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One of the most distinguishable features of Henry VIII’s reign was the meticulous use of architecture and the interior to instatiate his supremacy as King of England. This research uses the king’s Privy Chamber, a private apartment in the royal apartments, at Whitehall Palace as the paradigmatic example to critically assess the Henrician interior in an interdisciplinary study. Through an examination of the primary accounts and records, inventories, archaeological studies and visual evidence from extant interiors and visual representations, this essay digitally reconstructs the Whitehall Privy Chamber to analyze its function. The creation of digital reconstructions of the Whitehall Privy Chamber reveals tangible evidence allowing us to understand the Henrician interior as a holistic space that simultaneously aligned Henry VIII with his historic ancestry and imagery of the virtuous Renaissance Prince.
Introduction

Once situated along the banks of the Thames River, just north of Westminster, Whitehall Palace epitomized the architectural magnificence of the court of Henry VIII (1491-1547, ruling from 1509 until his death). Unfortunately, the splendor of Whitehall was lost when a fire destroyed most of the palace in 1698. Nevertheless, a trace of the palace’s extraordinary nature is evident in an account of Whitehall from 1531 by Mario Savorgnano, Count of Belgrade. Savorgnano describes “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.” Evident in this early account is the architectural brilliance that Whitehall once embodied as a royal palace in the 1530s-1540s.

Of all the Whitehall interiors, the most difficult to study is the king’s Privy Chamber, due to the lack of accounts and records related to this room. However, as a case study in the application of digital recreations, the Privy Chamber becomes exemplary as a way to analyze fragmentary evidence associated with the king’s Privy Chamber at Whitehall through a technological lens. The value in analyzing digital recreations also lies in the Privy Chamber’s function in Whitehall. Although the Privy Chamber was originally a secluded place in the palace, the function of the Privy Chamber expanded during the reign of Henry VIII. 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. The Privy Chamber became increasingly used for important audiences and ceremonies. In March 1542, the ennoblement of Sir John Dudley as Viscount Lisle took place in the Privy Chamber, and in February 1544 the Duke of Najera was received there as well. Furthermore, the shift in function of the Privy Chamber can be seen in that a new extended privy lodging that was subsequently built at Whitehall. The Privy Chamber in Whitehall Palace was therefore a space designed to foster a representation of Henry VIII as authoritative, knowledgeable, and vital for his courtiers who would have access to the chamber.

Although aspects of Whitehall’s architectural footprint have been collected and analyzed by scholars such as Roy Strong and Simon Thurley, the current state of digital technology allows for new and innovative ways to visualize Henrician interiors such as that of the Privy Chamber. In my use of archival research and archaeological evidence to digitally reconstruct the king’s Privy Chamber at Whitehall, I argue that the Henrician interior operated as a communicative space in which Henry VIII’s authority was demonstrated. Moreover, the architectural and decorative features of the Privy Chamber at Whitehall reinforced Henry VIII’s sovereignty through an iconographic program which merged antique designs and Gothic forms in an architectural allegory of his role as king.

Whitehall Palace: The Privy Chamber

Whitehall Palace was acquired by King Henry VIII around 1529 as a result of the downfall of Cardinal Wolsey, the Archbishop of York. Henry VIII ordered a significant reconstruction of the palace immediately upon gaining Whitehall. As Thomas Alvard wrote to the king in 1532, “glad i am that his graces buyldings here in westminster… there shall lak no diligence daye no nyght
according to his grace is pleasure.” Simon Thurley’s work has outlined that there were two building phases at Whitehall Palace under Henry VIII’s patronage. The first of which took place from 1530 to 1532 and the second from 1537 until Henry VIII’s death in 1547. It was during the first phase that improvements to the residential lodgings were undertaken which included the restructuring of the king’s Privy Chamber.

The king’s Privy Chamber was part of a sequence of the king’s private lodgings located on the first floor at the center of the palace (Fig. 1). Archaeological surveys indicate that the chamber was approximately six by fourteen meters with a doorway positioned on the north wall joining to the king’s Presence Chamber, a ceremonial reception room, by way of a small gallery. In the south wall, there was a doorway linked to an additional sequence of private apartments. There was also a doorway on the east wall that connected to a stair turret that gave access to a garderobe below. Thurley notes that given the archaeological plan of the Privy Chamber, the windows would have most likely been located on the west wall. Additionally, according to Thurley’s interpretation of the archeological plans of the Privy Chamber, he argues that the fireplace would have most likely been positioned against the east wall. From these excavation records, a basic architectural template materializes. By exploring characteristic interiors from the period via surviving palaces, archival records, inventories, and extant paintings that depict Henrician interiors, a documentary library may be assembled on the customary decorative features, which supports certain stylistic selections used for the digital renderings.

