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THESIS ABSTRACT

HENRY VIII: INTERIORS OF PERSUASION

King Henry VIII’s reign was full of difficulties stemming from his family’s weak claim to the throne and their highly contested sovereignty. Furthermore, Henry’s particular inability to produce a legitimate male heir until late in his reign created dynastic complications to his already turbulent reign. What is most distinguishable about Henry VIII’s response to such tribulations was his meticulous use of architecture and the interior to substantiate his rightful supremacy as King of England. Consequently, a style emerged during Henry’s reign that applied innovative Italian Renaissance antique designs and humanist philosophies to established chivalric Gothic architecture and overt heraldry. This Henrician style pervaded the watching, presence, and privy chambers in the king’s principal household and seat of official government: Whitehall Palace. Specifically, this sequence of semi-public ceremonial chambers reveals the representation that King Henry VIII desired to propagate throughout Whitehall Palace onto his court.

The political symbolic meanings of the decoration can be gained through a reconstruction of the ubiquitous architecture and decorative elements in the Henrician ceremonial interior. Conceived within the sixteenth-century context of Henrician attitudes toward identity and representation, the application of the Henrician style in the ceremonial chambers was rooted in the newly developed conception of perception and persuasion. In viewing these interiors, Henry’s courtiers would be edified of his sovereignty through a visual persuasion campaign mean to reinforce his authority through constructed associations. Particularly, the application of chivalric Gothic and Italian Renaissance antique designs can be seen as Henry aligning himself with the
representational symbols of his historic ancestry in tandem with the imagery of the virtuous Renaissance Prince.

This research focus on the reconstruction and analysis the Whitehall ceremonial chamber’s interior decoration, consisting of a multifaceted visual analysis of the remaining Henrician interiors, significant objects, illustrated manuscripts, and key paintings, based on contemporary chronicles, legal documentations, and inventories. By placing the reconstructed Whitehall ceremonial chambers within the Henrician culture that cultivated the interior as the symbolic manifestation of supremacy, the watching, presence, and privy chambers materialize as interiors of persuasion and expose the underlying theories of representation at the court of Henry VIII.
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INTRODUCTION

HENRY VIII: INTERIORS OF PERSUASION
THE CEREMONIAL CHAMBERS OF WHITEHALL PALACE

No Tudor monarch had a more complex and arduous relationship with power than King Henry VIII. His reign was full of tribulations revolving around his family’s weak claim to the throne and their highly contested sovereignty.\(^1\) Furthermore, Henry’s particular inability to produce a legitimate male heir until late in his reign created dynastic complications to his turbulent reign. As sociopolitical events transpired during the 1520s relating to Henry’s lack of an heir and perusal of divorce, his authority as King began to visibly deteriorate.\(^2\) Consequently, Henry VIII’s grasp on the English throne was only as sound as his perceived ascendancy.

What is most distinguishing about Henry’s response to such tribulations was his utilization of architecture and interior decoration as a medium for communicating his rightful supremacy as King of England. Therefore, paralleling Henry’s political situation of the 1520s and 1530s was his growth in attention to architecture and interior decoration. Henry quickly exhausted his personal funds and the profits following the Act of Royal Supremacy and the Dissolution of the Monasteries by transforming his prized royal houses into lavish representations of his magnificence.\(^3\) It is from Henry’s posthumous inventory of 1547, in tandem with the 1542 inventory of Whitehall Palace, that a glimmer of the grandeur in which he lived can be distinguished. By his death in 1547, Henry owned the most royal houses of any English monarch to date, as well as approximately 2,770 tapestry items – one of the largest collections ever accumulated within Europe – over 150 panel paintings, 2,028 items of plate, and 1,450 books just at his libraries at Whitehall Palace.\(^4\)
Most importantly, Henry’s official seat of government, Whitehall Palace, was consciously transformed into the visual representation of his sovereignty. At Whitehall, a Henrician interior style emerged, most noticeably in the sequence of the watching, presence, and privy semi-ceremonial chambers. This prevailing Henrician style fused prevailing Italian Renaissance antique designs and humanist philosophies with traditional chivalric Gothic architecture and overt heraldry, in what historians have dubbed a type of ‘Chivalric Eclecticism.’ The distinctive Henrician style of the watching, presence, and privy chambers were intended to symbolize Henry through representational imagery, visually connecting him with fashionable Italian philosophies and dynastic lineages. Through such representational associations, the semi-ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace were a means to propagate a self-fashioned image of authority and virility that were rooted in historic legacy and fashionable elegance.

It would be an error to identify the Whitehall interiors as simply a propagandist campaign. As Franklin L. Baumer argues, by means of official declarations, translations, Latin works, legal treaties, tracts preaching, scurrilous pamphlets, and even poems, the Henrician government enact a propaganda campaign aimed at all classes of public opinion. However, the message intended for the populace would be directed towards issues surrounding the newly created Church of England and Dissolution of the Monasteries, meant to reinforce the new ideological and religious shifts that were taking place within England. Though Henry’s use of such material should be approached as a propagandist campaign, the interiors and architecture of Whitehall Palace were not necessarily conceived of as a reinforcement of political and religious ideologies as much as a visual representation of authority meant to sway the viewers.
A far more accurate approach towards understanding the Whitehall ceremonial chambers would be a ‘persuasion’ campaign, as Tatiana String notes.\textsuperscript{7} In contrast to items intended for the populace that were based on an authoritative ideological message, the interiors of Whitehall were formulated to persuade and edify Henry’s court on his rightful authority.\textsuperscript{8} It must be remembered that the populace and nobility had incredibly different functions during the sixteenth century and that it was not necessarily the populace that determined if Henry VIII was the rightful King. For it was Henry’s courtiers, ambassadors, and diplomats, those who witnessed Henry’s marital tribulations and historically had conspired against the crown, who held the most power within the Henrician court; at times even more than Henry himself. Thus, the intention of such interiors was to persuade and influence those collectively more powerful than Henry of his ascendancy.

What is clearly distinctive for Henry VIII is the contextual nature of his affinity towards architecture and decoration, as well as, the interior’s use to disseminate the fashioned image of Henry’s authority. It is important to recognize that during the sixteenth century authority was founded on cultural endorsement and physical enforcement, which resulted in legitimatization.\textsuperscript{9} By considering authority through a cultural framework, Henry VIII had to not only demonstrate his power by means of physical enforcement – which was feeble at best – but additionally cultivate a cultural endorsement through associative imagery and perception to verify his legitimacy. Rooted beneath such definitions is the concept of creating a public representation through the manipulating of one’s exterior image, which would in turn reflect one’s inner character. Thus, the exterior became a constructed icon communicating information about the
As Tim Blanning notably stated, “Power depends as much on perception as reality.” Such a construction of authority in an effort of cultural endorsement correlates to crucial notions of perception and sight, which were beginning to be being absorbed into sixteenth century culture.

Conceived within the sixteenth century context of Henrician attitudes towards identity and representation, the application of the Henrician style in the ceremonial chambers was rooted in these newly developed theories of perception and persuasion that were pervading Europe. Specifically, a truly distinctive Henrician methodology of power and perception was utilized through interior decoration within the Whitehall ceremonial chambers. In many ways, perception and representation were utilized as symbolic devices for displaying authority that can be considered a type of self-fashioning, or the cultivation an specific representation to be displayed that is embed with symbolic associations to one’s self. Whitehall Palace was built at a moment when an increased understanding of perception and representation was integrated with traditional theories of Burgundian display, which were conflated with innovative Italian humanistic philosophies. Thus, within the Henrician culture, authority could be meticulously cultivated through representation.

The method for this study is a combination of visual culture analysis within the context of Henrician views of perception and display. However, it should be stated that it is not the purpose of this paper to understand the reaction and success of the interior as a representation of Henry, but to examine the theoretical approach to the Henrician ceremonial chambers that was utilized in their conception and creation. The first chapter focuses on the architectural and historical background of Whitehall Palace as a whole,
largely based on the archeological research of Simon Thurley. Such an archeological and historical background to the architecture is imperative due to its influence upon the later decoration and identity of the palace.

Within the second chapter, there is a movement away from the previous academic research in an attempt to comprehensively reconstruct the ceremonial chambers and their decoration. Though, Simon Thurley and Roy Strong have discussed either the function or specific elements of decoration within these chambers, neither have attempted an inclusive reconstruction based on the function of the semi-ceremonial chambers. The second chapter, then, recreates the luxuriousness of these chambers through a multifaceted visual analysis of the remaining interiors, significant objects, illustrated manuscripts, and key paintings. The third, and final, chapter couples the reconstructed chambers with an examination of the symbolic manifestation of supremacy located within the interiors. Such research attempts to expose the image that Henry VIII intended to propagate through the architecture and decorative arts in his semi-ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace in response to his sociopolitical circumstances. By placing the reconstructed Whitehall ceremonial chambers within the Henrician culture that cultivated the interior as the symbolic manifestation of supremacy, the watching, presence, and privy chambers materialize as interiors of persuasion and expose the underlying theories of representation at the court of Henry VIII.

During the 1520s, old contentions resurfaced, sparked by two interconnected events. As Catherine of Aragon was unable to produce a surviving son, a concern of a conspiracy against the crown arose around 1520. At such time, Henry VIII wrote a peculiar letter to Cardinal Wolsey, wanting him to “make good watch on the duke of Sufflok [Charles Brandon], on the duke of Buckingham [Edward Stafford], on my lord Northumberland [Algernon Percy], on my lord of Derby [Thomas Stanley], on my lord of Wiltshire [Henry Stafford] and on other which you think suspect to see what they do with this news.” Cal. SP. Dom., vol. III, 1. Such words express Henry’s anxiety towards his weakened position on the throne, in having no heir and the possibility of an uprising from nobility. Moreover, public option was such that in 1519 the Venetian ambassador to the English court thought that Edward Stafford “might easily obtain the crown” if Henry VIII died “without male heirs.” Cal. SP. Ven., vol. II, 1287. Memories of Henry VIII’s own father’s uprisings and struggle to maintain the crown, even with two legitimate sons, may have greatly influenced his attitude on the matter pressing him into decisive action.


Thomas P. Campbell, Henry VIII and the Art of Majesty: Tapestries at the Tudor Court (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), x; Starkey, Henry VIII: A European Court in England, 8.

Term from Simon Thurley.


CHAPTER ONE
THE HENRICIAN INTERIOR: THE ROYAL RESIDENCE OF A KING

The most important manifestation of Henry VIII’s attempt to influence the loyalty of his courtiers, in reaction to his weakened authority, was in the palace. The palace was far more than a residence to the King; it was the architectural materialization of royal government and supremacy. It would be through the architectural exterior and interior shell, as well as the objects and ephemeral decorations held in Whitehall Palace, that a distinctive Henrician approach was employed, as decorative as it was political. Specifically, within the sequence of semi-ceremonial chambers, the Henrician style was an atypical combination of Italian Renaissance antiques applied to chivalric Gothic decoration, alongside overt heraldic and allegorical imagery. By reconstructing the characteristic architecture and decorative elements within the Henrician interior, in an original comparative analysis with Henry’s other royal palaces, as well as with verbal and visual accounts, the political implications of such decoration within the watching, presence, and privy chambers can be obtained.

WHITEHALL PALACE - AN ARCHITECTURAL & HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In order to comprehend the political meaning and proliferation of the customary Henrician decoration, it is first imperative to address the general history and building phases within this administrative and royal residence. Whitehall Palace was situated along the banks of the Thames River just north of Westminster on the northern shore in central London [fig. 1.1]. Edward the Confessor originally founded the area of Westminster through the construction of Westminster Palace and Abbey, and by 1200, King Henry II had established Westminster as the seat of the English monarchy and
government. In 1240-41, Walter de Gray, the Archbishop of York, bought an adjoining property to Westminster and constructed a manor that he subsequently granted to his archdiocese in 1246. For the next three centuries, this residence would be the principal house of the Archbishops of York in Westminster, then known as York Place, it would later be transformed into Whitehall Palace.

In 1514, the most notorious and influential of the Archbishops, Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, would establish himself at York Place when he became Archbishop of York.¹ Cardinal Wolsey had gained a vast amount of authority over diplomacy and English politics through his various appointments as a papal legate, the Lord Chancellor, the King’s chief adviser, and the Archbishop of York.² As the sixteenth-century Italian historian Polydore Vergil recalled, Wolsey was “learned in letters…a wise man…[and] also bold and absolutely prepared to do anything.”³ Wolsey was particularly known for his extravagance and personal magnificence, which he continually demonstrated through his various building projects, splendid festivals, and elaborate feasts.⁴ George Cavendish, who was in the service of Cardinal Wolsey, vividly recorded one example that Wolsey promoted at Hampton Court:

The first waiting-chamber was hanged with fine arras, and so was all the rest, one better than another, furnished with tall yeomen. There was set tables round about the chamber, banquet-wise, all covered with fine cloths of diaper. A cupboard with plate, parcel-gilt, having also in the same chamber, to give the more light, four plates of silver, set with lights upon them, a great fire in the chimney.⁵

Significantly, Wolsey was placed in charge of many of Henry VIII royal houses, with Henry having little interest in the task of the maintenance or building of palaces during his early reign. As a result, Wolsey presided over their operation by means of the Eltham Ordinances, as well as, supervising Henry’s various building projects at Bridewell,
Beaulieu, Greenwich, Eltham, and the renowned Field of Cloth of Gold political event where a temporary palace was constructed in 1520 at Calais.6

However, Wolsey’s most significant building projects centered on his political residence of York Place and his personal residence of Hampton Court. Immediately upon acquiring York Place, Wolsey began expanding the residence in an effort to create his official London seat, visually confirming his authority through magnificent displays. At York Place, he added innovative architectural and decorative elements like flint galleting, chequerwork – an inlaid decoration of geometric shapes with contrasting colors or textures – black-and-white antequework or grotesque paintings, and long galleries overlooking the gardens.7 Through such decoration, Wolsey fostered in England the Italian Renaissance humanist theories on decoration and created the platform for Henry VIII to later expand upon.8 Nevertheless, in spite of Wolsey’s persuasive political position, on 22nd of October 1529, he pled guilty to the charge of praemunire. As a result, Wolsey surrendered all his property to Henry VIII, including York Place.9

Upon gaining York Place, soon to be renamed Whitehall Palace, Henry VIII began immediately expanding the residence, in an endeavor to emulate Wolsey’s talent for demonstrating authority through the construction of palaces and presentation of splendor. George Cavendish recorded “that the king’s pleasure was to have his house at Westminster (then called York Place, belonging to the Bishoprick of York), intending to make of that house a palace royal; and to possess the same according to the laws of this his Grace’s realm.”10 Henry’s focus on Whitehall Palace paralleled the critical power vacuum created by the downfall of Cardinal Wolsey, as well as key sociopolitical events that transpired during the 1520s and 1530s.
Concurrently, with the fall of Wolsey and the rise of Anne Boleyn, Henry’s influential mistress, Henry VIII was without an official royal residence. In 1512, a fire destroyed the Palace of Westminster, which was the former official residence. York Place’s close proximity to the historical power center of Westminster alongside the Thames River made it a fine replacement. The Venetian ambassador Sebastian Giustiniani recorded, “His majesty is now staying at Greenwich, and often comes to Westminster, having designed new lodgings there, and a park adjoining York House, which belonged to the late Cardinal Wolsey. The plan is on so large a scale that many hundreds of houses will be levelled.”\textsuperscript{11} What Giustiniani articulates is the close relationship Henry had with the design of his new lodgings at Whitehall Palace. Henry’s involvement can be seen in his many visits while work was under way, for instance 1532, Henry showed du Bellay around describing the progress of the palace and what still had to be done.\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, Henry scrutinized the ‘plattes’ and plans that were sent back and forth for approval between Henry and his builders.\textsuperscript{13}

Notably, there were two distinctive building phases at Whitehall Palace under the patronage of Henry VIII [fig. 1.2]. The first of which was concentrated from 1530 to 1532, whereas, the second building phase spanned from 1537 until Henry VIII death in 1547.\textsuperscript{14} Henry’s first phase of construction at Whitehall is of specific importance for Henry’s semi-ceremonial chambers, some of which were re-appropriated from Wolsey’s original rooms and renovated in tandem with the construction of Henry’s royal lodgings, were initially built between 1531-1532. This first phase must be viewed within the context of Henry’s involvement with Anne Boleyn, for it essentially centers on the king’s creation of a seat of government for the new royal couple. Anne Boleyn had a strong
presence within the English court, and greatly influenced Henry in many different aspects, one of those being his ambition for the arts.\textsuperscript{15} As the Spanish ambassador stated, the king’s motivation for Whitehall was “to please the lady [Anne] who prefers that place for the king’s residence to any other”.\textsuperscript{16} This preference was most likely due to the fact that York Place, unlike Hampton Court, did not have provision for the Queen’s household, therefore Anne could stay there alone with Henry before their marriage as well as create a seat of power without associations to the previous Queen.

The first phase of Henrician conversion at Whitehall Palace was constructed in two sections, to the west was the royal recreation centre and to the north were the residential lodgings. A bridge concealed within a gatehouse known as the Holbein Gate linked the two sections. Additionally, the first phase included the clearance and enclosure of the palace, the building of the privy gallery, Holbein Gate, King’s and Queen’s lodgings, the Low Gallery, orchard and the Privy Bridge. From the first year of work at Whitehall only three accounts survive: the book of the clerk Thomas Heritage, a series of thirteen record books, and a summary ‘declaration’ made by Thomas Alvard.\textsuperscript{17} From the Office of Works record, it seems that the main designer associated with this phase of building was James Nedeham, though many others likely worked jointly on this enormous project.

