The Reformers' Portraits in Tudor Whitehall
Tracey A. Sowerby

Introduction
Despite a wealth of scholarship on both the portraits of Tudor monarchs and the architecture of their palaces, the display of portraits within courtly spaces in England has received little attention.[1] In part this is because there has been greater interest in the iconography of the monarchs' pictures than in the uses made of them at court.[2] In part, it is because there are few inventories of the Tudor monarchs' belongings that help us to locate where, let alone how, their goods were displayed. And in part it is because of the disparate sources that need to be brought together in order to begin to reconstruct how the inside of Tudor palaces may have looked. Reconstructing the display involves utilising the existing inventories (with due caution) alongside a patchwork of descriptions of what visitors saw while at court. Many of these accounts are dispersed throughout Europe, for it was the foreign visitors to the palaces who recorded what they saw there in greatest depth—for Tudor courtiers the display rarely warranted describing to other people who saw it regularly.

The visual culture at court, however, was intrinsic to the non-verbal communication of early modern monarchs. This went far beyond the matter of magnificence—which was of course one message monarchs wished to convey—to articulate specific points about the nature of the ruler's values, governance, legitimacy, family, international networks, and even policies. And that was, of course, why foreign visitors often paid it serious attention. This means that any portrait series at court had a diplomatic dimension to it, at least *in potentio*. Scholars have long acknowledged the importance of portraits for inter-dynastic marriage negotiations and royal self-fashioning to both domestic and foreign audiences. Only recently, however, has the systematic and wider-ranging use of portraits as diplomatic tools been explored in greater depth.[3] This essay builds upon recent scholarship to examine the diplomatic meaning of portrait groupings. First it discusses three different ways of defining a portrait series and analyse whether the portraits in Tudor palaces fit into any of these categories. Then it analyses how the portraits were displayed and used by the Tudor monarchs, with a particular focus on the reign of Elizabeth I. Finally, it examines a particular portrait series that was displayed in Elizabethan Whitehall—a collection of nine portraits of Continental Reformers —that has received no concerted scholarly attention to date.

I Portraits in Series in Early Modern England
There are various things that we could mean by a portrait series. One—perhaps the most uncontroversial—definition is a set of portraits produced at the same time—in whatever medium—that were primarily designed to be seen alongside one another, even if they could also be displayed individually. Several printed portraits that fit this definition were produced across the sixteenth and seventh centuries.[4] A 1560 publication purported to show the lineage of English kings from Noah to Elizabeth I; it comprised over 100 woodcut portraits including

---

[1] Simon Thurley: The Royal Palaces of Tudor England. Architecture and Court Life, 1460–1547 (London, 1993); Simon Thurley, Whitehall Palace. An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698, London 1999; Simon Thurley: Hampton Court. A Social and Architectural History, London 2003; Simon Thurley: Somerset House. The Palace of England's Queens 1551–1692, London 2008.

[2] For example Kevin M. Sharpe: Selling the Tudor Monarchy. Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England, London 2009; Tatania C. String: Art and Communication in the Reign of Henry VIII, Abingdon 2008; Roy Strong: Gloriana. Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I, London 1987; Roy C. Strong: The Cult of Elizabeth. Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry, London 1997; Sydney Anglo: Images of Tudor Kingship, London 1992.

[3] Tracey A. Sowerby: "A memorial and a pledge of faith": Portraiture and Early Modern Diplomatic Culture, in English Historical Review 129 (2014), pp. 296–331; Tracey A. Sowerby: Negotiating the Royal Image. Portrait Exchanges in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Diplomacy, in Helen Hackett (ed.): Early Modern Exchanges. Dialogues Between Cultures and Nations 1550–1800, Aldershot 2015, pp. 119–42.