The Architectural Interior of the Privy Chamber

The interior of the king’s Privy Chamber at Whitehall can be broken into two categories: that of design (floors, walls, and ceilings) and the furnishings. Henrician floors were customarily oak covered in plaster. These were then painted over in geometric patterns or tiled and covered with rush mats and textiles. Because the king’s Privy Chamber was located on the first floor, it would likely have been painted oak that could have been covered with rush mats scented with herbs. For example, observable in the group portrait The Family of Henry VIII (Fig. 2) is just such a red, white, and black geometric patterned flooring. Notably, the architectural decorations in The Family of Henry VIII suggests that this interior may be a fanciful rendering of the king’s privy lodgings at Whitehall Palace. Thurley has argued...
that visible through the archways in the background of the painting are the Whitehall privy garden on the left with low flower beds next to Princess Mary’s lodgings and on the right a sliver of the turret of the great closed tennis court, which are known through archeological evidence found at Whitehall. The Family of Henry VIII is therefore helpful in its connection to Whitehall, even if it is a whimsical interpretation, especially when placed alongside other paintings of interiors and archival records.

Based on evidence from other palace Privy Chambers, the Privy Chamber would likely have included similar wall paneling and decorative ceiling as seen in The Family of Henry VIII. Characteristically, the king’s chambers were typically done in linenfold wall-paneling which covered the full wall from the floor to the cornice, or up to the wainscoting, and a coffered ceiling. For instance, in the king’s Privy Chamber at Greenwich Palace, Richard Ridge was paid to panel the chamber, framing and fitting new jole pieces [wall-plates] in 1537. After the paneling was installed, John Hethe decorated the paneling with gilt and gold. The similarities between this Greenwich account reference to added gold and gilt decoration and the wall-paneling with gold embellishments in the background of The Family of Henry VIII helps to establish a visual example that is reinforced in the archival documents.

Henrician ceilings were typically a coffered design painted in blue and red with rich gilding and the predominate Tudor Rose. At Greenwich Palace in 1537, Henry VIII ordered new battens for the Privy Chamber’s ceiling and cornice in antique work. Stylistically popular, antiquework derived from the rediscovery of ancient Roman wall paintings from the Domus Aurea and commonly consisted of motifs of arabesque or grotesque decorative patterns and fantastic figures. A brilliant example of the integration of antiquework into interior decoration is visible in the classicizing cornice and columns in The Family of King Henry VIII and on the cornice and pilasters in the Whitehall Mural (Fig. 3). Furthermore, antiquework would also appear in the ceiling designs. Such can be seen in the gilded grotesquework embellishing the geometric fretted ceiling in the Wolsey Closet at Hampton Court Palace (Fig. 4) with its gilded timber frets and

Figure 2. Unknown, The Family of Henry VIII, ca. 1545. Oil on Canvas, 141 x 355 cm. Royal Collection Trust / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2017.
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Heraldic badges, a ceiling design similar to that which is seen in The Family of Henry VIII.21

Doorframes and windows were regularly decorated in the Henrician interior. Doorframes were commonly constructed of stone and done in plain chamfered moldings designed around the prominent Tudor arch.22 A surviving doorframe, located at Hampton Court Palace (Fig. 5), contains a carved and painted image of a lion and rouge dragon holding the English crown and the arms surrounded by antiquework in the spandrels of the doorframe.23 Windows would be either clerestory, placed above the cornice, or placed lower along the wall. An account from Greenwich Palace in 1537 reveals that in the king’s Privy Chamber windows were decorated with antiquework on the jambs with five antique heads.24 Although an idea of the type of doorway and windows can be derived from these examples, there is a lack of specific information regarding the king’s Privy Chamber at Whitehall and whether the windows would have been clerestory or not, a question that will be explored later.25