The building at Whitehall that sustained between the two main phases, from 1532 to 1537, is of importance as well. In 1534, Pope Clement VII ruled Henry’s marriage to Catherine of Aragon as valid and his separation from her and marriage to Anne Boleyn was invalid in the eyes of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{18} The consequences resulted in the abolition of papal authority in England with the Act of Supremacy, which severed ties
with the Pope and Rome, established a new Church in England placing Henry VIII as the Head of the Church of England and Wales. England was now a Protestant kingdom giving Henry a new category of authority based on his kingship and his new role as the Head of the Church. After divorcing the beloved Catherine of Aragon, uprooting the traditional religion by supplanting it by establishing the Church of England, Henry was in a fragile political position. Even before the concern with Anne’s inability to produce a male child, Henry’s position of authority was unsteady. In 1533, Eustace Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador to England, implied that England was on the verge of civil war.\textsuperscript{19} Compounding matters, in 1536, Henry’s marriage with Anne was dissolved on grounds of her alleged adultery and incest, and she was executed for her treason against the crown.

The Dissolution of Monasteries commenced in 1536. As Henry VIII liquidated close to 825 monasteries, thereby appropriating their income and taking ownership of their assets, giving Henry new profits amounting to 1,300,000 British pounds in total, from which to developing his affection for magnificence.\textsuperscript{20} As a result in 1536, Henry’s most serious uprising, the Pilgrimage of the Grace in Yorkshire and the rising in Lincolnshire – a series of linked rebellions – occurred in Northern England. The uprising represented a true threat to Henry VIII and his newly transformed government.\textsuperscript{21} Though, Henry would put down the rebellion through political maneuvering, it demonstrated that the discontented in England could instantaneously form a vast army, which would outnumber any Henry VIII could muster.\textsuperscript{22} During this intermediate period between the two focal building phases, Henry’s coffers increased exponentially, as his authority was undermined through Yorkist protests and peasant uprisings. Additionally during this time,
his attention was mainly focused on his palaces outside London, creating a need for updating the decoration at Whitehall during the mid-1530s and early 1540s.\textsuperscript{23}

The second Henrician building phase at Whitehall Palace, from 1537-1547, included a new waterfront, great garden, orchard and garden gallery, the King Street Gate, and the privy garden and in 1547, the royal lodgings were yet again restructured and Henry’s privy lodgings were reorganized to better suit him during his last sickly year. The second building phase during Henry’s reign must as well be observed in the historic context of Henry’s personal life. Eleven days after the execution of Anne Boleyn, Henry married his new mistress, Jane Seymour, and in October 1537, she gave birth to Prince Edward, the future King Edward VI and legitimate male heir that Henry had been waiting for. Unfortunately, soon after the birth, Jane Seymour died due to complications from labor. The birth of Henry’s legitimate male heir would have resounding ramifications upon the decoration of his palaces.

The sociopolitical shifts that took place within England, particularly during the 1520s, closely correlated with Henry’s growing attention to architecture and interior decoration, which truly came into being by the 1530s. Henry VIII would have to communicate not only with his people, but especially with his court and the nobility the changes that were taking place within England. Thus, Henry VIII altered his personal and political focus during the later 1520s and early 1530s in an endeavor to emulate Cardinal Wolsey’s talent of demonstrating authority through the construction of palaces and presentations of magnificence in an effort to consolidate his sovereignty.

It is imperative to understand Whitehall Palace as an entity before moving into the interior decoration of the semi-ceremonial chambers since the interior decoration was
conceived in tandem with the exterior design. Whitehall Palace was a fantasy, with external walls of black-and-white chequerwork and antiquework, painted with fantastic beasts and sprigs of acanthus, every pinnacle crowned with a heraldic beast, or with flags and vanes painted and gilded.24 There are several accounts of Whitehall Palace’s architecture and interior decoration due to its impressive nature and distinctive role as official royal residence. The earliest account is from 1531 by Mario Savorgnano, Count of Belgrade, who wrote “The building is now being enlarged…with windows on each side, looking on gardens and rivers, the ceiling being marvelously wrought in stone with gold, and the wainscot of carved wood representing a thousand beautiful figures; and around about there are chambers, and very large halls, all hung with tapestries.”25 Such accounts highlight the lavish interiors and grandeur that was associated with Whitehall Palace.

A German visitor Lupld von Wedel records, “several of a finer exterior, but the latter did not equal this on the inside…[the interior was] very beautiful and royal indeed.”26 Additionally, from excavated examples at Whitehall, painted grotesquework or antiquework was found on a back stairway in the privy kitchens, the use of such decoration in utilitarian locations indicates the abundance of grotesquework throughout Whitehall Place interiors and consequently may have been the decorative theme within the palace.27 Interestingly, not all took to the decoration of Whitehall. A visiting Italian in 1531 alludes to Whitehall as being “without much architecture as is usual in all the buildings of this country.”28 Principally foreigners critiqued the architecture within England, which further demonstrates the singularity of this moment in Henrician architecture and interior design to England.
With the massive construction at Whitehall Palace, in its creation as the predominate center of government and power in England, Henry VIII invested a considerable amount of funds, resources, and time towards his building endeavors after 1529. As a king, he not only owned the most royal residences of any English monarch, he additionally established such a precedent in his building at Whitehall Palace that chroniclers for centuries after reference his authority on architecture. As a result of Henry VIII’s extensive and magnificent building project, Whitehall Palace remained the primary London residence of the English court from 1529 to 1698 with very little alterations until the Stuart’s residence in the palace in 1603. In 1698, a fire devastated the palace and consequently nothing remains of Whitehall except the Banqueting House built during the reign of James II. Concurrent with the rapidly altering political position of Henry VIII, after 1529 the watching, presence, and privy chambers at Whitehall palace were decorated to represent the Henry VIII’s sought ascendancy and vitality through the proliferated Henrician style.

“The king therefore, perceived him [Wolsey] to be a meet instrument for the accomplishment of his devised will and pleasure, called him more near unto him and esteemed him so highly that his estimation and favor put all other councilors out of their accustomed favor that they were in before. In so much as the King committed all his will and pleasure unto his disposition and order.” George Cavendish, *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey* (London: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1905), 10.


Conversely, many condemned Wolsey for such extravagance, such as John Palsgrave who thought that Wolsey’s accommodations at the Field of the Cloth of Gold were “manifest tokens of vainglory.” *Cal. SP. Dom.*, vol. II, 5750.

In January 1526, Wolsey reconstructed the royal household to limit access to the king, in an effort to maintain his vast amounts of authority, which created obstacles to his political opposition through a collection of ordinances and regulation for the government of the Royal House, known as the Eltham Ordinances. These household Ordinances of 1526 were largely centered on controlling the privy lodgings of the king, the private division of the royal household and court. Furthermore, such Ordinances demonstrated Wolsey’s authority over Henry’s households, which would in turn impacted Henry’s understanding of magnificence and the power of architecture and decoration.

Additionally, at Whitehall Palace flint bands were used on the riverside privy kitchen, the crenellations of the chapel were in flint chequerwork and painted in black-and-white squares, the hall was painted in squares as well. The back stair was painted with black-and-white grotesques. Simon Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 36; Simon Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: The Official Illustrated History* (London: Historic Royal Palaces in association with Merrel, 2008), 20.


York Place technically belonged to the archdiocese of York and not Wolsey personally. Therefore, Henry VIII had to legally acquire the residence through Wolsey by an act of assigning the manor to the crown before a judge. Chief Justice Shelley was sent to Esher to persuade Wolsey to sign the required recognizance. Simon Thurley, *Hampton Court: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 37.

The direct translation of designed [*designato*] and plan [*designo*] are important to note within the context of Henry’s involvement in the design of Whitehall Palace. *Cal. SP. Ven.*, vol. IV, 1527-33, no. 664.
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CHAPTER TWO
THE SEMI-PUBLIC CEREMONIAL CHAMBERS

In examining the sequence of Henry VIII’s watching, presence and privy semi-public ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace, traditional decoration is evident within all three interiors. Throughout these three chambers, architectural features presenting the royal devices and mottos were prominently placed alongside furniture and textiles with specifically chosen iconography. Particular heraldic colors were coordinated through lavish textiles, such as tapestries, carpets, valences, and curtains, as well as cushions and table coverings. The furniture demonstrated the finery of the king, through leather and carved wood chairs and benches, chest and cupboards, displays of gold and silver plate sets and trinkets. Gilding enhanced the finely carved details of the ceiling and walls, all to create sumptuous interiors in a lavish royal residence.

However, the watching, presence, and privy chambers all represented a particular function in relation to Henry VIII and the decoration consequently reflected that function and the audience of that particular chamber. It is important to understand that in the Henrician palace there were two distinct designations within the residence, those of the outward chambers and the inward chambers. Based on these designations, particular household departments would operate in the maintenance of the palace’s everyday functions. The outward chambers were the public spaces of the court, which included the great hall, watching chamber, presence chamber, and various other rooms. The inward chambers were the private apartments of the royal family, consisting of the privy lodgings and importantly the privy chamber. Distinctively, the watching, presence, and privy chambers may all be viewed as semi-public ceremonial rooms within the Henrician court, as the arrangement and function of these chambers greatly shifted during Henry’s
reign, particularly that of the privy chamber. It was in this suite of the king’s chambers that some of the most extravagant and politically motivated decorations were employed.

From records and inventories of Whitehall Palace, in correlation with Henry’s other key residences such as Hampton Court Palace and Greenwich Palace, as well as visual representations, insight into the customary decorative elements in this sequence of ceremonial chambers can be gained in order to obtain the symbolic meanings of the interior decoration. Tudor visual representations contributed greatly to the recreations of these chambers, the most significant of which is The Family of Henry VIII [fig. 2.1]. This painting is exceedingly important as scholars assert that it almost certainly represents a genuine interior, most likely in the king’s privy lodgings at Whitehall Palace itself.¹

Three other visual representations of interiors help inform our understanding of the decoration in these chambers. The first of which, the Black Book of the Garter [fig. 2.2], depicts Garter ceremonies from 1534. The second representation of a Henrician interior is Foxe’s Acts and Monuments engraving from 1563 [fig. 2.3]. Though complicated after the death of Henry VIII, Foxe’s interior is similar to many surviving Henrician interiors at Hampton Court Palace, giving compelling visual evidence towards the common Henrician interior decoration. The third remarkable example is the Whitehall Mural [fig. 2.4] as it resembles an authentic interior and was located in the privy chamber at Whitehall Palace.

Within this sequence of the king’s semi-public ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace, certain commonalities emerge in the architectural features and decorated interiors. The typical interior walls of the king’s chambers would have been brick or stud partition, covered with hair plaster.² Wall-paneling was widespread in the Henrician interiors,
which either covered the full wall from the floor to the cornice or up to the wainscoting.³

Often the king’s chambers were decorated in linenfold paneling, a type of carved paneling that resembled folded fabric [fig. 2.5]. Henrician floors were wood, customarily oak, covered in plaster then painted in geometric patterns or tiled and covered with rush mats or textiles, depending on the room and occasion.⁴ Typically, the ground floors were able to support tiles, bricks or flagstones, whereas the first-floor rooms would only occasionally be tiled, thus the king’s ceremonial chambers located on the first-floor would have been painted.⁵ Doorframes were commonly constructed of stone within the main ceremonial areas, done in plain chamfered mouldings, after the English Gothic fashion with those in important rooms such as the king’s lodgings, having more elaborately carved and moulded jambs [fig. 2.6].⁶ Similarly, windows and fireplaces were frequently comprised of a Tudor arch with Gothic details, often applied with antiquework. Generally, all the internal stonework of fireplaces were painted with gilded terracotta roundels and spandrels filed with quatrefoils or tracery [figs. 2.7 & 2.8].⁷

Ultimately, textiles would be one of the most impressive elements within Henry VIII’s ceremonial chambers. In textiles, there was a strict hierarchy that dictated the placement and occasion for each textile. Henry owned around two thousand pieces of tapestry at his death in 1547, a third of which were high-quality works containing gold and silver thread.⁸ Hangings and curtains would mostly been made of satin or silk and lined with buckram, the favored color combinations being green with yellow and crimson with yellow.⁹ An example of the typical imagery depicted on textiles can be seen in the 1542 Inventory of Whitehall Palace, which lists repeated embellishment of flowers, birds,
pomegranates, Tudor roses, commonly embroidered with the King’s and Queen’s mottos and badges.\textsuperscript{10} Such lavish decoration is exemplified within an account from Edward Hall:

> every wall and chamber were hanged, and all wyndowes so richely covered, that it passed all other sightes before seen. In every chamber in place convenient were clothes of estate, greate and large of clothe of golde, of Tissue, and riche embrodery, with Chaiers covered with like cloth, with pomelles of fine gold: and great Cushyns of riche woorke of Tukey makynge, nothynge lacked of honorable furnishement.\textsuperscript{11}

Commonly, within the king’s outer apartments histories and religious narratives would be displayed, whereas, within Henry’s inner chambers antique and classical-themed tapestries were hung.\textsuperscript{12}

Furniture and small objects would additionally be within the three chambers, however traditionally Henrician interiors were quite bare in their furnishings due to the shifting of the spaces functions. In each of the outward chambers of a Henrician palace, as well as the privy chamber, at least one ceremonial buffet would be present, often between the windows.\textsuperscript{13} One later rendering of Henry VIII Dining, either in the presence or privy chamber [fig. 2.9], gives an example of the buffet on the right-hand side decorated with cups and lavish objects. Joiners within the Office of the Works would supply the king with an assortment of additional wood furniture, including coffers, chests, chairs, benches, and tables.\textsuperscript{14} Small decorative items in the Henrician interior would have included clocks, mirrors, dishes and trinkets, depending on the room and the occasion.\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, a consortium of various objects meant for tending to the fire would be present, such as andirons or firedogs, fire-backs, screens, rakes, shovels, and more, all of which are listed throughout the 1547 posthumous inventory of Henry VIII and the 1542 inventory of Whitehall.\textsuperscript{16} Often such items were applied with the fashionable antquework style and the heraldic references of Henry.
Lighting was a vital element in Henrician interiors. Candles within the king’s chambers would have been made of beeswax and could have been highly decorated, as recorded in the 1542 Inventory “dyuers candelles and peces of candelles of waxe whereof three be painted and gilte”.\textsuperscript{17} Within the king’s chambers, the most common candleholder was in the form of a wall-sconce, although lanterns were occasionally mentioned within inventories and accounts.\textsuperscript{18} Candles could as well be mounted on standish or candle stands, as at Whitehall Palace where there were highly ornate. One records “2 branches with vices guilte and painted the foote beinge foure square. In the toppe thof an antique boy with thinge qyndynge round aboute his legge.”\textsuperscript{19} In the watching, presence, and privy chambers at Whitehall Palace, these items would be the general decorations of which additional ornamentations were applied, reflecting the individual purpose of each chamber and presenting a visual representation of Henry’s magnificence.

\textit{The Henrician Interior: The Watching Chamber}

The first chamber in the sequence of Henry VIII’s ceremonial chambers was the king’s watching chamber, also known the guard or great chamber. The main function of the watching chamber was as a guardroom. As the \textit{Narrative of the Visit of the Duke of Najera} records, this chamber was where the yeomen of the guard kept watch in order to exclude any improper persons.\textsuperscript{20} Interestingly, at the beginning of Henry VIII’s reign there were 126 guards positioned in the watching chamber at Whitehall Palace, however by 1512 there were 300 and in 1513 over 600 guards.\textsuperscript{21} In response to the congestion, the guard’s numbers were largely reduced to the eighties by the early 1540s.\textsuperscript{22} However, during the 1520s and 1530s, this chamber would have been a highly populated space, filled with courtiers and ambassadors waiting to see the king as well as numerous guards.
and servants going about their daily business. Even more so, during ephemeral events peasants and commoners were welcomed into this chamber, which increased the numbers and broadened the audience of the chamber. For example at Greenwich Palace in 1542, Henry VIII used the watching chamber to distribute the Royal Maundy to a large number of the local poor.\textsuperscript{23}

Being one of the larger chambers in the royal residence, after the great hall, the watching chamber was the preferred venue for ceremonies, and its decoration would reflect its public ceremonial function.\textsuperscript{24} Ennoblements and other state ceremonies would take place within this space, such as in December of 1543; Queen Catherine Parr’s brother and uncle were ennobled within the Great Watching Chamber at Hampton Court Palace.\textsuperscript{25} Utilized in a ceremonial capacity, great feasts, revels or masques were as well frequently held within the watching chamber. In 1517 at Greenwich Palace, the watching chamber was “to be staged wand great lightes to be set on pillers that were gilt, with basons gilt, and the rofe was covered with blewe satyn set full of presses of fine gold and flowers”\textsuperscript{26}. This is almost certainly a reference referring to a staged play or masque performed within the court.\textsuperscript{27}

Concurrently, the essential function of the watching chamber during the reign of Henry VIII was as a dining chamber. As the Eltham Ordinances specify, “the lord chamberlyn likewise to keepe his boord in the utter chamber [watching chamber], calling unto him the residue of the barons with other noblemen”.\textsuperscript{28} Members of the household dined in the watching chamber, such as the Vice-Chamberlain, the Captain of the Guard, the Master of the Horse, the Lord Steward, the Comptroller, and the Cofferer, members of the King’s Council of low rank and any guests, who did not dine in the great hall or
presence chamber. As well as being a guardroom, the watching chamber was moreover a sleeping chamber for the Pages of the Chamber at night, making it a truly flexible and functional space. Thus, being one of the outer chambers, as well as one of the larger chambers, the watching chamber was the most adaptable and highly trafficked.

