal on the church’s north side, the construction of the narthex itself implied the creation of an antechamber that was open to the faithful. Unlike the direct access devised by Juan de Colonia, the narthex displays a transitional architectural space that

Fig. 9.11 Simón de Colonia, church of Santa María de Miraflores, cloister (1480s).

Fig. 9.12 Simón de Colonia, Chapel of the Condestable, Burgos Cathedral (1480/90s).

Fig. 9.13 Current means of access to Santa María de Miraflores.
connects the exterior and the interior of the church. Whether intentionally or not, the narthex influenced and still influences the visitor’s perception of the church’s architectural space. Crossing the main portal, the faithful entered, as now, a space covered by a tierceron vault and scarcely lit by a small rose, originally on the west side of the narthex. Alternating in each corner, the emblems of the Order of the Band and Castile decorate the shafts, referring again to the monastery’s founder. Crossing the church portal from darkness of the narthex, visitors enter a space that is dramatically larger and bright, during daylight hours at least (see Fig. 9.9). A similar effect has been observed in the old chapel of San Pedro that precedes the Constable’s Chapel in Burgos Cathedral, though this may have been prompted by other factors.

In Miraflores, beyond the old church portal, the space opened to the faithful was the westernmost bay of the church. This space is separate from the lay brother’s choir by a grille. The current iron grille was installed in the nineteenth century, although the original grille, ‘la reja grande’, was also iron. Installed in 1493, the original grille was decorated with the royal coats of arms and, very likely, two sculptures of angels by Gil de Siloe. Nowadays, if the screen is closed, the beholder can hardly see the royal tombs from the west end of the church, and this seems to have been the case at the end of the fifteenth century. Placed below the exuberant presbytery vault and before the richly carved retable, the tomb of John II and Isabella of Portugal is more than 31.5 metres from...
the grille. Observed from the west bay, only its pale profile can be perceived (Fig. 9.16).

Analysis of the interior suggests that Simón de Colonia was fully aware of this situation when he conceived the inner elevations. Unlike the nave vaults, the ribs of the presbytery vault are decorated with delicate tracery (Fig. 9.17). Simón de Colonia had used the same feature to decorate the ribs of the Conception Chapel in Burgos Cathedral, as well as the arch separating the Constable’s Chapel from chapel of San Pedro. Although this form has been associated with a dubiously semantic load, it seems to be no more than a decorative device that enhanced the richness of the vaults. What is noteworthy is not Simón’s use of this vocabulary, but rather its manipulation to create different aesthetic effects depending on the standpoint of the beholder. I will illustrate this point by comparing the vaults at Miraflores with this in the Conception Chapel in Burgos Cathedral.

In the vault of the Conception Chapel, the tracery springs from the lateral sides of the ribs, creating a delicate border along their entire length. Observed from the interior of the chapel, the ribs resemble a dynamic floating structure, detached from the vault webs (Fig. 9.18). The drama of this illusion is increased by delicate polychromy. Below the webs, which were probably painted in blue, the ribs were painted in gold, remnants of which are still visible. In Miraflores, on the contrary, the tracery work hangs from the intrados of the main ribs of presbytery vault and from the transverse arch separating the capilla mayor from the nave (see Fig. 9.17). The tracery visualises the spatial division between the presbytery and the nave, in accordance with the decorum of both spaces. As the church has only a single nave, this formal variation was one of the few
Fig. 9.21
Church of Santa María de Miraflores, vault view. Produced by N. Menéndez, C. Pintos de los Reos, A. Kolbe, and R. Körpf.

means available to Simón to differentiate the two spaces.

Comparing both vaults, we can conclude that the Conception Chapel’s vault was conceived to be observed from below, within the chapel. But the vaults of the capilla mayor at Miraflores were to be observed obliquely, particularly from the westernmost bay of the nave. By examining the design procedures and creative strategies codified in the parchment fragment from Miraflores, I will show how Simón carefully considered the church's spatial organisation when designing the vaults.

Like the vaults drawn on the parchment fragment, the vault of the nave at Miraflores includes a ridge rib (see Figs. 9.5 and 9.6). This seems to have been planned by Juan de Colonia, following the vault plan of Las Cuevas (see Fig. 9.7). In the vaults of the four western bays of the nave, the ridge rib and diagonal ribs form six compartments, which are subdivided by tiercerons (the transversal compartments) and triradials (the longitudinal compartments) (Figs. 9.9 and 9.21). The vault of the eastern bay includes an extra transverse rib, creating eight compartments, each articulated by triradials (Figs. 9.10 and 9.21). One might think that Simón wanted to emphasise spatial differentiation in the nave, as it was originally planned, the monks’ choir was and is located in the two eastern bays.