Decorating and Furnishing the Privy Chamber

In the account records, there are a few known items that would have been in the Privy Chamber at Whitehall. One account from Whitehall Palace describes the renovation of a fireplace in the Privy Chamber and states that “ffrenche men” worked on the front of the chimney for the king’s Privy Chamber.26 According to Thurley “ffrenche men” may imply a fireplace with stucco-duro or plaster reliefs which derived from a style commonly seen at Château de Fontainebleau.27 Furthermore, royal fireplaces would have typically fused antiquework beside internal stonework painted with gilded terracotta roundels and spandrels filled with quatrefoils.
or tracery.\(^{28}\)

One of the most unusual items in the Privy Chamber is a fountain recorded in the 1547 inventory. The record states that in the king’s Privy Chamber there was “many straunge deuises of friers and diuerse other thinges hauing in it a fountayne of allablaster” set into the wall decorated with a ball of crystal and stones and was locked up with two doors, which were both decorated with leaves and garnished with pearls and gold thread.\(^{29}\) A wall fountain of this kind must have been impressive, as it is the only item directly referenced for being in the Privy Chamber in the 1547 inventory. The ambiguous description could be denoting an *acquaio*, which is a wall fountain typically found in the *sala principale* of Florentine palaces that often included a built-in basin and an elaborate frame.\(^{30}\) Italian decorative and stylistic influences were frequently found in England during the period, as can be seen in the application of antiquework in the interiors, therefore the inclusion of an Italian *acquaio* should not be surprising. However, given the uncertainty of the reference in the inventory and limited surviving items from England, the design of the fountain is conjecture at best. Nevertheless, the position of the fountain in the king’s Privy Chamber at Whitehall may have been on the east wall, due to a garderobe below it that would have had access to water, as well as the lack of other useable space.

The most well-known piece of decoration in the Privy Chamber was Hans Holbein the Younger’s *Whitehall Mural* (ca. 1537). The mural portrayed the commanding figure of Henry VIII set within the dynastic context of his parents and his wife Jane Seymour, who bore his son and heir. Most simply, the *Whitehall Mural* is an evocative image of dynasty and virility.\(^{31}\) The architectural setting of the mural, however, projects a familiarity with prevalent classical and antique influences in the applied antiquework cornice and architectural shell niches in the background of the mural. It is conceivable that the internal architecture of the mural, although fictive, responded to the interior decoration of the Privy Chamber, thus sharing similar architectural features. Such can be perceived in the antiquework and architectural shell niches in the mural when compared to the typical Italian wall-fountain design and the commonality of the antiquework on the cornice and pilasters in other examples like *The Family of Henry VIII*, with its own references to Whitehall palace. Thurley argues that the mural would have been located on the south wall of the Privy Chamber.\(^{32}\) Furthermore, both Thurley and Strong contend that the mural would have been placed like a gable window. This assertion is supported by Charles Pantin in 1673 when he writes that the mural was “sur le pignon de la Croisèe” and the internal perspective of the painting suggesting a higher placement.\(^{33}\) If this is correct, the mural would have been above the wall paneling therein opening up more space for the fireplace and fountain to be located along the east wall.

The position of the mural above the wainscoting would have allowed for the hanging of textiles, which we know were in the interior. The accounts of the Great Wardrobe from Whitehall Palace refers to the repair of twelve tapestries that were for use in the Privy Chamber of the king.\(^{34}\) Thomas Campbell’s survey of Henrician textiles describes that in Henry VIII’s inner chambers those with antique or classical themes were the most common.\(^{35}\) By cross-referencing the wardrobe accounts with Henry VIII’s inventories, only a few possibilities emerge, suggesting that the tapestries in the Privy Chamber would have been similar to the
Arras of the History of the Twelve Months.\textsuperscript{36} Additionally, the 1542 inventory states that a Cloth of Estate served as a hanging within the King’s Privy Chamber, which was later moved to the Tower Wardrobe by 1547.\textsuperscript{37} The inventory describes this Cloth of Estate as being made of gold tissue with purple and crimson embroidered badges and arms of the king.\textsuperscript{38} The richness of such a textile is apparent in the hanging displayed behind the figure of Henry VIII in The Family of Henry VIII. Regrettably, the placement of the tapestries and Cloth of Estate are not stipulated in the inventories, as has been seen in other items addressed above, and were most likely not permanent items within the chamber.\textsuperscript{39}