At Whitehall Palace, the king’s watching chamber was located on the first-floor, linked to the ground-floor great hall by a stairway connecting to a small gallery with seven windows facing east [fig. 2.10]. The Whitehall watching chamber was approximately thirty by sixty feet, with crenellated gable end and a great bay window located on the west side, facing over the privy gardens. This arrangement can be seen in a sketch of the palace from 1665 and a cross-section of the palace [figs. 2.11 & 2.12]. In the chamber, there were several east-facing clerestory windows above the roof of the small gallery. The chamber had a door located on the east side, with a fireplace on the north wall, due to the flue being located there that served the ground-floor fireplace.

Originally, Cardinal Wolsey constructed the Whitehall watching chamber between 1515-1516. The records indicate that Henry VIII only altered the decoration once he gained possession of the house, thus an impression of the chamber can be acquired from Wolsey’s records. In an account from July 1515, Wolsey installed a new ceiling, as joiners were paid for “dubbing of the raff in the grete chamber” and to “glewe the batons”. The ceiling that Wolsey constructed at Whitehall would have closely paralleled the surviving ceilings within the Wolsey’s Rooms and Great Watching Chamber at Hampton Court Palace [figs. 2.13 & 2.14]. A similar ceiling design can be identified in Foxe’s Acts and Monuments engraving as well. Importantly, once Henry
gained possession the heraldic roundels of Wolsey, which were often interspersed throughout the ceiling, would have been replaced with Henry’s badges.

The watching chamber, under the ownership of Wolsey, was fitted with paneling, as the records indicate, and topped with a great cornice.\textsuperscript{34} In comparison, at Hampton Court Palace the Great Watching Chamber was paneled with oak wainscot and framed up by the joiners.\textsuperscript{35} Whereas, at The More, another of Henry’s royal residences, Hethe was commissioned in 1541 to gild the “king’s word” in lead on the “jowepiece [wall-plate] in the king’s presence and watching chambers”.\textsuperscript{36} Additionally, during the ownership of Wolsey, the Whitehall watching chamber was fitted with two great doors with brass locks engraved with Wolsey’s arms.\textsuperscript{37} Likewise, at The More the joiners were paid for “making of all the dores in waynscotte belonging to all the seid chambers closets and gallery”.\textsuperscript{38} Therefore, in the Whitehall watching chamber the main entrance may have been carved and moulded jambs, with additional doorways being done in wainscoting. Such an arrangement can be additionally be observed throughout Hampton Court Palace.

According to Wolsey’s accounts in the Whitehall watching chamber, Bernard Flower, the king’s glazier, constructed a great bay window.\textsuperscript{39} The presence of a great bay window was very common in the king’s chambers, particularly the watching and presence chambers. Frequently, bay windows were constructed in stone with elaborately carved moulded jambs, pendent fan vaulting, and vertical mullions with iron diamonds framing the heraldic decorated glass. Similarly to Whitehall Palace, the Great Watching Chamber at Hampton Court had five clerestory windows and a large two-story bay window, which was recorded as including thirty-six lights that were glazed by Galyon Hone with clear glass interspersed with royal arms, badges, and mottoes.\textsuperscript{40}
The fireplace within the Whitehall watching chamber would have been equally impressive. Due to being positioned in the first outward chamber of the king, within one of the larger spaces, intended for guarding, dining, and sleeping, the fireplace would have to be able to heat a large space and be an embodiment of power in it’s magnitude and ornamentation. An account from Whitehall Palace states that “Frenchmen” were replacing the chimneypieces, which was a reference that may have indicated elaborate antiquework design. Moreover, the fireplace in the watching chamber may have been similar to Hans Holbein’s Design for a Fireplace [fig. 2.15]. This highly ornate two-story chimney with grotesquework coupled with decorative roundels and Henry’s badges was around fourteen feet high by nine feet, is supposed by scholars to have been located in the outward chambers at Whitehall Palace during the 1540s, giving an indication of the size and grandeur that might have been present.

Beyond the architectural shell of the watching chamber, decorative items would have added additional extravagance to this outer chamber. However, the furniture within the watching chamber would be relatively bare in comparison to the king’s other chambers. This is largely due to the watching chamber being an adjustable space, whose key function was to guard the king’s inner chambers, and to accommodate the household court and members of the King’s Council of low rank at meals and to provide a sleeping space for the Pages of the Chamber. Thus, the space was continually shifting in its daily use, as well as during the ephemeral celebrations and ceremonies that transpired. A cupboard would have been located in all of these three chambers, as previously stated, being used mainly for storage in the outer chambers. Additionally, tables would be placed for dining or special events; these tables would be brought in
during meals and removed to make space for the daily functions of the room by the guards or the sleeping arraignments.\textsuperscript{44}

One must, moreover, imagine the watching chamber with the royal guards’ rich red livery, holding highly decorative weapons.\textsuperscript{45} An account of the Duke of Najera’s visit to Whitehall in 1544 records, “in the second of which [the watching chamber] were stationed in order on either side of the King’s bodyguard, dressed in habits of red, and holding halberds.\textsuperscript{46} Five banners of quartered crimson and purple silk that were painted with the king’s arms were recorded under the care of the Great Wardrobe to the guards.\textsuperscript{47} Such banners would be hung within the chamber, especially during court ceremonies. The watching chamber at Whitehall Palace would have been a political statement, as the first in a series of the king’s chambers and the initial visual statement of Henry’s authority.

\textit{The Henrician Interior: The Presence Chamber}

Connected to the watching chamber was the presence chamber.\textsuperscript{48} Principally a ceremonial space in the palace during the reign of Henry VII and Henry VIII, it was known as the chamber of the estate due to its role as the official reception room of the king. Additionally, the presence chamber was the dining chamber where the king publicly dined and where ambassadorial visitors would commonly dine.\textsuperscript{49} As the Etham Ordinances required, “when the King’s highnesse shall not dine abroad, in his owne dyning chamber [the presence chamber], there shall be a boord in the same furnished with such lords spirituall and temporall, to be served with the service called the King’s service.”\textsuperscript{50} Traditionally, the king would dine alone within his more private privy chamber and ambassadors and the high lords of the court, including all the lords above
the rank of a baron, dined in the presence chamber. However, as Henry VIII’s reign progressed, shifts in the function of the presence chamber appeared, moving from the function of dining to include ceremonial functions. For instance, the exchange of New Year’s gifts by the king, the ennoblement of Anne Boleyn as Marchioness of Pembroke, and the receiving of visiting dignitaries and ambassadors, all took place in the presence chamber, instead of the ceremonial watching chamber, by the 1520s.51

Located, on the first-floor, the presence chamber at Whitehall Palace was approximately twenty by sixty feet, slightly smaller than the watching chamber [fig. 2.16].52 In the presence chamber there were three clerestory windows facing north and a sizeable window facing west. There were no windows on the other walls due to the queen’s presence chamber adjacent to it on the east side as well as another chamber against the south side.53 There was one door leading from the watching chamber to the presence chamber, located on the northwest corner, as well as a doorway leading from the small gallery connecting the Great Hall.54 Additionally, on the south side of the chamber, a doorway lead to a small gallery, off of which two small closets were located that lead to the privy chamber.55 To the far end of the northeast corner there was also a doorway connecting to the queen’s presence chamber.

As with the watching chamber, the presence chamber was appropriated from Wolsey’s original rooms. From the records at Whitehall Palace, in the presence chamber carvers fashioned a new fireplace with the royal arms of Henry VIII. The arms were placed over the chimney decorated in gilding and held by a stone dragon.56 This was most likely in a roundel form, which was commonly placed above the fireplace.57 Architecturally, the space would have been clad in the traditional highly decorated wall
paneling with gold gilding decorated with the arms and mottoes of Henry.\textsuperscript{58} Furthermore, a surviving design for an interior, most likely intended for Whitehall Palace, demonstrates the grand and elaborate design that would have been in the outward chambers during the later 1540s [fig. 2.17].\textsuperscript{59} Though, much later then the focus of this paper, the design does indicate the intricate decoration that would have been placed in the ceremonial chambers.

The Whitehall presence chamber ceiling would have possibly been an ornately decorated blue-and-gold geometric ceiling with battens of the arms and badges of Henry VIII. It may have been similar to the ceiling of the Wolsey Closet at Hampton Court Palace [fig. 2.18], with its highly ornate coffers painted red-and-blue with meticulous gilding.\textsuperscript{60} A comparable design for a ceiling to the Wolsey Closet can be observed in the painting \textit{The Family of Henry VIII} that was painted after a Whitehall interior, which depicts a simplified coffered geometric patterned ceiling with battens with the prominent blue-and-red Tudor Rose. The presence chamber’s windows would have been highly decorated as well. There were three clerestory windows facing north and an additional window facing west. The previously seen sketch of the palace from 1665, gives an indication of the west-facing window, which would have been four sections wide by two sets tall. In comparison, at The More, the glazier Galyon Hone embellished several windows with the arms, badges, and inscriptions of the king, the most important of which was within the king’s presence chamber.\textsuperscript{61}

The most significant and distinctively decorative feature within the presence chamber was the cloth of the estate, a luxurious fabric canopy commonly done in gold braided decoration, beneath which was the king’s seat. Traditionally, these seats were
either the post-and-boarded or X-frame structure, which would be decorated with fabric lining, gold braided tassels, and cushions. The cloth of the estate would be part of an assemblage that included an elevated dais, the canopy of the cloth of the estate, a foot carpet, and the combination of chair and footstool with cushions. Furthermore, the cloth of the estate assemble can be perceived within the three visual representations previously addressed, as well within the inventories taken at Whitehall Palace. From the Duke of Najera’s visit to Whitehall in 1544, he recalls the amount of rich textile that was located within the presence chamber, “In the third saloon [the presence chamber] were nobles, knights and gentlemen, and here was a canopy made of rich figured brocade, with a chair of the same material…” Such a description illustrates the coordination of colors and textiles, as well as the numerous courtiers within the space.

Within the presence chamber, there would have been an array of additional furniture, including tables for dining and display, cupboards and buffets, chairs or stools, and other small objects. Comparatively, at Saint Johns Clerkenwell House, another of Henry’s royal residences, recorded in the presence chamber was eight pieces of old tapestries, a table with tressles and a large carpet upon it, several cupboards with carpets, carpets in the windows, and andirons. Due to the presence chamber being a public dining space in the king’s chambers, a table would have been brought in for dining purposes when needed. The rendering of *Henry VIII Dining* portrays the king’s dining habits; being seated under the cloth of the estate, upon a dais with the Gentlemen of the Privy chamber and Grooms serving him. The presence chamber was in essence the reception room of the king, therefore its decoration revolved around presenting Henry
within a lavish interior centering on the cloth of the estate besieged with royal iconography.

**The Henrician Interior: The Privy Chamber**

The privy chamber, the next in the sequence of ceremonial chambers, was originally one of the private spaces in the palace and the first of the king’s inward chambers. Here the king would customarily work, dine, or seek solitude from the more public spaces of the royal court. As the Eltham Ordinances of 1526 state, the privy chamber was for “the King’s quiet, rest, comfort and preservation of his health”. The document goes on to mark that no one “admitted to come or repaire into the King’s privy chamber; other than such onely as his grace shall from time to time call for.” However, as previously mentioned the function of this chamber greatly altered during the reign of Henry VIII. The privy chamber became filled with courtiers, ambassadors, privy councilors, and Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber, and increasingly began being used for important audiences and ceremonies by the later 1520s. As one courtier commented in 1517, that it “a very unusual procedding’ when the King had the Spanish ambassadors ‘to dine with him privately in his chamber with the Queen’. Thus, the ceremonial diners for ambassadors were moved to the privy chamber.

The increased access to the privy chamber by members of the court is additionally reflected in the number of staff that attended the privy chamber. The Eltham Ordinances of 1526 designated fifteen staff members should be present for the king’s use, conversely by 1530 the number in use had risen to twenty and by 1539 to twenty-eight. These numbers grow with the addition of the Privy Council which was formally created in 1540 to includ twenty-eight men and the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber with nineteen men,
all with the right to dine within the privy chamber.72 Thus, the increase staff reflected the amount of people that were continually in the chamber.

The use of the privy chamber to entertain guests consequently affected the function of the presence chamber, as well as, the concept of privacy at the Henrician court. Originally, the presence and watching chamber were intended for the reception of ambassadors, audiences, and court ceremonies, however several of these function had shifted to the privy chamber making the space far less a private retreat and more a semi-public ceremonial space. In March 1542, the ennoblement of Sir John Dudley as Viscount Lisle and the bestowing of the Great Seal on Lord Wriothesley in 1544 were both performed within the privy chamber at Whitehall, as well as in February 1544 the Duke of Najera was received in the privy chamber.73 Furthermore, the affects of this shift in privy can be seen in that Henry VIII was forced to create new extended privy lodgments, which included a private ‘secret’ lodging to serve the function that the privy chamber was originally intended for.74 It is interesting that, once Henry VIII died, his successors reverted the privy chamber back to its original function as a private space for the king or queen. Therefore, only during Henry VIII’s reign would the privy chamber straddle both a private and a semi-public ceremonial function.

The privy chamber at Whitehall Palace was located on the first floor in the center of the palace [fig. 2.19], in the sequence of the king’s privy lodgings. Moreover, this chamber was entirely constructed by Henry VIII, and not appropriated from Wolsey’s originally chambers. The privy chamber was approximately twenty by forty-five feet, with a doorway on the north side connecting to the king’s presence chamber via a small gallery and a doorway on the south side connecting to a sequence of further privy
lodgings. From the excavations of the royal lodgings, the privy chamber would have also had a doorway connecting to a stair turret on the east side. With the privy gardens being on the west side, this is where the windows would have been located, overlooking the garden. However, on the east side, due to another chamber abutting against the opposite side, there could have not been any windows, but more likely a fireplace.

Further evidence from other Henrician privy chambers show that the Whitehall privy chamber probably would have had a coffered antique-style ceiling full of heraldic badges painted and gilded, and walls decorated in carved ornate wall paneling. Comparatively, at Greenwich Palace in 1533, the ceiling of the privy chamber was “fret ceiling” embellished with 67 bullions and 218 buds, with the bullions each made of wood with four long leaves of gilded lead with similar style flower buds. However, by 1537 Henry ordered Richard Ridge to fit a new ceiling and cornice in the antique fashion. Additionally, in 1537, Richard Ridge was also paid for “framyng inougyn & fyttyng upe of new jole pyces [wall-plates] ronde abought the said chamber”. Once Richard Ridge had constructed the wall paneling onto the wall itself, John Hethe decorated it with gilt and gold.

An account from Greenwich Palace in 1537, states that the windows within the king’s privy chamber were “for making clen the antykeover the wyndowe…& making clen of the antyke in the other wyndowe & makng of v new antye heds for the same pryce, viijs. Hence, windows were commonly given a border that contained mottos and badges of the king. Furthermore, from records at Whitehall Palace, “ffrenche men working upon the fronte of [the] chymnaye ffor the prevye cahmber”. This reference is most likely a fireplace made of stucco-duro or stone plaster. Additionally the term
“ffrenche men” supposedly references decoration done in the prevalent antque work style.\(^8^3\) The combination of stucco-duro and “ffrenche men” would also indicate a highly elaborate piece, due to the ability to mold and carve such material within the King’s inner chambers, which would have been the most ornate of all the chambers.

A wall fountain is recorded in the inventory taken in 1547, stating that in the ‘Kinges Preuye Chamber’ there was an alabaster fountain set into the wall and that it was decorated with balls of crystal and stones, with reference to it being locked up with two doors, which were decorated with leaves and garnished with pearls and gold thread.\(^8^4\) Coincidently, Hampton Court Palace’s privy chamber there was a “thing artificial” enshrining an alabaster fountain set in to the wall, which may have been similar to the item that was in the Whitehall privy chamber.\(^8^5\) Such an item would have certainly been influence from the Italian acquaio, a wall-fountain that was traditionally paired of with a fireplace. The Whitehall privy chamber wall-fountain could serve both the function of washing ones hands, as it states in the inventory either before dining or in a religious capacity, as well as the purpose of a plumbing system.\(^8^6\) The alabaster wall-fountain, moreover, must have been impressive as it was the only item referenced in the 1547 inventory.

Hans Holbein the Younger’s dynastic Whitehall Mural was located on the south wall of the privy chamber, facing those who entered, and was approximately nine feet by twelve feet; with the central figure of Henry VIII around six feet tall.\(^8^7\) The mural depicts King Henry VII and his wife Elizabeth of York standing behind their son King Henry VIII and his third wife Jane Seymour, all of whom are placed in an interior covered with antquework decorations in the Italian fashion with Turkish carpets around an altarpiece.
Upon the altarpiece an inscription reveals the supremacy of Henry VIII as King of England. As Carel van Mander, a contemporary visitor to Whitehall recalls, Henry VIII “stood there, majestic in his splendor…so lifelike that the spectator felt abased, annihilated in his presence.” The internal perception of the painting suggests that the mural was located at a high level in the privy chamber and this is confirmed by the observation of Charles Pantin in 1673 who calls it “sur le pignon de la Croisée”, in other words placed like a gable window. Thus, the mural may have been located on the upper wall over the wall-paneling.