many of English kings, both mythical and real, with short verses on each.[5] Another collection clearly designed as a series took the form of a book, with portraits of William I to Elizabeth I on the recto of the page and a verse about the ruler on the preceding verso.[6] Other examples were produced on the continent and imported into England, such Henrick Goltzius's 1585 engraved series of full length portraits of English monarchs from William I to Elizabeth I.[7] Equally, we might view within this context the surviving sets of games pieces and decorated games boards depicting notables that were produced for elite consumers from at least the 1530s.[8] The label of a portrait series by this definition could be applied to other material objects, such as a set of knives in the Victoria and Albert Museum whose handles depict English monarchs from Henry I to James I.[9]

Painted portrait series that were conceived and executed as such were rare in Tudor palaces and were not very common in Tudor England in general. There were exceptions, most of which date from the later sixteenth or early seventeenth century. For instance, Knole Palace boasted a dedicated series of portraits of English monarchs, dating from the early 1600s.[10] The fifteen full length canvases of the male ancestors of John, Lord Lumley at Lumley Castle appears to have been a deliberately conceived group intended to highlight the longstanding nobility of the family.[11] The Bodleian Library's frieze of portrait heads painted in the late 1610s included images of famous scholars and illustrious alumni and patrons of Oxford University.[12] Most collections of portraits in sixteenth-century England, however, do not appear to have been envisaged as a portrait series in this sense and this was as true of royal palaces as aristocratic collections. Richmond Palace, one of Henry VII's main residences, was said to have a series of pictures of English monarchs from William II to Henry himself (which also included a few mythical kings such as Arthur and Brutus) on the wall of the great hall.[13] When it came to their own dynasty, Tudor monarchs preferred group portraits, such as Holbein's famous mural at Whitehall Palace or *The Family of Henry VIII* (c.1545) over portrait series.[14] James I's reign seems to have marked a change in this regard: several portrait series of the royal family were produced in various media.[15]

Another sense in which we could understand a portrait series is a group of disparate portraits of linked individuals collected together deliberately in order to articulate group identity. Examples include the portraits that religious and chivalric orders, or civic corporations displayed of their members in their headquarters. Although these had a clear ordering logic, they also had something of an *ad hoc* element to them: as the membership of the corporation changed, new portraits were added to the display and old ones (sometimes) removed.

---

[4] For example those discussed in Sarah Meiers: Portraits in Print. Hieronymus Cock, Dominicus Lampsonius and "Pictprum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferieris effigies", in Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 69/1 (2006), pp. 1–16; Karl A. E. Enenkel: From Chivalric Family Tree to "National" Gallery. The Portrait Series of the Counts of Holland ca. 1490–1650, in. Karl A.E. Enkel and Konrad A. Ottenheym (eds.): The Quest for an Appropriate Past in Literature, Art and Architecture, Leiden 2019, pp. 233–301.

[5] Anon.: Beholde here (gentle reader) a brief abstract of the genealogie of all the kynges of England, London 1560.

[6] T. T.: A booke, containing the true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the kings of England, London 1597.

[7] Henrick Goltzius: Kings and Queens of England, Haarlem 1585.

[8] For example Kunsthistorisches Museum Vienna, Kunstkammer, 3419, Hans Kels, gameboard for the "langen Puff" (1537), 3824, Hans Repfl, games pieces (1575–77).

[9] Victoria and Albert Museum, London [VAM], item number 465–1869.

[10] June Osborne: Entertaining Elizabeth I. The Progresses and Great Houses of her Time, London 1989, pp. 132–7.

[11] Catherine MacLeod, Tarnya Cooper, and Margaret Zoller: The Portraits, in Mark Evans (ed): The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree. Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age, [London] 2010, pp. 59–61.

[12] J. N. L. Myers: Thomas James and e Painted Frieze, in Bodleian Library Record, 3 (1952) 30–51; J. N. L. Myers: The Painted Frieze in the Picture Gallery, in Bodleian Library Record, 4 (1950), pp. 82-91.

[13] Anglo: Images of Kingship, pp. 113, 115.

[14] Royal Collection, RCIN 405796. A copy of Holbein's mural by Remigius van Leemput is now in the royal collection (RCIN 405750).

[15] For example VAM P.147-1910 to P152-1910, 960-1904, 961-1904, 962-1904, 963-1904.