Digital Recreations & Analysis: An Interior of Persuasion

From these known items and architectural features combined with the ubiquitous Henrician decoration previously outlined, an impression emerges of the Whitehall Privy Chamber. And such an impression visibly crystallizes through digital reconstructions. It should be noted that the aim of reconstructing the Privy Chamber is not to suggest its definite appearance, but to help visualize the evidence we have, separating it from our current gaps in knowledge. The importance of digital recreation is the opportunity they present to project adaptable three-dimensional architecture, which then enables scholars to understand the different dynamics at play within an interior. The process of digitally recreating the interior is didactic in itself and can lead to a new type of spatial awareness when individual items are placed in relationship to one another in a holistic space. Moreover, the procedure of imputing different features of the interior into the digital recreation and leads to new questions previously unconsidered.

Two distinct questions arose in my initial research involving the placement of the Whitehall Mural in relationship with the windows and the position of the wall fountain. Beginning with extrapolating the decorative and architectural details established from archival and visual records, I construct the basic templet of the architectural design of the interior. All the applied imagery in the digital recreations are based on either extant interior decorations or the previously mentioned paintings, whose application is supported by the archival records that confirm similar design elements in comparable royal interiors. With the templet of the interior created, I was than able to create two different versions of the Privy Chamber at Whitehall for analysis. Since the placement of the Whitehall Mural is debatable, the first recreation (Figs. 6 & 7) assumes that the Whitehall Mural was placed low on the wall, while the second recreation (Figs. 8 & 9) considers how it would look if the mural was placed above the wainscoting.\textsuperscript{40}

The capability of digital recreations to be used as a research tool allows for different possibilities to be compared to each other in an adaptable platform. In terms of the Whitehall Mural, the internal architecture of the mural clearly responds to the interior decoration of the Privy Chamber, which can open up research on the ways in which works of art would have been conceived of in terms of the interior. Additionally, as previously stated both Thurley and Strong contend that the mural would have been placed above the wainscoting, an argument that seems to be supported by the availability of open space for the tapestries that we know would have been hung in the Privy Chamber, as visible in the digital renderings.\textsuperscript{41} Furthermore, the placement of the mural responds to questions on the position of the wall fountain in connection to the garderobe and fireplace, which through further study could reveal more
information on the design and construction process of Henrician palaces. It is through digital recreations that relationships between known objects can be better explored to either present new research questions or solidify previous scholarly arguments.

The practical application of digital recreations allows for scholars to examine the Privy Chamber’s architecture and decoration jointly, which when considered as a space designed to promote Henry VIII helps to reveal the interior’s persuasive message. In viewing the chamber as a cohesive space, as it would have been visually experienced, the Privy Chamber at Whitehall more explicitly reveals a sophisticated mixture of antequework and Perpendicular Gothic design influences. The Privy Chamber’s Gothic decoration is best characterized by a vertical emphasis of the elaborate window tracery, slim stone mullions, fan vaulting, spandrels filed with quatrefoils or tracery, and the Tudor arch, which are most clearly present in the design of doorways, windows, and fireplaces. The visual rhetoric of Perpendicular Gothic in the royal interior has allegorical value due to the historical precedence of the style and the location of Whitehall Palace. Of specific importance is Whitehall’s direct proximity to Westminster Abbey, historically the center of political and religious power in England, as can be seen in the later ‘Agas Map’ of London (Fig. 10). The visual correlation of the Gothic styled Westminster Abbey and the political relationship of the kings who constructed and added to the Abbey, such as Henry VIII’s father Henry VII, would have created a visual association between Whitehall Palace’s gothic qualities and English royal ancestry.

Reinforcing Henrician lineage in the architecture was the abundance of heraldry directly linking to Henry VIII’s ancestors, which created a complex layering of lineage and stability of rulership. As previously noted, the royal interior was frequently enriched with the emblems of Henry VIII, including the Tudor Rose and portcullis, as well as the English royal arms, some of which are visible in the dynastic Whitehall Mural. The authority heraldry had within the Henrician court is well documented by scholars such as Sydney Anglo’s study on spectacle and pageantry in the early Tudor England, as well as by Strong and String. In 1530, Henry VIII issued letters patent under the Great Seal stating that Thomas Benolt would undertake necessary visitations to “reform all false armoury and arms devised without authority, marks unlawfully set or made…whether it be in stone, windows, plate or any other…” The focus on maintaining and regulating the royal badges and mottos in perfect condition reflects on the cultural authority invested in these chivalric symbols as instruments to demonstrate the legitimacy of the dynasty.