A further account from Whitehall Palace gives an indication of a set of tapestries that would have hung on the privy chamber’s walls. A Great Wardrobe account refers to the repair of several sets that were used within the Whitehall privy chamber, recording “twelve pieces of good tapestry pro privata camera Regis [privy chamber].” By cross-referencing this account with recorded tapestries at Whitehall Palace that were comprised of twelve pieces, only a few examples emerge. It seems most likely, however, that the tapestries referenced could be either the Arras of the History of the Twelve Months or a set of twelve tapestries depicting scenes of hunting. These subjects would be appropriable placed within the inner chambers. Curtains would have hung in the Whitehall privy chamber as well, there is a reference in the 1542 inventory to a hanging made for the Whitehall privy chamber. The record states that a cloth of estate serving as a hanging within the King’s privy chamber was of gold tissue with purple and crimsons embroidered badges and arms of the king.

In comparison, the 1547 inventory of the privy chamber at Hampton Court Palace included: two cupboards of wainscoted and one table covered with a green cloth, as well
as stools, andirons with the Tudor Rose, a fire shovel, black leather desk, a candlestick, and a covered leather case with Instrument.\textsuperscript{94} As well in the Hampton Court privy chamber, a clock stood on a carved pillar with a green-fringed top.\textsuperscript{95} Greenwich Palace’s privy chamber, in constrast, included a walnut breakfast table, two other tables, one covered in black velvet, and a cupboard for his goblets, a few chairs and some musical instruments.\textsuperscript{96} In a 1534 inventory of Greenwich Palace’s privy chamber, three great trussing coffers coved in leather and lined in red cloth were listed.\textsuperscript{97} At least by 1541-1542 an eight-tiered buffet was set up in the privy chamber at Greenwich.\textsuperscript{98} The privy chamber shifted greatly during the 1520s becoming a far more accessible space, thus designed shifted as well to reinforce the king’s image.

Whether initially designated as outward chambers or as an inward chamber, the watching, presence, and privy chambers’ construction correlated to Henry’s political instability during the late 1520s and 1530s. As Henry’s political and authoritative power diminished during this time, these three chambers shifted in their function towards semi-public ceremonial spaces that were far more permeable to an increased audience of courtiers, ambassadors, dignitaries, and guests of the court. Concurrently, as Henry’s power destabilized, his wealth increased with the dissolution of the monasteries, creating a prefect instance for the physical manifestation of Henry’s authority through architecture and interior decoration. By incorporating specific imagery associations of chivalric Gothic and Italian antiquework, Henry fostered powerful connotations to present an image of authority to his court.
1 Due to the composition and decoration, it has been deduced that the setting, on the ground-floor of the king’s lodgings at Whitehall, is probably depict a real interior. It would seem that all the figures, but from the figure of Jane Seymour who died in 1537, were painted from real life. The view through the archways shows the privy garden in the south and the left-hand archway shows part of Princess Mary’s lodgings painted with grotesques decoration. Thought the right-hand archway part of the park side can be seen, including a turret o the great close tennis court. Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 214-215.


3 Within the 1547 inventory, there are several entries in reference to the application of wainscoting within different chambers “Item the walles of the haule cealed round aboute wth waynescottes being soore decaied, Item the Ceeling rounde aboute the parler of wanescott Carved.” David Starkey ed, The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Transcript of the Inventory, transcribed by Philip Ward (London: The Society of Antiquaries of London and the Authors, 1998), 349.

4 Within the presence and privy chamber of the palace, rush mats that were scented with herbs and laid out on the floor, which were replaced daily. Alison Weir, Henry VIII: The King and His Court (New York: Random House, Inc., 2001), 47.

5 Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 220. For example see: Nottingham University Library, Ne.01 f. 204v. However, the one exception was at Hampton Court Palace where the Great Hall was paved with tiles in October 1532. TNA: PRO E36/241 p. 631. Additionally, at Greenwich for the Queen’s bedchamber, presence chamber, and privy chamber the floor in front of the hearth were paved with “syvyll” or “cevell” tiles supplied by Henry Mychele of Southwark, and other halfpaces in her room were paved with yellow and green Flanders titles. Colvin, H.M., et al., The History of the King’s Works 1485-1660, vol. IV (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1982), 38. For more information see: Bodleian Library MS Rawl. D. 775, f. 38.

6 Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 225. An example of a carved and painted stone doorframe remains at Hampton Court Palace, leading from the Great Hall to the Great Watching Chamber. This particular doorframe contains ornate carved and painted image of a lion and red dragon holding the English crown and the arms of Britain surrounded by grotesque decoration.


8 All of Henry’s principle palaces, including Whitehall, were fitted with sets of the Story of David, Story of Jacob, and Story of Solomon, which were commissioned in tandem with the creation of the king’s apartments during the 1530s. Campbell, Henry VIII and the Art of Majesty, 80.

9 Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 225. The sub-divisions within wall hangings included, curtains, valances, traverses, and commonly made of silk, velvet or damask with gilt yarns, and carpet. Henry VIII owned over eight hundred carpets, ranging from Turkish to Usash and Chintamani rugs and of the turkey rugs listed in the inventory of 1547 about fifty-to-sixty measured about fifteen-to-thirty feet. Within the 1542 Inventory, there are several references that provide indications of the type of textiles that would have been on the floor of rooms, like the presence chamber and the privy chamber, such a small carpets or rugs, as well as the common rush mats. Maria Hayward, trans and ed., The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: The Palace and its Keeper, vol. 1 (London: Illuminata Publisher for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 2004), 11 and 29-31.

10 Hayward, vol. 1, 29-31.


12 Campbell, Henry VIII and the Art of Majesty, 80.

13 Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 242. Form more information see: Bodleian Library Rawl. MS D 781 f. 15. In the 1547 inventory, a cupboard is recorded as “[Item 10454] foreparte and sides covered with crymsen vellat garnished in sundried places with copper giltie with the kinges armes crowned having sondrie tilles of leather within with nyne leaves or dores to the same enameled with pictures of
horsemen with iii elaves to open couered with like crymsen vellat and likewise garnished with copper lined with grene bridges satten garnished in sundrye places with narrowe passamayne of venyce golde.” Starkey ed., The Inventory of King Henry VIII, 129-130. The different between a cupboard and buffet is that a cupboard was meant increasingly for storage, while the buffet was for display, originally cupboards were a board used to display plates or other valuables, however it increasingly became an enclosed wooden box with doors. The buffet or cupboard relates back to official dining occasions practiced by the Burgundian dukes, for the Burgundian’s a fundamental part of dinning was the lavish display of gold and silver plates and cups. This custom of display was intergraded into Tudor dinning culture, which can be viewed in the Greenwich presence chamber in 1538 when Henry VIII received his New Year’s gifts, and subsequently displayed them on the buffet for all the court to see. Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 240-242. Form more information see: British Library/British Museum Harl. MS 1419a f. 56; Starkey ed., Henry VIII: A European Court in England, 126-135.

14 A man recorded as Grene “the coffermaker,” was a regular royal supplier, who commonly made coffers with tills or drawers covered in baric or leather with an outer case in leather. TNA: PRO E101/424/11.

15 Mirrors were generally made of steel, either framed in gilded word or in wood covered fabric, most commonly crimson satin. Most frequently, clocks were positioned on wall-mounted brackets, as can be distinguish in the background of Holbein’s More Family. Only one clock survives from Henry VIII’s collections, a gilt metal clock with weights engraved with Henry’s and Anne Boleyn’s initials and mottoes. Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 220 and 244. For example see: Bodleian Library Harl. MS 1419 ff. 246-50, 136-136v.

16 Fireplase accessories would have been set into the fireplaces and formed an important decorative feature within the chambers displaying the badges as Henry. One entry within the inventory at Whitehall states, there were “one paire of Aundierns of Iron curiousely wrought with sondrye antiques painted and guilte havinge in the toppes of them the kynges arms crowned supported by his graces beasts.” Hayward, trans and ed., vol. 1, 17. There is additionally an extent pair of cast-iron firedogs, which display the arms of Henry VIII, the initials HR (Henricus Rex) and the falcon of Anne Boleyn. Starkey ed., The Inventory of King Henry VIII, 243. One entry within the inventory states that at Whitehall there were “one paire of Aundierns of Iron curiousely wrought with sondrye antiques painted and guilte havinge in the toppes of them the kynges arms crowned supported by his graces beasts. Starkey ed, The Inventory of King Henry VIII, 243. Screens to cover fireplaces during the summer were a highly demand item, as joiners carved four of these with the King’s arms and feet of lions, dragons and greyhounds, costing ten pounds. TNA: PRO E36/241 p. 443.

17 Within the Whitehall Palace Inventory from 1542 there are twenty-two silver-gilt chandeliers [items 7980], thirteen candlesticks with three gilt [item 103, 133] and six parcel-gilt [item 145-146], four white for use when the king was dining [item 3749-3750], three pairs of gilt altar candlesticks for the king’s closet [item 131, 139, 3753], and seventeen gilt metal candlesticks “to be fastenyed to a wall” [item 1147]. Items 1224-1225. Hayward, trans and ed., vol. 1, 18.

18 Bodleian Library Rawl. MS. D 775 fos. 26v, 34v; 780 fos. 32v, 36v; 781 fos. 15, fos. 52. As seen in: Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 244. Furthermore, Cavendish described the wall-scones, which were the most common within the king’s lodgings, used at Hampton Court in 1527 writing “the plates that hung on the walls to give lights in the chamber were of silver and gilt, with lights burning in them...”. Cavendish, 73. Scones were either hung from ropes of gold with golden tassels or spiked into the wall, such as in the gallery at Hampton Court there was a copper candlestick “sett in the waynescot. British Library/British Museum Harl. MS 1419 f. 245. As seen in: Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 244. At Hampton Court the smith made eight tinned brackets to hold wainscot bowls or plates for candles; six of them were sent to Greenwich for the ‘king’s chamber’ the other two remained at Hampton Court. British Library/British Museum Harl. MS 1419 p. 124. As seen in: Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 244. Additionally, such lighting could be embellished with Venice gold and silver rope with decorative tassels, “serving for hanging Candlesticks” [item 1224-1225]. Hayward, trans and ed., vol. 1, 18.
19 British Library/British Museum Harl. MS 1419, 1419 f. 137. F. 106, f. 135v. As seen in: Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 224-245. Additionally, there were the seventeen candlesticks of “metalle guilte to be astned to a walle” found at Whitehall in 1547. TNA: PRO E36/239 f. 91.


21 Sir Reginald Hennell, *The History of the King’s Body Guard and the Yeomen of the Guard: The Oldest Permanent Body Guard of the Sovereigns of England, 1485-1904* (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1904), 60. In response to such crowding, the Eltham Ordinances criticized the guards, stating they “doe occupie the greatest part of his hall and likewise of his lodgings neer about the court, but also do enterteyne everie of them one or two laddes or simple servants.” *A Collection Ordinances and regulations for the Government of the Royal Household for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns: From King Edward III to King William and Queen Mary* (London: Society of Antiquaries by John Nichols, 1790), 146-7.

22 Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 120.

23 As example, in April 1520, the French and Venetian ambassadors were fed in the guard chamber at Richmond. Bodleian Library Rawl. MS D 781 f. 22v. As seen in: Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life*, 122. L&P, vol. iii, no. 197.


28 *HO*, 153.

29 Ibid.

30 Such windows must have faced east, due to the great chamber being located on the west. Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698*, 19, and 29.

31 Ibid, 18.

32 Ibid, 18.

33 TNA: PRO E36/236 p.95.

34 TNA: PRO E36//236, p. 95, 107v, 116, 118v, 131.

35 TNA: PRO E36/242, July-Aug. 1534, E36/240, pp. 123, 125, 309, 367, and 615; Colvin, 132.

36 Colvin, 168. Additionally, at Henry VIII’s Hudson House, carpenters and joiners were paid for the wainscoted fettig and paneling of the watching chamber, as well as the decoration upon the fireplace painted of roses and antiquework with gold details. Colvin, 155. For more information see: TNA: PRO E101/465/2; L&P, vol. viii, 250; iv (2), 3622 (27), 3991 (27); and Bodleian, MS, Rawlinson D 781, ff. 101-4, 113v-114.

37 TNA: PRO E36//236, p. 95, 107v, 116, 118v, 131.


39 TNA: PRO E36//236, p. 95, 107v, 116, 118v, 131.
In 1553, for the coronation of Anne Boleyn, modifications were undertaken at the Tower of London, within the King’s chambers new ceilings, doors, and fireplaces were installed all in the antique fashion; furthermore a ‘mantell of wainscot with antyk’ decoration was installed in the dining chamber, which was one of the first antique chimney-pieces. TNA: PRO E36/253 pp. 557, 589; British Library/British Museum MS Royal 14b IVA; Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 230.

The indication from accounts of the bareness of the watching chamber can be seen the focused on only tapestries and buffets within the 1547 inventory of the watching chamber at Saint Johns Clerkenwell house, another of Henry’s households. The inventory of 1547 lists “Item ij large peces of Tapestries of an olde historire…other litell peces and ij other thone ouer the dores and thither ouer the Chymney”. Item 13808-13811, and Item 13807. These would be hangings used to cover the doorways and fireplace, to prevent drafts. Starkey ed, *The Inventory of King Henry VIII*, 345.

These would have been basic pieces made using simple techniques having little or no decoration. Hayward, 19. Items 1163, 1159, 1151, 1154-1156, 1159-1162. The inventory of 1542 records numerous of these; one example demonstrates the minimal design, “Item oone Cupbourd of Wainscott with Rooses and oone Porteuillize vpon the same.” Item 1162. Hayward, 116.

As the inventory from 1547 indicates a table with tresseles and a carpet placed upon it, as well as the room join in wainscoting with a cupboard of wainscoting. These same tables are references within the Whitehall Inventory of 1542, “Item a Table of waynsott all the nether parte paynted the feete coverid with grene cloth / and frengi with silke.” These same tables are references within the Whitehall Inventory of 1542, “Item a Table of waynsott all the nether parte paynted the feete coverid with grene cloth / and frengi with silke.” Item 13808-13811. Starkey ed, *The Inventory of King Henry VIII*, 345.

Such was recorded at Whitehall for the watching chamber, “foure score and eighteen pertisunstes partley gilt garnysshid with crymsen vellat and frengided with red silk” [Item 947] and “twentye and two Pollaces gilt / the staves coverid with crymsen vellat / frengid with a depe frenge and a narowe frenge of Venice golde and crymsen sik” [Item 952]. Hayward, 34.

Gante, “Narrative of the visit of the Duke of Najera to England in the year 1543-4 written by his secretary Pedro de Gante”, 351.

TNA: PRO E315/160 f. 73r; Hayward, 34.

“lattyng and plastering of the dore at the grete long stare hede and all that cometh towards the dynnyng chamber.” TNA: PRO E36/236, p.116.

*L&P*, vol. iii, no. 896.

*TNA: PRO E36/243, Oc.-Nov 1535. Colvin,136,*


*TNA: PRO E36/253 pp. 557, 589.*
Regulations clearly stated that the cloth of the estate was revered only for the king, “no manner of whatsoever degree he be of so hardye to come nighe the kings chyre nor stand under the clothe of estate.” British Library/British Museum Add. MS 21116, f. 8v, 11v. As seen in: Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 122. An example can be seen in the 1542 inventory, “oone Chusshion of nedleworke on them having two pomelles of Copper and gilt / and two Roundelles of wodde having in them the kinges Armes or Letters painted and gilt.” In total, the 1542 inventory includes eighty-four single chairs, cushions footstools and stood, sixty set of two-pieces, and forty-three sets with three-pieces, suggesting that either seating was only provided for small groups in any one room, as well as around hundred and fortify-four cushions are mentioned. However, this inventory additionally includes two sets of sixteen chairs covered with cloth of gold raised with crimson velvet [238-239], which suggests a sizeable room to use such as long galleries. Hayward, 36 and 22.

Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 238. A record from the 1542 inventory at Whitehall Palace states “thre Cheirs of cloth of gold reysid with blac vellat / frengied with blac silke oonly eche of them having two pomelles of Copper and gilt / and two Roundelles of wodde having in them the kinges Armes or Letters painted and gilt.” In total, the 1542 inventory includes eighty-four single chairs, cushions footstools and stood, sixty set of two-pieces, and forty-three sets with three-pieces, suggesting that either seating was only provided for small groups in any one room, as well as around hundred and fortify-four cushions are mentioned. However, this inventory additionally includes two sets of sixteen chairs covered with cloth of gold raised with crimson velvet [238-239], which suggests a sizeable room to use such as long galleries. Hayward, 36 and 22.

Gante, “Narrative of the visit of the Duke of Najera to England in the year 1543-4 written by his secretary Pedro de Gante,” 351.


“Item viij peces of olde tapestries. Item A Table a paier of Tressles with a lardge carpet vpon the same. Item ij Cubboards with two carpettes. Carpettes in wyndowes. Two Andiornes, A forme.” Starkey ed, *The Inventory of King Henry VIII*, 345.

For example, the seating plan for a banquet in the presence chamber at Greenwich Palace in 1517, illustrates the typical table arrangement in ‘U’ formation, which would also be done in the ‘T’ shape as well in the form of movable boards. Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 122. For more information see: College of Arms MS M 8 F. 65v

HO, 154.
This invasion of the privy lodgings by large numbers of courtiers participating in state ceremonial made the privy chamber more of an ante-room to the privy lodgings. It should be noted that at Whitehall by 1547, there was a room beyond the privy chamber, between it and the privy gallery, this room has every appearance of having been a withdrawing room which acted, like the closet-and-gallery, as a break between the now rather more public privy chamber and the privy lodgings. At Woodstock there is reference to the ‘utter privy chamber,’ which might indicate that, as at Whitehall, there was a graded series of room rather than just one privy chamber. HO, 360. Additionally, as an effect to the overpopulation of the privy chamber, household staff shifted towards the bedchamber and the new sub-department Bedchamber for the more private areas of the court. Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 139.