Showing members wearing similar robes or insignia that identified them as members of the organization helped to convey corporate identity[16]

A third way of understanding a portrait series is that of a group of pictures that were created or acquired in an ad hoc manner, but which were deliberately arranged as a series when they were displayed. The portrait galleries of Tudor noblemen and wealthy gentlemen comprised portrait series by this definition. Some portrait galleries were arranged to celebrate the dynasty, others to commemorate illustrious men, and yet others to convey political messages. For example Bess of Hardwick exhibited portraits at Hardwick Hall in order to suggest that her granddaughter Arabella Stuart was the leading candidate to succeed Elizabeth I as queen of England.[17] In some cases, portrait series that were conceived as such sat amidst other portraits in the gallery.[18]

It is in this third, looser sense that we could say that there were portrait series in all Tudor palaces. By the end of Henry VIII's reign all of the main palaces contained a wide array of portraits of international and domestic luminaries. These pictures had come into the Tudor monarch's possession in a variety of ways. Some, particularly portraits of English royalty, had been commissioned by the monarchs. A small number had been purchased by one of the monarchs. The vast majority, however, had been presents. Some had arrived during marriage negotiations, while others were sent as diplomatic gifts.[19] Their addition to the palatial display was therefore a response to an outside influence, rather than a domestic imperative and their display had to leave space for the additions that would inevitably come. In short, the collection and display of portraits in Tudor palaces was *ad hoc*: even in the reign of Charles I, who cared more for connoisseurship and pictorial display than his predecessors, there was no area of the palace dedicated exclusively to portraiture.[20]

These portraits do not fit neatly into the traditional categories of analysis for portrait groups. They cannot be understood simply as portrait series of notable men (or women) chosen for emulation, nor can they be understood as a dynastic portrait series designed to show lineage and continuity. Linda Kilinger Aleci has proposed that we should understand portrait series as more than symbols of status, galleries of worthy men, or expressions of kinship, and instead recognise them as expressions of—and props to—identity.[21] To some degree, this conceptual framework can be applied to the portraits in Tudor palaces, which mostly depicted a mix of members of the Tudor dynasty, important domestic figures, and foreign rulers and their families. However, Aleci's framework does not go far enough. When the portraits belonged to a ruler and were displayed in royal palaces, their meaning was not merely about princely self-fashioning, it was also a means of diplomatic signalling.

Before discussing the specific diplomatic meaning of the portrait display, it is important to outline how they were displayed, because this had an impact on their diplomatic use. Surviving accounts and inventories indicate that the portraits were concentrated in the main hall and the main gallery or galleries in the palace. Galleries became associated with the monarch's more private rooms from the 1530s and access to them was restricted.[22] When the

---

[16] For example Daantje Meuwissen: Faithful to Tradition. The Function of the Portrait Series of the Land Commanders of the Teutonic Order, Utrecht Baliwick, in Johannes A. Mol, Klaus Milizer, and Helen J. Nicholson (eds.): The Military Orders and the Reformation. Choices, State Building and the Weight of Tradition, Utrecht 2006, pp. 237–68; Robert Tittler: Portrait Collection and Display in the English Civic Body, *c.*1540–1640, Journal of the History of Collections 20/2 (2008), pp. 161–72.

[17] Jonathan Harris: The Reception of English Government Propaganda, c.1530–1603, DPhil thesis, Oxford 2014, pp. 97–98.

[18] For example the case of Lumley Castle. MacLeod, Cooper, and Zoller: The Portraits, pp. 59–70.

[19] See Sowerby: "A memorial and a pledge of faith" and Sowerby: Negotiating the Royal Image.

[20] John Peacock: The Politics of Portraiture, in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (ed.): Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, Basingstoke 1994, pp. 199–228.

[21] Linda Kilinger Aleci: Images of Identity. Italian Portrait Collections of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, in Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson (eds): The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance, London 1998, pp. 67–79.