That is to say that both bays constitute a unified space from a functional point of view. The purpose of this design variation emerges clearly only when the interior is observed from the westernmost bay. As discussed above, the space in the church opened to the faithful. Indeed, looking from this standpoint, the eastern vault seems to be similar to the other vaults of the nave. It suggests that Simón manipulated the vault system so that the nave’s inner space appeared from the perspective of the faithful as a unitary space, an optical illusion that Simón de Colonia shaped by displacing the position of the bosses from the transversal axis (see Fig. 9.16).

Conclusions

At the request of Isla I, Simón de Colonia modified the church of the charterhouse of Miraflores, as designed by his father in the 1450s. All the evidence suggests that the queen did not consider the original church’s plain style appropriate for a royal foundation. Besides a clear stylistic paradigm shift, Simón de Colonia’s architecture reveals a thoughtful reflection on the perception of architectural spaces and forms, in which the potential viewpoint of the beholder played a key role. In other words, Simón conceived his architecture to be seen from key viewpoints, both within the church and outside it. If his father’s design largely imitated the plan and vocabulary of Santa María de las Cuevas, Simón invented new modifications to the church at Miraflores, creating subtle visual illusions and radically new aesthetic effects.

2. El luogo de habitación hermanos del Rey, y el Condesable, escribiéronlo a la Reyna que cruyó que en Valladolid, que venguía en la parte de panteón, y a escuela, y se huyó, y se huyó, y se huyó. La Reyna vino las tres letras de la Duque el 23 del del Condestable, parti la de Valladolid, y que para la ciudade, y que en la ciudad de Ospedale, se quedó en la casa de Ospedale. Esa huynía a la Reyna vino las tres letras de la Duque el 23 del del Condestable, parti la de Valladolid, y que para la ciudade, y que en la ciudad de Ospedale, se quedó en la casa de Ospedale.

3. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 1v. ACM.

4. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 3v. ACM.

5. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 4r. ACM.

6. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 5v. ACM.

7. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 6v. ACM.

8. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 7v. ACM.

9. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 8v. ACM.

10. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 9v. ACM.

11. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 10v. ACM.

12. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 11v. ACM.

13. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 12v. ACM.

14. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 13v. ACM.

15. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 14v. ACM.

16. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 15v. ACM.

17. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 16v. ACM.

18. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 17v. ACM.

19. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 18v. ACM.

20. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 19v. ACM.

21. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 20v. ACM.

22. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 21v. ACM.

23. Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos (hereafter Fundación de la Catedral de Burgos). Cartas y documentos, 1, fol. 22v. ACM.
19. The south wall was a remnant of the old palace built by king Enrique III of Castile. On the palace of la Frontera, see: Lázaro Herrera and Alvaro, El antiguo palacio real de Miraflores, Revista de la Comisión Provincial de Monumentos Históricos de Burgos 19 (1953): 209-14.


21. For Astorga Cathedral, see: Pedro de la Riestra, La ciudad a través de la cartografía histórica de Simancas. See Sec. Consejos, Mapa no. 760, AHN; Sec. Ruiz, Los sepulcros barbudos. El cuarto para los seglares.’ Transcribed by Nicolás Menéndez González, Apuntes históricos Miranda, Sepulcro de Nuestra Señora, y un óvalo pequeño en frente de la puerta. Esto se pudo realizar en el año 1458, como se dice. Noticia breve, fol. 41-2. ACM. The portal was dismantled and restored to its current location under prior Juan de Santoyo (1448-1466), as part of an extensive renewal programme of the church. ‘El año de 1467’ se empezó a comprar la iglesia, se blanqueó toda se hizo la corona, la que se construyó sobre la que tenía, que apenas se dividía: se pusieron todos los Cuadros con sus adornos, y cuatro vidrieras de la iglesia mayor de la iglesia, que se abrió el ático que está sobre la puerta de la iglesia, y se pusieron los vidrios. Se no pudieron asi ser desmontados por los años de 1658, since the 1530s by the construction of chapels on the church's north side and the gatehouse. ‘Nos place de ofrecer a la dicha buestra horden los nuestros oficinas al modo de la dicha horden’. Nota breve, fols. 21-2, ACM. Indeed, the portal was dismantled and restored to its current location under prior Juan de Santoyo (1448-1466), as part of an extensive renewal programme of the church. ‘El año de 1467’ se empezó a comprar la iglesia, se blanqueó toda se hizo la corona, la que se construyó sobre la que tenía, que apenas se dividía: se pusieron todos los Cuadros con sus adornos, y cuatro vidrieras de la iglesia mayor de la iglesia, que se abrió el ático que está sobre la puerta de la iglesia, y se pusieron los vidrios. Se no pudieron asi ser desmontados por los años de 1658, since the 1530s by the construction of chapels on the church's north side and the gatehouse. ‘Nos place de ofrecer a la dicha buestra horden los nuestros oficinas al modo de la dicha horden’.