It is important to note the gallery leading from the presence to the privy chamber, for it distinguishes the shift from the outer chambers of the palace to the inner chambers. As the presence chamber was part of the public suit of rooms, the privy chamber was considered part of the inner chambers and the entrance into the king private lodgings. The use of the small gallery created a physical obstruction to help restrict access to the king and grant him relative privacy. However, even with this architectural obstacle the audience within the privy chamber, as previously addressed, significantly increased during Henry’s reign.

Henry’s new private rooms leading from one to another, from a public court and overlooking the gardens became the first modern suite of royal lodgings in England and became the model thereafter. Thurley, Whitehall Palace: The Official Illustrated History, 27 and 48.

Colvin, 104.

Bodleian Library Rawl. MS d 780 f 25v. As seen in: Thurley, Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 207. Within the Queen’s presence chamber and bedchamber at Greenwich a similar ceiling, decoration was utilized, of bullions and buds set on white-painted battends. MS Rawlinson D. 775, ff.52-2. Colvin, 104. Furthermore, 1537, Richard Ridge “for a bargyn ingroste with him…ffor tryng, framyng inbouyng and ffyttyng upe of new battens in the rougg of the kyng’s privy chamber after the annntyce facion and in tryng…” In 1536 at The More Palace, a new chamber for Henry was built and Richard Ridge and joiners were paid for “drawing the compasse of the fret in the roof” and for implementation the fret with “pendants, bossis, syngills and ballis”. Colvin, 167. For more information see: Bodleain, MS. Rawlinson D 780 f 124v.

Colvin, 105. Additionally, in 1536, at Hampton Court Palace, James Mercaden and Robert Sande were paid for the “cutting carvyng and clensyng of v traylls of waynscott standying upon the posts in the kyngs holyday closet and the quenys” both of which were described as “Frenchmen”. TNA: PRO E36/243, March-April, March- May 1536; Colvin, 133. Furthermore, it was Richard “Frenchmen” who fashioned at Hampton Court the “antik heads standing rounde aboute withynne the ynner court”. These head are presumably distinct from the medallions containing heads of Roman emperors made ten years earlier by Giovanni da Maiano, which were themselves set into the walls of the inner court. TNA: PRO E36/241, June through July 1531. For more information see: MS Rawlinson D 780, ff. 23, 25v, 36.

Colvin, 104. At Hudson House, glaziers were charged “for diverse and sondrie wyngdowys aswell in all the king’s new losgyngs, galerye and closets, as in all the qundowis in the grounde chambers under the same and with the making ofht eking’s arms, poises, badges and bendis sett and lasid in the seid wyndowys
and also with the setting repaying and amending of the king’s old glasse in diverse other palces”. TNA: PRO E101/465/20; L&P, vol. viii, 250, vol. iv, 3622 (27), 3991 (27); Colvin, 155-156. Interestingly, such accounts additionally recount that each time Henry VIII remarried, the glaziers had to replace the arms in all the windows, thus possibly the reference to “amending of the king’s old glasse”. Bodleian Library Rawl. MS D 776 ff. 236, 238-238v. As seen in: Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 227. For more information see: Bodleian Library MS Rawl. D 780, ff. 23, 25v, 36.

82 British Museum/Library MS Royal 14 B IV A. As seen in: Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 227.

83 In 1532 a cargo of “stone plaster” ordered by Alvard and Heritage from a Fleming at Calais is captured at sea by Luckers. L&P, vol. vi, 1200-2.

84 “Item ther is set into the Walle in the previe/chambre a thinge artificiallie made like a rocke wherein is many straunge deuises of friers and diuere other thinges hauing in it a fountayne of allablaster whiche is sore decayed and vpon the tope of the fountayne a round Bale of christall wherein was three heddes of gold whiche are gone and xxij stone made like deddes also gone whiche was supposed to be Camewes being sett abowe in a Border euery one of a compase of a grote all whiche fountayne and rocke is locked vpp with two Leaues like windowes the whiche leaves ar garnesdhed with peerle and golde threde pirled”. Starkey ed, The Inventory of King Henry VIII, 418.

85 Strong, Holbein and Henry VIII, 29-32.

86 Under the privy chamber was a gardrobe that could have been a bathroom of some-sort. The placement of a wall-fountain within the privy chamber would have facilitated in the plumbing pressure for the lateen below and was a common feature within Henry’s palace structures. For more information see: Thurley, Simon. The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Center for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1993.

87 Such an image would have dominated the interior space of the privy chamber taking up nearly half of the south wall. Thurley, Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 49. In addition, it should be mentioned that there was long tradition of decorating the King’s inward chambers with mural cycles. Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 207. There had been a long tradition of decorating royal houses with mural cycles: Henry III, for example, had decorated the walls of the Antioch chamber at Clarendon with Crusader subjects. T. Borenious ‘The Cycle of Images in the palaces and Castles of Henry III’, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Instititues, vi (1943): 40-50. The early part of Henry VIII’s reign saw the completion of several major murals. The largest of these was painted on the walls of the low gallery at Whitehall where painters were paid for ‘drawing and setting owte with colours the coronacion of our seide soverigne lorde with the circumstance of the same as also certayne other works upon the wallaes.” TNA: PRO E351/3322. At Windsor a room next to his bedchamber was called the Siege of Rhodes chamber after a series of murals which probably depicted the heroic defenses of Rhodes chamber in 1480 rather than its unsuccessful defense and capitulation to the Turks in 1522. At Whitehall there was a room known as the Adam and Eve room, which was presumably painted the story of Temptation and Fall. At Greenwich Palace, the King’s closet by the waterside was painted with the story of St. John. Bodleian Library Rawl. MS D 780 ff. 33, 91. As seen in: Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 208.

88 Conversely, the original mural does not remain, what that is left is the Remigious can Leeput facsimile from 1667 and a fragment of Holbein’s cartoon used for transferring the composition on to the wall does remain. “If you find pleasure in seeing fair pictures of heroes/Look then at these! None greater was ever portrayed./Fierce is the struggle and hot the disputing: the question/Des father, dose son – or do both – pre-eminence win?/One ever withstood his foes and his country’s destruction/Finally giving his people the blessing of peace/But, born to things greater, the son drove out of his councils/His ministers worthless, and ever supported the just/And in truth, to this steadfastness Papal arrogance yielded/When the scepter of power was wielded by Henry the Eighth./Under whose reign the true faith was restored to the nation/And the doctrines of God began to be reverenced with awe.” Zdeněk Brtnický z. Valdštejna, The Diary of Baron Waldstein, A Traveller in Elizabethan England, trans. and ed. G. W. Groos (London: Thames and Hudson, 1981) 56-7.


91 TNA: PRO E101/423/10 f. 74 r.

92 As recorded within the privy chamber at Greenwich Palace, “First v smalle Courtens of tartaron lined with buckeram appointed for the kings privey chamber.” Nottingham University Library MS. Ne02 f. 145v. As seem in: Starkey ed, *The Inventory of King Henry VIII*, 201. Another references, ‘two curtains of purple, white and black satten of bridge paned togethers thone conte vii panes and thither vi panes di either of them conte in depthe two yerde di line with buckram” British Library/British Museum Harl. MS 1419 f. 23. As seen in: Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 225.

93 From the elure of a cloth of estate. The hanging was made from cloth of gold tissue raised with purple velet and paned with vrimson velvet [item 237]. Did not appear in the 1547 inventory for it was delier to the Tower Warbrode on 9th July 1547. Item a Ceeler oonly of a cloth of Estate serving for a hanging within the king his graces privey Chamber of cloth of gold tissue reysed with purple vallant puld paneed with crymsen vellat, enbraudered vpon the said srymen vellat his graces badges Crowned And in the middle therof his hinges Armes crowned holden by his bestes within a Carland enbraudered vpon hit being in length ijj yerdes an din brethd two yerdes quarter lined with buckeram With Sixe signle vallaunces of like stuff and Workmanship likwiselyned…”. TNA: PRO E351/16 f.12; by 1547 this had been removed to the Garderobe of the Tower, British Museum/British Library Harl. MS 1419A.f.29

94 Starkey ed, *The Inventory of King Henry VIII*, 287.

95 British Library/British Museum Harl. MS 1419 f. 244. As seen in: Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 244.


98 In 1508 Henry’s sister, Princess Mary was to have in her bedchamber ‘emale carpettes for windowes, borde and cobordes, v. at the lest, of velet of cramosyne, and as many carpettes of whole for every day.” Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 242. British Library/British Museum Harl. MS 1419 f. 249. As seen in: Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 242.
CHAPTER THREE
HENRICIAN MAGNIFICENCE & INTERIORS OF PERSUASION

In reaction to Henry VIII’s weakening sovereignty during the early 1530s, a truly distinctive Henrician methodology towards perception as an device to display authority through the interior was fashioned in the watching, presence, and privy chambers at Whitehall Palace. By means of specific stylistic implications evident within the ceremonial chambers, a particular representation and association was propagated to emphasize Henry’s authority to a volatile court. As new attitudes towards identity and visual representation developed during the sixteenth century, new concepts of perception and persuasion grow that would in turn influenced Henrician philosophies of display and princely magnificence. The fundamental value of interior decoration as a form of representation for disseminating a specifically fashioned image of Henry VIII’s sovereignty is revealed by considering the symbolic associations of chivalric Gothic and Italian antquework within the ceremonial interiors at Whitehall Palace.

Henry’s turbulent reign would manifest itself in his methodology for communicating his rightful supremacy through the creation of a Henrician style. The dual influences of Burgundian chivalric court culture and Italian Renaissance humanist teachings extended beyond mere decorative elements to particularly chosen associations to previous and fashionable authoritative connotations. Notably within these stylistic categories, only certain aspects were incorporated within the interior, reflecting distinctive associations attached to each. Ingrained in chivalric Gothic and Italian antquework was the imperative theme of display and magnificence that fostered novel theories of representational imagery and perception at the Henrician court, which can be
understood by looking towards the invested meanings and influences within Henrician society.1

The peculiar combination of Burgundian court culture with Italian Renaissance humanism fused two distinct approaches to magnificence together at Henry’s court. Therefore, traditional attitudes towards magnificence as a display of wealth coalesced with theories of magnificence as a classical virtue. As a result, the watching, presence, and privy chambers at Whitehall Palace were an amalgamation of stylistic elements from chivalric Gothic and Italian antiquework, reflecting Henry’s own division between the two ideals of the chivalric knight and the Renaissance prince. As both models promoted magnificence through display as a communicative form of power, they concurrently symbolized distinct associations for Henry. Such models were essential for his advocated representation of a traditional historic authority rooted in the monarchy and church and that of a humanist educated and au courant ruler.

**HENRICIAN STYLISTIC CONNOTATIONS: CHIVALRIC GOTHIC**

English chivalric Gothic was a combination of nationalistic and religious architectural forms in a chivalric tradition, which was rooted in the Burgundian court culture’s theories of magnificence and traditional Gothic and heraldic architecture. Specifically, Gothic as an architectural element in the Henrician interior was linked to the memory of England’s historic past founded on the ideals of medieval chivalry as well as to conventional religious architecture. Established during the twelfth century, Gothic architecture was most commonly associated with religion, due to its frequent use in the construction of abbeys, churches, and cathedrals, featuring a strong vertical emphases,
elaborate window tracery, stone mullions, fan vaulting, arch mouldings, and spandrels filed with quatrefoils or tracery.\textsuperscript{2}

It is important to understand that English Gothic architecture was distinctive from that of the French and Italian Gothic styles, which inspired it. Though English Gothic was assimilated from French architecture, within England it was transformed into a distinctive style that became linked to the social and political milieu of the period. In turn, English Gothic developed into an expression of an emerging English national identity, due to the use of such spaces in correlation with political functions, as well as the architectural features being well suited for the English climate.\textsuperscript{3} However, by Henry VIII’s ascension to the throne in 1509, the Gothic style had largely fallen out of fashion throughout continental Europe for the more prevailing Renaissance, and eventually Mannerist, styles. Conversely, in Henrician architecture aspects of the Gothic style lingered, purposefully reflective England’s historic past through associations with previous rulers and growing national identity.

Architecturally, Henrician chivalric Gothic was established in the Perpendicular Gothic style, characterized by a vertical emphasis of elaborate window tracery, slim stone mullions, fan vaulting, arch mouldings, spandrels filed with quatrefoils or tracery, brick, an excess of heraldry, and four-sided pointed arches – commonly known as a Tudor arch. One of the finest surviving examples of the use of the Perpendicular Gothic style in the Henrician interior remains at Hampton Court Palace in the Great Hall [figs. 3.1 & 3.2]. The visual arrangement of the Great Hall, with a Great Bay Window decorated with heraldic emblems and a carved fan vaulting with arch mouldings and an ornately carved heraldic hammerbreaden roof with multiple celestial and large stained glass windows,
replicates Perpendicular Gothic religious architecture. The parallels between the Great Hall’s association with traditional religious architecture can well been seen in comparison to the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity, the Gloucester Cathedral, and the Lady Chapel of Westminster Abbey [figs. 3.3, 3.4, & 3.5]. As the Great Hall reproduce similar Perpendicular Gothic elements of the elaborate window tracery, slim mullions, fan vaulting, arch mouldings, spandrels filed with quatrefoils or tracery, and an excess of heraldry, with the two religious buildings of the of early era.

Within the ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace, Perpendicular Gothic architectural features may be observed through three distinctive elements: in the typical Henrician interior architectural treatments, in the use of heraldic devices, and in chivalric references. In terms of the architectural treatments, the Whitehall interiors regularly featured the Tudor arch infused with heraldic badges and mottos, ornately carved tracery, and arch mouldings with spandrels filed with quatrefoils. Such can be distinguished in the ceremonial chambers doorways, windows, and fireplaces, as we have previously seen in chapter two. Furthermore, the ceilings of the Whitehall watching, presence and privy chambers were based on Gothic traditions. The Painted Chamber at Westminster Palace dating from the 1260s contained a boarded Gothic ceiling with wooden shallow bosses, enriched with vivid colors with the background decorated in painted gesso. At Windsor Castle, a ceiling from Henry VII’s reign was similarly constructed with oak ribs decorated with rose bosse enriched by quatrefoils and richly carved background, almost certainly gilded and painted blue [fig. 3.6]. The ceilings within Whitehall’s ceremonial chambers during Henry VIII’s reign replicated such architectural features, only applying novel Italian antiquework on top of the anachronistic backdrop.
Crucially important to the chivalric Gothic implemented at Whitehall Palace was the excessive use of heraldic decoration, which was associated with medieval pageantry and Perpendicular Gothic architecture. As chapter two notes, in the presence chamber carvers fashioned a fireplace with the royal arms of Henry VIII held by a stone dragon. On the windows and ceilings were the arms, badges, and inscriptions of the king, with the wall-paneling in Henry’s chambers were inundated with his mottos and badges. The proliferation of Henry VIII’s mottos and badges throughout his ceremonial interiors, as observed, not only reinforced the ownership of the space, it additionally draws an emphasizes to the linage from which the badges were derived as a visual symbol of dynasty and royal linage.

The most predominate badge within the interiors was the Tudor Rose, which overlaid the Red Rose of Henry VII and the Dukes of Lancaster with the White Rose of Henry VIII’s mother Margaret of York and the Dukes of York. Henry VIII – particularly after his brother’s Arthur’s death – truly represented this emblem, for he was the symbolic unity of the two houses. In addition, Henry VIII frequently utilized his father’s emblem of the red dragon that had specifically selected associations for the Tudor monarchy. The red dragon was linked to the legendary King Cadwalader, as well as to the mythical King Arthur, from whom Henry VII claimed royal linage as a way to reinforce his right to the English throne. As Henry VIII’s central shield and emblem, the red dragon was typically arranged with the white greyhound holding the arms of the Tudors. Additional emblems of Henry were the English Lion, the French Golden Fleur-de-lys, and the portcullis of Henry VIII’s grandmother Margaret Beaufort – who gave Henry VII his sole claim to the English throne. The English court would have understood
the heritage of each badge of the king, reading them as visual representation of Henry VIII’s lineage, which was reinforced by Henry’s motto “Dieu et Mon Driot.”

The authority that heraldry held within the Tudor court is well documented through a series of early Tudor laws and measures. In 1498-99, Henry VII licensed two Kings of Arms to undertake a visitation to ensure that arms were not being mistreated or destroyed by the gentry. Whereas, in 1530, Henry VIII issued letters patent under the Great Seal stating that Thomas Benolt would undertake necessary visitations to, “reform all false armory and arms devised without authority, marks unlawfully set or made in scucheons, squares or lozenges, which schucheons, squares and lozenges be tokens of nobleness, and them to deface and take away wheresoever they be set…whether it be in stone, windows, plate or any other…” In 1542, an Act of Parliament made it a felony for any person to write “orutter prophecies” relating to the king, or anyone else, based on interpretations of “Arms, felds, beastes, fowls or other suche lyke thinges accustomed in armes cognisaunces badges or signets or by reasone of letters of the name of the King or of any other persone.” The focus on maintaining the royal badges and mottos in perfect condition, as well as the regulation of them, reflects the cultural authority invested in these symbols as instruments to demonstrate the legitimacy of the dynasty and eliminate any notion of the contestation of the English crown.