[22] Thurley: Royal Palaces, pp. 141–3.

queen was resident, only members of her household or council and individuals that she specifically invited into the space were permitted entry. If the monarch favoured an ambassador or had particularly sensitive business to discuss, then he or she might choose to do so in the galleries of the palace rather than the more exposed audience chamber.[23] Diplomats had access to these relatively restrictive spaces in another way: when the monarch was away on progress or based at another palace, foreign potentates (including ambassadors) were sometimes permitted to view the rooms. They would be escorted through the palace by one of the keeper's deputies, who could shape visitors' interpretation of what they saw.[24] Consequently, the audience for the display was limited to important domestic and foreign dignitaries.

It was rare for any area of the royal residences to display portraits exclusively. Images of English kings were usually displayed alongside paintings of European rulers, classical scenes, biblical scenes, still lifes, and a range of *objets d'art*. In any room there might be portraits and other artworks which made different, sometimes complementary claims about the queen and her rule. Baron von Waldstein, for example, recounted seeing the following in one room in Elizabethan Whitehall: portraits of the prince of Orange (probably William I); of Elizabeth Valois, queen of Spain; Mary of Hungary, the former Regent of the Netherlands; Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy; Charles III, duke of Savoy and his wife Beatrice of Portugal; the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V and his wife Isabella of Portugal; a young Edward VI; and Hans Eworth's allegorical *Elizabeth I and the Three Goddesses* (1569); needlework maps of Parma and Britain; early printed maps of the Americas; and a painting of the Roman assassin Gaius Mucius Scaevola—who was admired for his bravery.[25] The overarching message of the display, then, was the extent of Elizabeth and her predecessors' diplomatic alliances and trade routes, but there was also a secondary message about the virtues of the queen: the painting of Scaevola implied that she valued courage, while Eworth's picture openly praised her beauty, wisdom, and power as exceeding those of the gods.

The portraits in Tudor palaces were not ordered as a considered, logical series, in contrast to some contemporary princes' picture collections. A list of the portraits displayed by the Grand Duke of Tuscany in his palace in c.1600, for example, groups together various rulers by their domain: five Holy Roman Emperors are listed together as are five kings of France, three kings of Hungary, three kings of Naples, and three English monarchs. Nine pictures of Ottoman Emperors were listed almost without interruption, while twenty-eight pictures of popes were only punctuated by two other portraits.[26] Likewise, the Spanish collector and historian Gonzalo Argote de Molina described one room in Philip II's Prado palace in 1582 as "a room of royal portraits" in which paintings of forty-five "princes, ladies, and gentlemen" graced the walls. The room had a strong dynastic message, as the majority of portraits were of Philip's relatives, but also gestured more broadly to Philip (and his ancestor's) connections to Denmark, England, Germany, and Portugal.[27] Similar messages of dynastic strength and international connections—this time with Habsburg, Savoyard, Navarrese, and Tudor potentates—could be found in Catherine de Medici's gallery at Hôtel

[23] Tracey A. Sowerby: Material Culture and the Politics of Space in Diplomacy at the Tudor Court, in Birgitte Johannsen and Konrad Ottenheim (eds.): Beyond Scylla and Charybdis: European Courts and Court Residences outside Habsburg and Valois/Bourbon Territories, 1500–1700, Copenhagen 2015, pp. 46–56.

[24] Gottfried von Bülow: Journey through England and Scotland Made by Lupold von Wedel in the years 1584 and 1585, in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society n.s. 9 (1895), p. 235.

[25] G. W. Groos (ed. and trans.): The Diary of Baron von Waldstein. A Traveller in Elizabethan England, London 1981, p. 47. He made an error regarding Edward's portrait. The verses he gives belong to Holbein's portrait of Edward VI as a young child (National Gallery of Art, Washington DC), but gives his age erroneously as twelve.

[26] The National Archives, State Papers 98/1, fols. 163r–165r.