If Gothic and heraldic architectural features aligned Henry VIII with his royal lineage, then antequework positioned him as a learned and sophisticated king. At Whitehall Palace, archeological evidence has shown that antequework covered both the exterior and interior of the palace, as can be seen in the surviving fragments uncovered from the excavation of the back stair of the privy kitchen at Whitehall Palace. Extending beyond the mere application of a decorative pattern, antequework reflects Henry VIII as a knowledgeable prince who is partaking of the latest fashions spreading as a result of the migration of artists to England, such as Holbein and Pietro Torrigiano, and advances in print culture. Connected to the classical influences circulating in England was the notion of the ideal Renaissance prince, based on the Platonic idea of the ‘philosopher-ruler’ who was intelligent in both political and humanistic discourses.
Figure 6. Digital Recreation, Privy Chamber without clerestory windows, facing south. Wall Fountain, Florence, ca. 1520. Da Rovezzano, Benedetto, 5959:1-1859 © Victoria and Albert Museum. Digital Reconstruction by the Author.

Figure 7. Digital Recreation, Privy Chamber without clerestory windows, facing south-east. Digital Reconstruction by the Author.

Figure 8. Digital Recreation, Privy Chamber with clerestory windows, facing south-east. Digital Reconstruction by the Author.
The combination of heraldic culture joined with antiquework fused these two distinct approaches to authority and rulership together in the Henrician interior: that of the chivalric knight and the Renaissance prince. Both heraldic court culture and Renaissance theories of magnificence promoted display as a communicative form of power, which had distinct associations for Henry VIII. String has argued that in the ceiling design for the Chapel Royal in St James’s Palace there is an unusual combination of fashionable Renaissance decoration with a heraldic programme that reflected the traditional Tudor symbols and possibilities of new alliances through marriage. A similar use of decoration was incorporated in the Privy Chamber in Whitehall, and such models were essential for Henry VIII’s representation of traditional authority rooted in the monarchy and church and that of a humanist-educated and au courant ruler.

Henry VIII’s Privy Chamber served as a communicative form of power through its presentation of such decoration to these changing audiences. The inclusion of Gothic motifs and antiquework in the interior demonstrates the use of display as a reinforcement of authority. It was a commonly held notion during the sixteenth century that power and authority could be best conveyed through the visual representations of virtue. The value of using interiors as a form of influence can be perceived in Sir Thomas Elyot’s *The Boke named the Governour* (1531) when Elyot claims,

“Semblable decking ought to be in the house of a nobleman or man of honour. I mean certain ornaments of hall and chamber, in arras, painted tables, and images containing histories, wherein is represented some monument of virtue, most cunningly wrought...whereby other men in beholding may be instructed, or at the least ways, to virtue persuaded.”

The interior served the function of portraying the honor and virtue of the patron to edify the audience. Reinforcing such a proposal is String’s argument that Henrician imagery was meant to purposely communicate in terms of a visual language. As such, in Henrician England a truly distinctive methodology towards the royal interior as a device to display authority to the particular audience was fashioned.

Digital renderings of the Privy Chamber do
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not allow us to step back in time to have a truly immersive experience in the royal interior, they do permit a new lens through which to analyze the architectural past. In terms of the Privy Chamber a greater care can be given to the allegorical meanings of the interior formed through the juxtaposition of separate features. Moreover, the use of digital technology for scholars has wider applications for exploring the interior in more dynamic and adaptable ways. It is in the application of such technological platforms that the Privy Chamber reveals a simultaneous align of Henry VIII with the representation of his historic ancestry as well as with the imagery of the virtuous Renaissance Prince.
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43. Henry VII ordered that The Lady Chapel at Westminster Abbey should be painted with “our armes, badges, cognisants, and other convenient painting,” because such lavish decoration exposed that “a king’s work [was] appertaineth. As seen in Micklethwaite, 1883, 368. Also see Anglo 1969; Strong 1967; and String 2008.
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