Key in the incorporation of Henrician chivalric Gothic is not only the implementation of antiquated Perpendicular Gothic elements and heraldic devices within the Whitehall watching, presence, and privy chambers, but its union with Burgundian chivalric court culture. The thirteenth and fourteenth century’s influential Burgundian Dukes of France, particularly Philip the Good and Charles the Bold, cultivated a culture
based on magnificence as a display of power through sheer wealth that would in turn greatly influence England.\textsuperscript{17} For instance, in 1461, Philip the Good helped crown King Louis XI of France.\textsuperscript{18} For the occasion, Philip lavishly decorated his residence at the Hôtel d’Artois in a magnificent display of finery that surpassed King Louis XI’s own residence. As Jehan Maupoin, a Parisian chronicler noted, “Every day people flocked to see him [Philip] there [at the Hôtel d’Artois], in the great hall hung with fine tapestry worked in gold thread, which depicted the story of Gideon”.\textsuperscript{19} Philip additionally erected a great tent in the center of his courtyard in view of the street, covered in additional tapestries depicting the heraldic arms of each of his territories.\textsuperscript{20} As Philip demonstrates, the Burgundian court magnificence was not linked strictly to royalty, but was essentially a display of power through absolute wealth.

The absorption of Burgundian theories of magnificence within England can be easily distinguished by the fifteenth-century as English chroniclers were commenting upon the use and prestige of magnificence for the rulers of Europe.\textsuperscript{21} An English lawyer, Sir John Fortescue’s fifteenth-century treatise *The Governance of England* describes the English attributes of magnificence during the late fifteenth century stating:

\begin{quote}
the kyng haue such tresour, as he mey make new bldynge when he woll, ffor his pleasure and magnificence; and as he mey bie hym riche clothes, riche furres, oper than be wonned to fall ynder pe yerely charges off his warderober, rich stones, serpes, bauderikes, and oper jeuls and ornamentes conuenyent to his estate roiall. And often tymes he woll bie riche hangynges and other apparel ffor his howses…\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

Such an approach to magnificence conveys the theory that magnificence was the art of extravagant public expression that reflects upon ones position and power through displays of wealth. The notion of magnificence as a display of supremacy within England
may be further perceived in Henry VII’s The Lady Chapel at Westminster Abbey, as Henry VII ordered that the chapel should be painted with “our armes, badges, cognisants, and other convenient painting,” because such lavish decoration exposed that “a king’s work [was] appertaineth.” The argument to make the king’s perceptible as the patron, reflects the elevated spectrum of display sought by sovereigns to represent their power through magnificent imagery and a display of wealth, as was assimilated from Burgundian practices.

In Henry VIII’s ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace, these same notions of magnificence, as dedicated by *The Governance of England* and influenced by Burgundian methods were enacted. The watching, presence, and privy chambers, were hung with lavish tapestries of gold and buffets displaying gold and silver plates and trinkets, the architectural features richly carved and gilded, as every surface was adorned and decorated in a display of pure wealth. It is important to note that like the Gothic style used within the Henrician court, by Henry VIII’s reign the Burgundian court had fallen out of power and the approach to magnificence through great displays of wealth in public festivals and chivalric tournaments was shifting towards more intimate court fests and masques. However, the representation of thirteenth and fourteenth century forms of chivalry remained in England, visually demonstrated through heraldic devices and knightly imagery.

Specifically, within the Henrician court, chivalry was represented in association to religious and knightly figures. Henry VIII would be portrayed in antiquated knightly depictions, for it was within the visual idiom of the English court. Visual representations of chivalry should be, moreover, seen as a method of legitimizing the newly formed
monarchy, such as the early Tudors claim of royal lineage through King Arthur.\textsuperscript{24} The use of crafting a visual representation to communicate a specific image of authority through knightly allusions becomes far more apparent in considering the representation of Henry VIII within the \textit{Whitehall Mural}.

The pose that Henry strikes within the mural, as well as in the comparable portrait of \textit{Henry VIII} [fig. 3.7], essentially reflects a military stance derived from the portrayal of fifteenth century chivalric and religious heroes.\textsuperscript{25} As Tatiana String notes, Henry VIII’s presence is of sheer strength – through his wide legs and broad shoulders mimicking a stance in armor – as his power is displayed in his individuality and direct pose, embodying stance of knightly triumph.\textsuperscript{26} Upon entering into the privy chamber at Whitehall Palace, one would encounter not only a lavishly decorated interior with Gothic features and antiquework decoration, but a dynastic image of Henry VIII, depicted after the likeness of fifteenth century religious and knightly imagery, like those of St. George and St. Michael [fig. 3.8 & 3.9].\textsuperscript{27} Significantly, these chivalric Gothic elements within the Whitehall ceremonial chambers represented a dual connotation rooted in historical association of religious precedents and historical ancestors.

The location of Whitehall Palace must additionally be addressed in relation to Gothic and political associations. It should be take into account that Whitehall Palace did not have previous royal associations, as the Palace was acquired from Cardinal Wolsey, and it must be remembered that before Henry’s possession of the palace a fire had destroyed the previous seat of royal government. Therefore, the decision for Whitehall to be the official seat of royal government is significant in that it was seen as the best possible location to establish a new seat of power. Of specific importance was
Whitehall’s proximity to Westminster, which was historically the center of political and religious power in England. Located directly adjacent to the palace was Westminster Abbey, originally built by Edward the Confessor, rebuilt in the Anglo-French Gothic style by Henry III, and added to with Henry VII’s Gothic The Lady Chapel. The visual correlation of Westminster Abbey and the political relationship of those who built the Abbey would have created a visual association with Whitehall Palace’s utilization of Gothic features, which replicated of similar designs.  

Furthermore, the use of Gothic details in the Henrician interior must be understood in the context of Henry VIII’s break with the Catholic Church and his creation of the Church of England with Henry as the Head. The communalities between Henry VIII’s Perpendicular Gothic elements in the interior, as seen in the Great Hall, and Gothic religious architecture, such as the Lady Chapel, reflects an awareness of the symbolic associations used within the Henrician interior. The association with religion for Whitehall Palace becomes far more apparent when coupled with foreign remarks on the architecture. As Philip Julies, Duke of Stettin-Pomerania observed, “the lodgments in this palatio [Whitehall Palace] are almost all low, and constructed many recesses after the monkish way of building.” Moreover, the utilization of chivalric imagery, as seen in the Whitehall Mural, and the use of religiously themed tapestries, such as the Story of Abraham, reflects the correlation between the developing Henrician style’s religious and Gothic visual associations, for the growth of the Henrician style developed simultaneously with the English Reformation.

Henry VIII was politically aligned to the ascendancy of past monarchs and the influential power of the church, which reinforced the authenticity of his family’s hold on
the English throne by incorporating Gothic influences through religiously derived architecture, chivalric imagery, and an abundance of heraldry. What is specific to the Henrician interior is the persistent use of anachronistic Gothic features well into the sixteenth century. Though Henry in many ways did not have genuine power in terms of a military force, he attempted to foster his authority as a monarch by rooting his sovereignty in association with powerful predecessors in an attempt to claim and maintain his ascendancy within a politically divided court culture.

HENRICIAN STYLISTIC CONNOTATIONS: ITALIAN RENAISSANCE ANTIQUEWORK

Theories of magnificence in the Henrician court were equally related to the influence of Renaissance Italy. The most notable Italian Renaissance elements in the watching, presence, and privy chambers at Whitehall Palace were antiquework, commonly seen in grotesque decoration. Italian inspired grotesquework within Whitehall was comprised of designs influenced from the rediscovery of ancient Roman wall paintings from the Domus Aurea, commonly consisting of arabesque decorative patterns that are generally fantastic and distorted, frequently including foliage, masked faces, and mythological figures.

The proliferation of Italian antiquework in the king’s ceremonial chambers at Whitehall can be seen in two ways: the physical application of grotesque decoration and the influence of Italian humanist theories. The abundance of antiquework is easily distinguishable, as seen in the new ceiling and cornice after the antique fashion fitted at Greenwich Palace in 1537, to numerous accounts of the windows within the king’s chambers being covered in antiquework. The ceilings and wall-paneling within the Whitehall ceremonial chambers were decorated with grotesquework details, as previously
seen in chapter two. Frequently, every surface and object within the Henrician interior would be applied with grotesque decoration. The excess of antiquework additionally correlates to the textiles placed within the inner chambers, which were commonly antique themes such as the *Story of Aeneas*, which was purchased for one of the king’s private apartments at Whitehall.

However, the Italian Renaissance’s influence within Henry VIII’s chambers extended beyond the mere application of a decorative pattern; it affected the very notions of display that impacted the design of the interior as a whole. Based on the renewal of classical theories that were reinterpreted through a Renaissance perspective – though in many ways altered from pantheon religious approach to fit within the context of a Christian society – the Italian Renaissance re-appropriated a philosophy of secularism, admiration of aesthesis, and an assertion of personal individualism. Renaissance humanist and classically inspired theories from Italy proliferated in England, largely encouraged by Cardinal Wolsey in his construction of York Place and his personal involvement in politics and architecture. Henry VIII’s teachers and councils, such as Desiderius Erasmus and Thomas More, further instilled in Henry such theories of the perfect courtier based on these humanist theories.

The Renaissance growth of humanism was reflected in the avocation of a Platonic society that revolved around the philosopher king, motivated by the teachings of Cicero that stressed a comprehensive and liberal curriculum based on the classic and natural science where members of the elite were educated in preparation for public service. Such humanist and Italian Renaissance theories would correlate to the ideal Renaissance prince. In many aspects, Henry VIII was an archetypal Renaissance prince: he was well
educated by some of the most renowned humanist teachers, was fair and robust, and
practiced newly formulated theories of government inspired from humanism. As one
contemporary noted of him:

The world has such a hope in his virtues and such an opinion of his
magnanimity and such a conceit of his judgment and wit, that every
one confessed, that of very long time there was none raised up to
crown with a greater expectation. He was made the more agreeable
to the fancies of men by the consideration of his age…his excellent
feature and proportion of body, his great liberality and general
humanity…But especially he pleased greatly the nobility to whom
he transferred many singular and great favours.  

Based within the notion of Princely virtus was the Platonic conception of the
‘philosopher-ruler.’ This ruler was intelligent in legal and political disputes, showed fair
treatment of subjects, prudence, wisdom, intelligence and a clear understanding of one’s
position in society. Such a ruler must as well personify temperance, restraint and balance,
fortitude, clemency, and magnificence or expansive generosity, all of which Henry VIII
demonstrated, especially within his early reign.  

The Italian Renaissance influenced applied decoration through humanist teachings
of self-fashioning and representation. As Renaissance society shifted towards an
awareness of self – which can be located within the context of new technology
advancements in optics and growth of a consumer culture – such a refocusing of identity
awareness can be seen through the increased deceptions of self as a reflection of one’s
status that connects to the classical theories of magnificentia. Concurrently, the Italian
Renaissance humanist teachings and Italian Renaissance theories of princely
magnificence conflated with established notions of Burgundian magnificence, to create a
complex approach to display. The interior became not only a reflection of power, but also
a reflection of self during the sixteenth century. For the Renaissance humanist, the
classical virtue *magnificentia* was an Aristotelian philosophy that was valued as a princely virtue. As Aristotle wrote in his *Ethica Nicomadchea*, “Magnificence is an attribute of expenditures of the kind which we call honorable…A magnificent man will also furnish his house suitably to his wealth (for even a house is a sort of public ornament), and will spend what is becoming.”\(^{36}\) The resuscitation of classical theory was rapidly absorbed into the ideology of *magnificentia* as a desirable quality.

The theories of *magnificentia* were widely circulated by the sixteenth century. From Giovanni Pontano’s *The Virtue of Magnificence*, through Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae*, Leonardo Bruni’s *Preface to Book I Aristotelian Treatise on Economics, or Family Estate Management Addressed to Cosiomo de’ Medici* and Leon Battista Alberti’s *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, Renaissance intellectuals fostered and propagated the notion of *magnificentia*. Leonardo Bruni wrote, “Wealth is indeed useful, since it is both an embellishment for those who possess it, and the means by which they may exercise virtue.”\(^{37}\) *Magnificentia* was seen as a virtue within a Renaissance framework that was gained through various projects including the construction of churches, chapels, and palaces, as well as lavish festivals or entertainment.\(^{38}\) Accordingly, *magnificentia* was more than a display of wealth, but the display of one’s honor and virtue through expenditures for the betterment of society.

The expression of humanist teachings and the theories of *magnificentia* can be seen in Whitehall Palace’s ceremonial chambers through the specifically chosen ornamentation of antiquework. Distinctively, the alabaster wall-fountain within the privy chamber at Whitehall Palace demonstrates the utilization of Italian humanist theories in the interior. In part, the wall-fountain is an extension of Italian decoration within
England, since the Italian acquaio, or wall fountain with a built-in basin with an elaborate frame, was commonly found in the sala principale of Florentine palaces with a large fireplace in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth century. Such an alabaster wall-fountain, as well, correlates to humanist teachings focus on the natural sciences and contemplation of nature. As Jacopo Sannazaro, an Italian humanist poet wrote, “E chi dubita che piú non sia alle umane menti aggradevole una fontana che naturalmente esca dalle vive pietre, attorniata di verdi erbette…[And who doubts that it is not more agreeable to the human mind, than a natural fountain spring that comes from the living rock, surrounded by green herbs]”. The notion of the gratification from a fountain springing from rocks in combination with green gardens is reflected in the position of the stone wall-fountain in a chamber that overlooks the privy gardens, which by the 1540s included an Italian loggia.

The proliferation of Italian antique decoration within the ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace must be seen within the context of humanist philosophies. The simple application of grotesque decoration, on one level, reflected the a symbolic associations with a fashionable court culture established on Italian Renaissance theories of princely magnificence based from the Aristotelian philosophy of magnificentia. Furthermore, beyond the application of decoration itself, Italian Renaissance humanist teachings influenced the methodology of the interior as a manifestation of one’s self through the theory of magnificentia. Furthermore, Renaissance humanism produced awareness towards the idea of personal individualism and honor by means of its expression through material goods.
Thus, a Henrician style was created to emphasize Henry’s position as king through the application of Italian antiquework, which situated Henry as a modern and virtuous leader, in combination with Gothic architectural elements, which displayed Henry’s dynastic foundations through heraldry and religious and chivalric imagery. Additionally, the stylistic implications of the chivalric Gothic with Italian antiquework at Whitehall reflected Henry VIII’s intention to propagate a distinctively fashioned image to his courtiers. However, the ability to communicate such an image and representation would link to wider Renaissance cultural shifts based on contemporaneous notions of representation and persuasion.

*PERCEPTION & HENRICIAN INTERIOR OF PERSUASION*

Henry VIII used the Henrician style in his interiors of the Whitehall Palace ceremonial chambers in an attempt to foster a visual representation of himself for his courtiers. By examining Burgundian magnificence as a reflection of power through the display of wealth, merged with the Renaissance notions of princely virtue being shown through expenditures, underlying theories of representation emerge. The precise use of the stylistic elements reflects a particular moment in the Renaissance, when new theories of self, perception, and sight were being formed. In many ways, perception and representation were utilized as a symbolic device for displaying authority that can be considered a type of self-fashioning, or the cultivation an specific representation to be publicly displayed that is embed with symbolic associations to one’s self. Henry VIII’s ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace would make the most of such theories, specifically in reaction to his weakening ascendancy during the 1520s and 1530s, to reinforce his rightful position as King. As Henry VIII’s coffers increased with the
dissolution of the monasteries and his affection for decorative arts and architecture amplified, and societal shifts allowed for Henry to invest in a new market of self-fashioning and representation through the interior.\textsuperscript{42}

It is during the Renaissance that conception of sight, perspective, and portrayal became far more perceptible, particularly in art theory, scientific discovery, and linguistics. As Kevin Sharpe attests, “Europe of the Renaissance, early modern England, ubiquitously deployed a lexicon of sight and looking – of view, perspective, mirror, glass, regard, eye, portrayal and even gaze (Skelton is the first recorded user) because men and women were beginning to look at their world and themselves afresh and to be preoccupied with seeing and the arts of being seen.”\textsuperscript{43} It is during this period that there was a dialectical change in the approach towards personal identity and representation. As sixteenth century scholar, Desiderius Erasmus, stated “\textit{Homines non nassunter, sed funguntur.} [Men are not born, but fashioned.]”\textsuperscript{44} Such notions of self-fashioning are connected to the Renaissance theories of self-representation that can be commonly found within humanist literature.\textsuperscript{45} Baldassare Castiglione’s \textit{Book of the Courtier} asserts that the presentation of self was imperative; stating “the Courtier ought to take great care to make a good impression…”\textsuperscript{46} Whereas, Niccolò Machiavelli’s \textit{The Prince} states, “men are so simple and so ready to obey present necessities, that one who deceives will always find those who allow themselves to be deceived.”\textsuperscript{47} As Machiavelli argues and Castiglione implies, the power of impression or allusion were vital concepts within the European courts. In reaction, to such culture shifts, an increased attention was turned towards portraiture as a construction of visual identity, further representing the shifting understanding of self that occurred during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
An influencing example of self-fashioning through visual portraiture, in relation to self-fashioning in England, is Henry VII’s manipulation of his political representation. In tandem with Henry VII’s attempt to reinforce his young monarchy’s insecure possession of the throne, he cultivated the notorious image of Richard III as the embodiment of political and personal evil, juxtaposing Henry VII as the pious and orthodox prince in an effort to gain political support.48 As Sir Thomas More’s description of Richard III recorded:

Little of staure, ill fetured of limes, croke backed, his left shoulder much higher then his right…close and secrete, a deepe dissimuler, lowlye of counteyaunce, arrogant of heart, outwardly coumpinable [companionable] where he inwardely hated, not letting [hesitating] to kisse whome hee thoughte to kyll.49

When this commonly held description is compared with the portraits of Richard III, a disparity emerges. The portraits of Richard III modeled from life have no physical deformity and the singular portrait that seems to reflect this description has been alter after it was painted, during the reign of Henry VII, to give Richard malicious eyes and a deformed back.50 It is thought that Henry VII altered of the image of Richard III to display Richard’s moral evil through physical deformities. The underlying implication is that through self-fashioning, one can present one’s virtue or generate maliciousness as the embodiment of one’s genuine self. The court environment centered on self-fashioning and representation was one that Henry VIII was educated in, and in many ways watching his father’s struggles to hold on to power would greatly influence his own approach as king.