[27] L. Roblot-Delondre: Argote de Molina et les tableaux du Pardo, in Revue Archéologique, n.s. 16/2 (1910), pp. 57–60. Quotations (my translation) at 56–57.

de Soissons.[28] Analysis of Margaret of Austria's portrait collection, moreover, suggests that important diplomatic and dynastic messages could still be articulated by an arrangement of pictures that was less obviously structured and clustered than the examples above.[29]

There seems little doubt that the choice over which portraits to place on the walls of Tudor palaces was driven by diplomatic as much as domestic imperatives. Not displaying a portrait gift could be interpreted as a rejection of the amity of the prince who had given the painting. At the most basic level, the diplomatic significance of the portraits the Tudor monarchs owned came through the ways in which the portraits advertised the inter-dynastic affiliations of the Tudors on the one hand, and their broader diplomatic ties on the other. Visitors to Whitehall in the 1540s would have seen a fairly comprehensive collection of portraits of the recent kings of France, house of Habsburg, dukes of Burgundy and rulers of Spain. Not all of them were displayed in the same room, but they would have had a cumulative impact nonetheless.

The ad hoc series of portraits in the galleries became an integral tool in English monarchs' diplomatic discourses as they made unspoken points through their engagement with individual portraits. Occasionally they also drew directly upon the broader series of portraits. The strongest evidence for this comes from James I's reign. On several occasions, his wife, Anne of Denmark, used the portraits of foreign rulers in the gallery at Hampton Court to comment to diplomats on the suitability of them and/or their children to marry into the house of Stuart. Invoking a succession of portraits—and individual items within it—during audiences with diplomats was by no means limited to English monarchs.[30]

The display of portraits in the royal collection was both flexible in some ways and inflexible in others. Many of the portraits were large and heavy making them difficult to move or store. The association between diplomatic portrait gifts and the friendships—and alliances—between princes made removing them from display or moving them to a less prestigious part of the palace diplomatically problematic. Allowing for additions, the ordering of the portraits on the walls seems to have been relatively consistent from the 1540s through the 1610s.[31] However, the display could be changed without moving the pictures by using tapestries or screens to divide their galleries into smaller spaces during diplomatic encounters.[32] Many of the portraits had curtains, meaning small alterations could be made to the display in order to reflect evolving political alliances.[33] As few sixteenth-century portraits are in their original frames, this important feature is easily overlooked. Maria van Oosterwyck's *Still Life of Flowers in a Glass Vase* (c.1685) is still in its seventeenth century frame, which has metal hooks for a curtain rod.[34] Further evidence of this once extensive practice comes from other paintings. Rembrandt's *Holy Family with a Curtain* (1646), Adriaen van der Spelt's *Trompe-l'oeil Still Life with a Flower and a Curtain* (1658) and *Portrait of a Man behind a Curtain* (c.1780) by an unknown Dutch painter all employ the trompe l'oeil effect of painting in the frame with a curtain rod and a curtain partially drawn.[35]

[28] Alexandra Zvereva: La galerie de portraits de l'Hôtel de la Reine (Hôtel de Soissons), in Bulletin Monumental 166/1 (2008), pp. 33–41.

[29] Dagmar Eichberger and Lisa Beaven: Family Members and Political Allies. The Portrait Collection of Margaret of Austria, in Art Bulletin, 77 (1995), pp. 225–48.

[30] Sowerby, Negotiating the Royal Image, pp. 132–3.

[31] For the inventories see Maria Hayward (ed): The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall, Vol. II The Transcripts, London 2004, pp. 90–98; David R. Starkey (ed.): The Inventory of Henry VIII, Vol. 1. The Transcript, London 1998, pp. 237–40; W. A. Shaw, Three Inventories of Pictures in the Collections of Henry VIII and Edward VI, Woking 1937.

[32] Sowerby: Material Culture, pp. 52–53.

[33] Starkey (ed.): Inventory, pp. 237–40.

[34] Joslyn Art Museum News Release: Joslyn Art Museum Adds to European Collection with Stunning Still Life, 4 June 2019.

[35] On painting the curtain see Kathyrn Murphy: Drawing the Curtain, in Apollo 181(629) (2015), pp. 152–7.