For Henry VIII’s constructed environment – within the ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace – to serve as a communicative form of power, depending on perception in order for the meaning to be properly communicated. It must be understood that
Henrician imagery and decoration was meant to convey in terms of a visual language, a form of communication that expressed direct messages and illocutionary acts, which are equivalent to verbal language that correlated interior decoration and associations.\textsuperscript{51} As previously seen, the application of chivalric Gothic within the chambers denote chivalric and a strong dynastic monarchy based on a historical foundation, whereas the utilization of Italian antiquework designs denotes modern fashion and Henry as a virtuous Renaissance prince. Both associations relate back to theories of magnificence and display as a form to reinforce authority.

Such evidence is moreover supported by the emphasis that sixteenth century intellectuals placed on sight as a key aspect of education. Richard Morison, a humanist who served Henry VIII explained, “into the comen people thynges sooner enter by theeies, then by the eares, remembryng moche better that they see, then that they heare.”\textsuperscript{52} It was commonly held that in seeing the physical representation of virtue was by which power and authority was best conveyed and remembered. Furthermore, the theory of using interiors, such as the Whitehall ceremonial chambers, as a form of education and persuasion during the sixteenth century can be distinguished in Sir Thomas Elyot’s 1531 *The Boke named the Governour*, which exposes the principles of persuasion and representation.

Semblable deckynge oughte to be in the house of a noble man or man of honour. I meane concernyge ornametes of halle and chambers, in Arise, painted tables, and images containing histories, wherein is represented some monument of vertue, moste connyngly wrought…wherby other men in beholdynge may be instructed, or at the lest wayes, to vertue persuaded.\textsuperscript{53}

According to Elyot the interior served the function of portraying the honor and virtue of the patron, and through that demonstration, the interior would edify the audience. The
association of sight with education is essentially linked with Henrician architecture and interior decoration as a communicative form of authority. For Henry VIII, the constructed environment that was created at Whitehall Palace within the semi-public ceremonials chambers served this function as a communicative act displaying the visual representation of his authority. Not only would Henry’s dress and action reflect upon his self; his architecture, interiors, and decoration would reinforce that same image and edify his court, thus reflecting his own virtue as the rightful king.

The use of self-fashioning for Henry VIII must further be seen within the context of Henry’s weakening power structure and the Protestant Reformation in England during the 1530s. It is notable that when Henry VIII inherited the throne from his father there was little need to immediately reinforce his authority. For as a young monarch, newly married with strong dynastic prospects and a stable sovereignty that was helped in part by the influence of Cardinal Wolsey, Henry had little need to utilize self-fashion an image as a way to emphasize his authority. Such a propositions correlate to the absence of building and lack of emphasis on the interior during his early reign.

However, once Henry’s political position began to weaken, as a consequence of his lack of a male heir coupled with unrest within the court that resulted in uprisings, he sought to politically control the situation through visual representation due to his lack of an effective military force. With Henry’s subsequent break from the Roman Catholic Church and establishment of the Protestant Church of England, it was essential for Henry to reaffirm his political and newly established religious position. As a consequence to the sociopolitical events after 1529, as the theory of kingship was drastically changed within
England, a meticulously coordinated approach to image-making was utilized that extended to the interior.\textsuperscript{54}

Distinctively, the Whitehall Palace ceremonial chambers, with their chivalric Gothic and Italian antiquework, were created after 1529 in order to present and reinforce Henry’s authority to legitimize his sovereignty the would communicate through persuasion to the intended audience of his courtiers. As new sixteenth century attitudes towards identity and representation were cultivated, based on the novel concepts of perception and persuasion, they became the foundation of Henry VIII’s method for displaying his authority to his court through architecture and decoration. With a genuinely Henrician methodology of authority and perception that used Gothic and Italian Renaissance decoration to created symbolic associations of historical authority and contemporaneous influence, Henry aligned himself with his historic ancestry and chivalric knight in tandem with the virtuous Renaissance Prince, as a unique representation reflected Henry VIII’s authority through magnificence and splendor.
It is necessary to be aware of the remarkable influx of influences within England from the Italian and French courts, especially in relation to design and decoration. One of the key means of exchange was through print; particularly in relation to design through the spread of pattern-books as evident by Henry VIII’s own small collection of pattern-books, many of which were probably architectural and ornamental designs. England had its own connection to Italy via diplomats such as the Venetian ambassador Sebastian Giustiniani to close relations with the Court of Urbino in northern Italy and Baldesar Castiglione, an Italian courtier, diplomat, and author. Through such means, humanist philosophies spread throughout Europe and in turn influenced England, greatly impacting theories of architecture, design, education, and government. Italians were a key part of the design and construction for Henry VII, Cardinal Wolsey, and Henry VIII. These artisans, Giovanni da Maiano, Denedetto da Rovezzano, Vincent Volpe, Anthony Toto, Gasparin de Gaffyn, Joannes de Padua, Nicholas Bellin, Girolamo da Treviso, and Nicolò da Milano to name a few, brought with them Italianate techniques and decoration that were used at chambers at Whitehall Palace. Additionally, it must be addressed that English design was greatly influenced from the Netherlands and Northern Germany, largely through political maneuverings and marriages. For more information see: Thurley, Simon. The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Center for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1993.

There are three stylistic categories of English Gothic: the Early English c. 1180-1275, The Decorated c. 1275-1380 (further broken into the “Geometric” style from 1250-90 and the “Curvilinear” style form 1290-1350), and the Perpendicular, also known as the international, Rectilinear or Late Gothic style, c. 1380-1520.


Additionally, the use of hammerbeam roofing in large principal rooms was a customary antiquated feature within many of Henry VIII’s royal residences, which were typically ornamented with richly moulded, decorative spandrels and tracery, and painted in traditional blue.

TNA: PRO E36/243, Oc.-Nov 1535.

Other early medieval ceilings are mostly variations on the Westminster model. Thus sometime, instead of wooden paterae, leaden decorations were popular. At Clarendon the flat ceiling was painted with bise (blue) and spangled with gilded lead starts. Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 231.

At Etham, Edwards IV had built a hammerbeam roof along the lines of Westminster Great Hall Thurley, The Royal Palaces of Tudor England, 232.

TNA: PRO E36/253 pp. 557, 589.

Colvin, 168. Additionally, andirons, clocks, chairs, rich hangings were all covered in Tudor iconography. Hayward, vol. 1, 29-31; Starkey ed, The Inventory of King Henry VIII, 287. At Henry VIII’s Hudson House, carpenters and joiners were paid for the wainscoted fitting and paneling of the watching chamber, as well as the decoration upon the fireplace painted of roses and antiques with gold details. Colvin, 155. For more information see: Bodleian, MS, Rawl. D 781, ff. 101-4, 113v-114; Bodleian, MS, Rawl. D 781, ff. 101-4, 113v-114; & TNA: PRO E101/465/2; L&P, vol. iii, viii, 250; iv (2), 3622 (27), 3991 (27).

Interestingly, King Cadwalader was said to have been exiled during his youth, only to rise up and attack the ruling Saxons and kill their king, placing Cadwalader as the new king. This story greatly parallels the rise of Henry VII to the throne of England.

“God and My Right”


Wagner, 123-34.


17 It was Edward IV of England who instigated the development of magnificence in England after 1460 after he was forced to take sanctuary within the Burgundy court under Charles the Bold. Upon Edward’s return to England, he integrated Burgundian chivalric and magnificence influences within the English court. As Edward IV renamed two principal departments within the royal house, following the Burgundian practice, the *House of Providence* and the *House of Magnificence*. Lloyd and Thurley, *Images of a Tudor King*, 14.

18 Smith, “Portable Propaganda Tapestries as Princely Metaphors at the Courts of Philip the Good and Charles the Bold” *Art Journal*, vol. 48, 125.

19 Vaughan, 128.

20 Smith, 125.

21 Other contemporaneous authors indicate the spread of magnificence through literary sources from Guillaume Fillastre’s *La Toison d’or* dating from 1470 to John Skelton’s play *Magnyfycence: A Moral Play* published in 1516, who defines magnificence as the physical appearance of power by properly measured liberality.


24 Starkey ed., *The Inventory of Henry VIII*, item no. 13337, no. 8906. and no. 15377. Furthermore, Henry VIII owned several items in relation to King Arthur, such as a table with the pictures of Arthurus Rex Agnliea, at The More were “fourer peces [of arras] of historie of Arthur”, and there was a “Cope of grene vellat with wheat Eares Crownes and Crosses called king Arthures Cope orphrased with nedell work”. On example, *Lancelot du Lac*, written and illuminated in France around 1300 and soon after migrated to England, which was one of a number of Arthurian romances in French that Henry VIII inherited As we know from a French visitor, Palamède Gontier who included it on a list of books in the library at Richmond Palace in 1535. Starkey, *Henry VIII: Man and Monarch*, 33. Upon Philip the Fair of Burgundy’s visit, Henry VII gave him a tour of Richmond. As a contemporary account describes, at Richmond Palace where images of the noble kings of past decorated his hall, “the noble kings of this realm in harness and robes of gold, as Brutus, Hengist, King William Rugus, King Arthur [and] King Henry [VII]…with swords in their hands, appearing like bold and valiant knights.” Weir, *Henry VIII and His Court*, 114.


26 Furthermore, art historian Tatiana String argues that Henry VIII’s figure within the mural has been arranged in two triangles, which coverage and directs the gaze to Henry’s codpiece. She also notes that by comparison with other portraits, the elaborately decorated and contrastingly colored codpiece worn by Henry in the mural is even more overt and bulging than normal. String, 71-72. The position of the arms has been labeled by Joaneath Spicer as “the Renaissance elbow,” a pose utilized throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to convey significant theme of masculinity, in tandem with the present of his beard. Joaneath Spicer, “The Renaissance Elbow” in *A Cultural History of Gesture*, ed. J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg, Cambridge, 1991: 84-128. Importance of the beard as a ubiquitous motif in visual and literary
works of this period as an indicator of masculinity. W. Fisher, “The Renaissance Beard: Masculinity in the

27 Strong, 72. For more information see: Rona Goffen, “Carpaccio’s Portrait of a Knight: Identity and
Meaning,” Vrte veneta, vol. 37 (1983): 37-48. Similar Henrician imagery was the widely circulated during
the sixteenth century, which depicts Henry VIII within a comparable stance and representation that
emphasized his authority as the King and head of the English Church. Within the miniature Solomon and
the Queen of Sheba Henry is depicted as Solomon located within the focal point of the image in the same
wide shouldered hand upon hips position. The words above him state “Blessed be the Lord thy God which
delighteth in three to set thee on his throne, to be king for the Lord they God.” What the imagery and text
denote is the association of Henry and Solomon, whom Henry used as a model for his kingship due to
Solomon’s direct relationship with God without the mediation of the Church. Portrayed in the pages from
the Psalter of Henry VIII is a similar depiction of Henry as semi-divine status, however now of David,
God’s elect was the prefect biblical personage to promote the supreme Head of the Church. Though such
deceptions would have been for private complementation, other would have been widely circulated. The
frontispiece of the Great Bible of 1539, which was conceived as a carefully constructed diagram of how the
new Royal Supremacy affected the populace, as well as the representation of the Word of God transmitting
through Henry to the people that in turns personifies the new idea of kingship that would have been widely
circulated. String, 54; Lloyd and Thurley, 32. In terms of the populace, the introduction of the printing
press in England in 1477 had huge influence. What is of specific importance is the depiction of Henry
within the Great Bible, placed within the upper center. Following the trend of placing himself within
religious contexts, as seen through his depiction of Solomon, David, and relation to the Story of Abraham
tapestries, Henry is positioned as the Word of God seated upon an English Throne. Additionally, when
compared with other circulated imagery, from coins, the Royal Plea, and printed sources, Henry reminds
depicted in the model Holbein established through his private portraiture, such as the Whitehall Mural.
Lloyd and Thurley, 29.

28 A similar process of visual association with Westminster Abbey was used in the construction of the
modern day Parliamentary buildings, adjacent to Westminster Abbey. Parliament creates a visual
correlation through the use of similar decorative and architectural features that established the
Parliamentary building in reference to the historic power invested in Westminster Abbey, as well as the
associations of Gothic as a from national identity within England.

29 Bülow, 23.

30 Colvin, 104. At Hudson House, glaziers were charged “for diverse and sondrie wyngdowys aswell in all
the king’s new losgyngs, galerye and closets, as in all the qyndowis in the grounde chambers under the
same and with the making ofht king’s arms, poises, badges and bendis sett and lasid in the seid wyndowys
and also with the setting repayring and amendingy of the king’s old glasse in diverse other palces”. TNA:
PRO E101/465/20; L&P, vol. viii, 250, vol. iv, 3622 (27), 3991 (27); Colvin, 155-156. For more
information see: Bodleian Library MS Rawl. D 780, ff. 23, 25v, 36;

31 TNA: PRO E36/236 p.95; TNA: PRO E36//236, p. 95, 107v, 116, 118v, 131.

32 Campbell, 205.

33 Weir, Henry VIII and His Court, 145.

34 Raphael Holinshed, Holinshed’s Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland, vol. III London: Johnson,
1807-1808), 611.

35 Glenn Richardson, Renaissance Monarchy: The Reigns of Henry VIII, Francis I and Charles V (London:
Arnold, 2002), 25.

IV.2, 1122a-1123a.

37 Leonardo Bruni, Preface to Book I of the Aristotelian Treatise on Economics, or Family Estate
Management Addressed to Cosimo de’ Medici in The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts, ed. and

38 “The concept of magnificence was by far the most frequently cited rationale for building in fifteenth-century Italy. The point of departure was Aristotle's notion; found also in Aquinas, that the virtuous use of money consisted in expenditures for religious, public, and private things if they were permanent.... The humanists took full possession of this classical notion that buildings as permanent private monuments adorning public space assured the fame that great and worthy men seek.” Richard Goldthwaite, Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300-1400 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 220-221. “At the center of the humanist justification of the social value of wealth was the concept of magnificence, the visual expression of a man's inherent worth that gained him respect, friendship, and authority. Magnificence was a public concept expressed in display --in elaborate ceremony and in possessions, above all, buildings. As enduring private monuments that adorned public space, buildings assured the fame that great men seek.” Richard Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence: An Economic and Social History (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), 83.

39 There are two contemporaneous acquaio from Florence that still survive, one from the Girolami Palazzo c. 1500 and the other from the Palazzo Fossombroni c. 1527-34 [fig. 20 and 21]. Moreover, a treatise by Antonio Averlino, known as Filarete, Trattato dii architettura from Milan c. 1460-64, a section and illustrations on the Italian acquaio.Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Denis, At Home in Renaissance Italy (London: Victorian and Albert Museum, 2006), 284 and 286.


42 Henry, with the revenues from the transfer of the Church wealth to the Crown, was suddenly the richest king ever to sit upon the throne. His disposable income increased by 500 per cent. Thurley, Whitehall Palace: The Official Illustrated History, 28.

43Sharpe, 129.


45 Such can be seen within the Neo-Latin humanism focus on modeling their reputation in society from private letters and autobiography, which were privileged for this humanism game of self-fashion. Stephen Gersh and Bert Roset, Medieval and Renaissance Humanism: Rhetoric, Representation and Reform (Leiden, BRILL, 2003), xiii.


50 Furthermore, an X-ray analysis on one of Richard III famous portraits reveals that his deformed shoulder was originally much lower and the eyes were manipulated after it was painted, implying that after his death the painting was altered to create a new image of Richard. John N. King, Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis (Princeton: Princeton University press, 1989), 22-23.

51 “Qualities, properties, relations, actions, states, or dispositions’ represent attributions which in a verbal utterance could conveyed through adjectives, adverbs and relative clause.” Which in turn link to

52 *A persuasion to the Kyng that the laws of the realm shulde be in Latin*, often referred to as the ‘Discourse on Law’ Morison, *A persuasion*, fol. 19r. String, 2. For more information see: British Museum/British Library, Royal MS 18. A.L., fils 14v-19r.


54 Lloyd and Thurley, 25.
CONCLUSION

HENRY VIII: INTERIORS OF PERSUASION
THE CEREMONIAL CHAMBERS OF WHITEHALL PALACE

Upheavals, religious discord, political maneuvering, and personal intrigue marked King Henry VIII’s reign, all revolving around his tremulous relationship with contested reign. In turn, his volatile reign would manifest itself in his affinity and methodology for communicating his rightful supremacy. Henry’s presented environment in the watching, presence, and privy chambers at his key palace of Whitehall utilized contemporary theories of magnificence in tandem with display and spectacle as a communicative form of power. Influenced by his father’s struggle with power and his own attempt at promoting the newly found Tudor dynasty, Henry culled elements traditional to his family from the past and related them with the advanced fashion of his contemporaries. Thus, a Henrician style was created that applied innovative Italian Renaissance antiquework designs and humanist philosophies to established chivalric Gothic architecture and overt heraldry. Specifically, the watching, presence, and privy chambers at Whitehall Palace reveal the image that Henry VIII desired to propagate, as well as the theories of representation and persuasion during the sixteenth century. For it was through viewership of such chambers that one would be edified of Henry’s sovereignty.

Henry VIII’s approach to maintaining his sovereignty did not lie exclusively on structures of power through force, but an authority gained through a cultural construction that reinforced the king’s legitimacy through his presented representation. As Henry was unable to produce a legitimate male heir and his marriage to Catherine of Aragon dissolved around the weakening of his own ascendancy, he was forced to substitute his power for that of perceived supremacy. As a political vacuum was created with the fall of
Cardinal Thomas Wolsey and Henry’s royal authority disappeared, his affection for architecture and interior decoration coincided with key political and social events of the 1520s and 1530s. Whitehall Palace was the most important expression of Henry’s use of a Henrician style to influence his courtiers. As the official seat of government within England, it was within Whitehall’s ceremonial chambers that the created Henrician environment is best exemplified. In the reconstruction of the architecture and decorative elements presented here, the political meanings of such decoration can be gained.

The first chamber, the watching or guardroom, was large and lavish. Decorated with a huge stained glass bay window, historic narratives presented through tapestries, an Italian inspired batten ceiling decorated with the badges of Henry, and carved wall-paneling, this chamber would be the courtier’s first steps towards the king. The next within the sequence was the presence chamber with its symbolic seat of authority comprised of a velvet chair and cushion with gold trimmed cloth of the estate, tapestries would be hung over highly ornate wall-paneling, with a great fireplace decorated with the arms of Henry held by an immense stone dragon. Finally, after passing through a small gallery, one would enter the privy chamber, with ornately gilded wall-paneling, antique themed tapestries, a fireplace with corresponding wall-fountain encrusted in pearls, and a ceiling that would bolster the arms of the king. Most importantly, the impressive Whitehall Mural would dominate the space sending a visual representation of power and dynastic fortitude. All three of these chambers would spare no expense, hung with textiles, ornamented in gold gilt and paint, set with fireplaces with decorative mantels, lit by stained glass windows were the gold threaded tapestries and gilded antiquework wall-paneling with matching cornice would glitter. Tudor arch windows, doorways, and
fireplaces would be decorated with overt heraldry, while quatrefoils and tracery would insert an ornamental element in the ceremonial interior.

It is important that these three ceremonial chambers of Whitehall Palace were conceived in a specific context of sixteenth century attitudes towards identity and representation, which were rooted within the novel concept of perception and persuasion. Such methodologies for decoration of the interior relate to the underlying philosophies of display and princely magnificence. As one’s appearance was commonly thought to reflect one’s status, the extrinsic reflected the intrinsic. The self-fashioning a symbolic representation within Henry’s ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace were used in an effort to persuade Henry’s courtiers and ambassadors. The self-fashioning of the Henrician image correlates to the king’s propagandistic self-fashioning, as in response to the break from the Catholic Church and creation of a new Church of England. Similar methodologies were utilized to form a representation of Henry through imagery and a display of wealth, by means of identifiable features, emblematic associations, and a conflation of dynastic heraldic devices and fashionable icons. As Henry aligned himself with his historic ancestry and chivalric associations in tandem with the imagery of a virtuous Renaissance Prince, a particularly chosen representation was developed.

If we think about the ways in which we view Henry VIII today, through his image and historical impact, it rarely aligns with the factual historical and political narrative. For Henry was able to manipulate his image to one of a dominating power and force so considerable that even today we hold him to those standards. Within our minds, Henry is a massive figure of political and sexual intrigue. This image of Henry VIII is still reflected in the Whitehall Mural, standing wide legs and broad shouldered, staring
directly towards the viewer. His massive figure is garbed in the finest fabrics, bejeweled in all of his majesty, a predominate codpiece at the focal point. He is placed within the dynastic context of his family within an interior evocative of an Italian Renaissance interior with heraldry scattered throughout a chivalric Gothic architectural structure. The ceremonial chambers of the watching, presence, and privy chambers at Whitehall Palace equally reflect the image of Henry VIII through stylistic associations that are represented in this mural, one of supremacy and dynastic promise.
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Whitehall Palace is marked *Westmynfter hall*, on the lower left side. To the right of the marked *Kinges Streate*, is the privy gallery range looking over the privy gardens. This is the earliest and most accurate view of Tudor Whitehall to survive. The placement of Whitehall Palace near Westminster Abbey, which can be seen lower left, and near the Thames River made it an ideal location for the office seat of the monarchy and royal government.
FIGURE 1.2 - Site Maps of Phases of Building at Whitehall Palace: Site Map Whitehall Palace, 1528-29.
Site Map Whitehall Palace, 1530-32.
Site Map of Whitehall Palace, First Floor Plan, 1547.

The setting possibly represents a genuine interior, located on the first-floor of Whitehall Palace within the king’s lodgments. Apart from the figure of Jane Seymour, who appears on the right of Henry, the figures of Princess Mary, Prince Edward VI, King Henry VIII, and Princess Elizabeth all seem to have been painted from life. This painting gives a wonderful indication of a Henrician interior, with it’s gilded wall-paneling, coffered ceiling, painted-tiled floor, and clothe of the estate.

FIGURE 2.2 - Black Book of the Garter, recording the garter ceremonies of 1534. Illuminated register on vellum.

Anti-clockwise from top left: Henry VIII enthroned and seated on a carpeted dais with a Cloth of the Estate, surrounded by knights. Second, the knights process to the chapel down a long tiled hall. In the third, the knights processed down a hall. The final shows the arrival of three new junior knights. The interiors of these scenes display wall-paneling decorated with grotesques decorations, fretted ceilings, floors plastered and painted or tilted.
This is an Elizabethan rendering of a Henrician royal interior. However, the paneling, bossed ceiling decoration, and plastered and painted floor pattern parallels surviving interiors at Hampton Court Palace. Additionally, the wall hangings and throne canopy are comparable to contemporaneous Henrician interior images, such as *The Family of Henry VIII* and *Solomon and the Queen of Sheba*. 
The mural is estimated at approximately 270x360cm. The final version displays Henry VII on the back-left across from his wife and Henry VIII’s mother, Elizabeth of York positioned in the back right. On the front-left is Henry VIII across from Jane Seymour, his third wife and the mother to his only legitimate male heir, who died in 1537 – shortly before the completion of this mural. Additionally, the background is a highly classical interior with Italian pilasters decorated in grotesques work, which is almost an exact copy of similar pilasters from Domenico Ghirlandaio, Birth of the Virgin. Moreover, the background of this mural is architectural similar to Bernardo Prevedari after Bramante, Architectural Fantasy, engraving. It is also possible that this mural fix into the design program of the Whitehall privy chamber, in that it was placed within the room and the architectural features, such as the cornice, could have reflected the actual interior.

This is the only surviving fragment of the cartoon for the Whitehall Mural, which measures 257x137cm. The difference between the cartoon and the Lempput version is the King’s face, which is turned towards the viewer in the finished version, heightening his power within the composition.
**Figure 2.5** - ‘Wolsey Rooms’ wall-paneling, c. 1526. Carved oak. Hampton Court Palace, Surrey.

These are three examples from the ‘Wolsey Rooms’ at Hampton Court Palace. The wall-paneling replicates folded fabric and could be manipulated into different designs. Additionally, gold-gilt detailing would commonly been added to enhance the effects of the paneling, as can be viewed in the *Family of Henry VIII*.

**Figure 2.6** - Doorway from the Great Hall. Hampton Court Palace, Surrey.

This detail from the doorway leading from the Great Hall to the Great Watching Chamber at Hampton Court Palace, demonstrates the typical Henrician treatment of carved and painted heraldic decoration, as well as the ubiquitous Tudor Arch.
Figure 2.7 - Fireplace, c. 1530s, St. James’s, Westminster.

This fireplace was found in the Guard or Watching Chamber at St. James’s Palace, it still retains its original paint and gives a wonderful example of the typical fireplace and its colorful decoration.

Figure 2.8 - Fireplace and doorway for Catherine of Aragon’s presence chamber, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey.

Cardinal Wolsey commissioned this fireplace for Catherine of Aragon’s presence chamber at Hampton Court Palace. Though the original paint has been lost, it does grant an idea of the size and carved stonework of the typical fireplace, as well as its relationship with the doorway next to it.
**FIGURE 2.9** - *Henry VIII Dining*, unknown artist, late sixteenth-century. Pena and brown ink with grey wash on paper.

The interior suggests that this is a late sixteenth-century drawing and is unlikely to represent an actual Henrician interior. Additionally, the scene displays the typical cloth of the estate and the display buffet on the far right with different trinkets displayed upon it. However, the scene shows the king’s dining habits during the 1540s, being served by his Gentlemen.
FIGURE 2.10 - Aerial Plan of the Ceremonial Chambers & Speculative Recreation of Watching Chamber.

Aerial Plan of the Ceremonial Chambers

Recreation of Watching Chamber, Floor Plan.
Recreation of Watching Chamber, North Wall.

Recreation of Watching Chamber, West-North Wall.

Recreation of Watching Chamber, West Wall.
Recreation of Watching Chamber, South-West Wall.

Recreation of Watching Chamber, South Wall.

Recreation of Watching Chamber, South-East Wall.
These speculative recreations are based on the surviving inventories and a comparative analysis of remaining Henrician ceremonial chambers. They have been created to better understanding the environment within these chambers. Within the watching chamber, the fireplace is based on a design attributed to Hans Holbein the Younger that is thought to have been within the ceremonial chambers at Whitehall Palace. The tapestries are Henry VIII’s *Story of David* that are recorded as being located at Whitehall Palace. The wall-paneling is based on the paneling from the ‘Wolsey Rooms’ at Hampton Court Palace, since this is the first and largest, the paneling chosen was linefold paneling. The ceiling is from the Hampton Court Palace’s Great Watching Chamber’s ceiling that was built around the same time. The flooring within the watching chamber would have been most likely painted wood. The windows and doorways are all from Hampton Court Palace, the bay window based on the Great Bay Window in the Great Watching Chamber from Hampton Court. According to the records, crimson and purple would have commonly been displayed within these chambers. They must also be envisioned with several guards in red grabs and nobles waiting to see the king.
The sketch shows the crenellated gable end and great window of the watching chamber on the left, built from 1515-1516 by Cardinal Thomas Wolsey. Additionally, the gable of the Great Hall, built between 1528-1529, and the towers of the chapel can be viewed. On the lower right is the west end of the presence chamber, with its west-facing window.
FIGURE 2.12 - Reconstruction Cross-Section of the Whitehall Palace in 1547.

Specifically this displays works by Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, from 1528-29. From the left to right, can be viewed Henry VIII’s privy garden, the watching chamber from 1515-16, the south wall of the great hall with chequerwork, the gallery to the chapel, the south wall of the pew of the chapel and the privy kitchen.


Both of these ceilings display the characteristic wood design with molded strips and batons. Within the ‘Wolsey Rooms,’ the ceiling molded strips contain grotesque decorations, whereas the ceiling from the Great Watching Chamber is made of gold leather maché with the heraldic badges of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour.
This fireplace is a two-storey chimney, decorated with grotesques and royal badges. Due to its size and grandeur, it is furthermore consistent with what would have been expected within the state chambers at Whitehall Palace, though it is not known what palace this design was intended for. It does give an indication of the later designs that could have been employed within Whitehall, as well as the proliferation of classical Italian influence in the interior.
**FIGURE 2.16** - Aerial Plan of the Ceremonial Chambers & Speculative Recreation of Presence Chamber.

Aerial Plan of the Ceremonial Chambers

![Aerial Plan of the Ceremonial Chambers](image1)

Recreation of Presence Chamber, Floor Plan.

![Recreation of Presence Chamber](image2)
Recreation of Presence Chamber, North Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, West-North Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, West Wall.
Recreation of Presence Chamber, South-West Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, South Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, South-East Wall.
Recreation of Presence Chamber, East Wall.

These speculative recreations are based on the surviving inventories and a comparative analysis of remaining Henrician ceremonial chambers. They have been created to better understanding the environment within these chambers. For the presence chamber, the fireplace is based off a fireplace from the later sixteenth century and is in wood, however it has the arms of Henry held by a dragon as the inventory stated in stone. The paneling within this chamber is painted with the arms of Henry, based off a surviving bed paneling with the Arms of Henry and Anne of Cleves. The tapestries are a few from the *Story of Abraham*, a set that was located at Whitehall Palace. The cloth of the estate is based from the painting *The Family of Henry VIII*, with the cloth directly from the painting and the x-frame chair constructed from surviving items. The ceiling is from Hampton Court Palace’s Wolsey Closet, which displays the feathers of Henry’s son, Edward VI, and the arms of Henry VIII. The windows and doorways are based from surviving examples at Hampton Court Palace.
**FIGURE 2.17** - Design for an interior with the Arms of Henry VIII, attributed to Nicholas Bellin of Modena, c. 1545. Pen and ink.

This is the only surviving architectural drawing of a Henrician interior. It is likely that this drawing was intended for a room in Whitehall Palace. Additionally, one must note the strong French Mannerist influences within the design.

**FIGURE 2.18** - The Ceiling of the Wolsey Closet, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey.

The highly decorated molded ceiling of the Wolsey Closet displays the Prince of Wales feathers, which dates the ceiling to after the birth of Edward VI in 1537. Such decoration was similar to plates from the fourth book displaying ceiling designs from Sebastino Serlio’s *Regole General di Architettura*. 
**Figure 2.19** - Aerial Plan of Ceremonial Chambers & Speculative Recreation of Privy Chamber. Recreation:

Aerial Plan of the Ceremonial Chambers

Recreation of Presence Chamber, Floor Plan.
Recreation of Presence Chamber, North Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, West-North Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, West Wall.
Recreation of Presence Chamber, South-West Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, South Wall.

Recreation of Presence Chamber, South-East Wall.
Recreation of Presence Chamber, East Wall.

These speculative recreations are based on the surviving inventories and a comparative analysis of remaining Henrician ceremonial chambers. They have been created to better understanding the environment within these chambers. For the privy chamber, the paneling is based off the Family of Henry VIII, as well as the cloth of the estate, with the cloth directly from the painting and the x-frame chair constructed from surviving items. The fireplace is from a surviving fireplace from Hampton Court Palace made for the presence chamber of Catherine of Aragon’s lodgings. The wall-fountain is from one of the few surviving Italian Renaissance fountains, from Florence. The ceiling is from Hampton Court Palace’s Wolsey Closet, which displays the feathers of Henry’s son, Edward VI, and the arms of Henry VIII. The windows and doorways are based on surviving examples at Hampton Court Palace. The flooring is from a surviving fragment of rush matting uncovered at Hampton Court Palace from the sixteenth century. The mural is from the copy by Remigius van Leemput after Hans Holbein the Younger. Finally, the titles around the fireplace are from another example of surviving Henrician titles.
Currently, the Great Hall at Hampton Court Palace displays the sixteenth century Flemish tapestries of *The Story of Abraham*. What is important to note is the use of the richly carved hammer-beam roof that would have been originally painted, the large stained-glass windows, which replicate an almost Gothic cathedral atmosphere within the room.
This window, located on the left wall of the Great Hall at Hampton Court Palace, was a two-story mullioned bay window upon a dais with forty-eight lights that would light the king’s seat. Decorated with diamond stained glass windowpanes and finished with a remarkable carved fan vaulting and arch moldings all of which echoing typified architectural features of religious architecture with Perpendicular Gothic elements, particular in comparison of Henry VII Our Lady Chapel, Westminster Abbey.
The barrel vault ceiling in the nave of the Carlisle Cathedral displays the traditional blue and gold ceiling decoration that was common within Gothic interiors, religious and secular. Furthermore, the stained glass window on the east wall is comparable to the stained glass windows that appear within the Great Hall at Hampton Court Palace.
FIGURE 3.4 - South Cloisters, The Gloucester Cathedral, or the Cathedral Church of St. Peter and the Holy and Indivisible Trinity. Founded in 678-679, Gloucester, England.

The great stained glass window on the west front entrance parallels the stained glass windows that appear within the Great Hall at Hampton Court Palace. The South cloister feature elaborate fan vaulted roof, similar to the fan vaulting use within Henrician interiors and bay window treatments.
**Figure 3.5** - Henry VII's Our Lady Chapel, Westminster Abbey, 1503.

Done in the Perpendicular Gothic style by Henry VII, with pendant fan vaulted ceiling, decorated spandrels, clerestory windows, and stained glass, all surfaces are adorned with Tudor heraldry to reflect the patronage. Such decoration as incorporated into Henry VIII’s interiors, which can be viewed as a reflected of such elements from his father’s Chapel.
Such a ceiling design for Henry VII displays the use of batten oak ribs with decorative rose bosses that are placed upon a carved background. It was most likely painted and gilded. Additionally, the ceiling represents the impressive Gothic within the court of Henry VII.
Henry VIII is presented in a similar pose to the *Whitehall Mural*, placed upon a Turkish rug with an elaborately detailed cloth of gold behind him. This pose, a chivalric knightly one, was derived from fifteenth century knightly and religious imagery.
The wide leg stance, wide shoulders, and direct outward stare are reminiscent of the stance of Henry VIII in *Henry VIII* and the *Whitehall Mural*. 
Similarly, the wide legs and wide shoulders, as well as the hand placement are like the stance of Henry VIII in *Henry VIII* and the *Whitehall Mural*, reflecting a pose as if he were in armor himself.