Curtains added flexibility to displays of objects which were otherwise heavy and cumbersome to move. If a particular painting might cause offense, the curtains could be closed and the picture covered. One foreign observer noted this happening at Whitehall in 1609, when a picture of an Anglo-Scottish battle and other unspecified paintings had been covered to avoid bad feeling.[36] Portraits, too, could be covered should circumstances make this desirable. If Elizabeth's relations with a prince became unfriendly, the curtains could be closed on any portraits of the monarch in question, which would in effect remove that prince from the series of friends of the English queen. If explicit orders along these lines were given they have yet to be uncovered. But the practice is strongly suggested by the absence of Philip II's portrait from the majority travellers' accounts of Tudor palaces after 1585.[37]

Diplomatic exchanges were likely located in particular palaces in part due to the portraits that were displayed there. For example Henry VIII his ministers conducted negotiations with the ambassadors of the Schmalkadic League (who aimed to negotiate a theological, as well a defensive alliance) in the spring of 1539 in St James's Palace.[38] St James's had a range of portraits on display including recent French kings and the Emperor's extended family.[39] The palace's unusual concentration of Saxon portraits made it a particularly suitable venue if Henry wanted to suggest that the Schmalkaldic League were his natural allies. As well as two individual portraits of Duke John, there were two group portraits: one of Frederick the Wise and his brother and successor John, and one of Frederick, John, and John's son, John Frederick.[40] These reflected the Electors' use of dynastic portraiture in their visual propaganda and likely entered Henry's collection as diplomatic gifts.[41] The Palace also housed a folding table with portraits of five theologians with Luther at the centre.[42] Displaying this image suggested that Henry was more sympathetic to Lutheran doctrine than was in fact the case, which was in keeping with Cromwell's dealings with the Schmalkaldic League in the 1530s.[43] Taking these considerations into account, it seems unlikely that St James was chosen by accident.

II The Reformers' Portraits at Whitehall Palace: Identification

On a visit to Whitehall in the autumn of 1584 Lupold von Wedel noted that a room in the palace contained "the portrait of the old Elector of Saxony with Zwingli and many other ecclesiastical men".[44] The portraits of clerics that von Wedel noticed were the one clear exception to the otherwise ad hoc display of portraits in Tudor palaces. In total nine reformers, who were integral to the Reformation in Basel, Bern and Zurich, were represented. They were: Theodore Bibliander, Heinrich Bullinger, Rudolph Gualther, Simon Grynaeus, Wolfgang Musculus, Johannes Oecolampadius, Konrad Pellikan, Peter Martyr Vermigli, and Uldrych Zwingli. Zwingli was the leader of the early reformation in the town and was succeeded first by Bullinger and then Gualther as Antistes, or head of the church. Zwingli's friend Oecolampadius, professor of scripture at Basel, became Antistes in Basel, Grynaeus became professor of Greek there in 1529. Pellikan spent several years as professor of theology in Basel before taking up a chair in Zurich in 1526. Musculus took up the theology

---

[36] G. P. V. Akrigg: England in 1609, in Huntington Library Quarterly 14 (1950), p. 84

[37] Lupold von Wedel was interested enough in Philip II to note a chest of jewels Philip had given Mary. He also noted the portraits of numerous foreign rulers but did not mention Philip. See von Bülow: Journey through England, pp. 235–236.

[38] Roger B. Merriman (ed.): Life & Letters of Thomas Cromwell, 2 vols. Oxford 1902, Vol. 1, p. 274.

[39] Starkey (ed.): Inventory, pp. 384–5.

[40] Ibid., p. 385.

[41] Carl C. Christiansen: Princes and Propaganda. Electoral Saxon Art of the Reformation, Kirksville MO 1992, pp. 13–46.

[42] Starkey (ed.): Inventory, p. 385. The other theologians were not named.

[43] Rory McEntegart: Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden and the English Reformation, Woodbridge 2002, pp. 153–63.

[44] von Bülow: Journey through England, p. 235.

chair at Bern in 1549. Bibliander, a former student of Oecolampadius and Pellikan, became professor of Old Testament in Zurich in 1531.

These nine paintings formed a coherent series and were probably all by, or copied from pictures by, the same painter. As such, they deserve especial attention. It is possible to suggest with some confidence both what several of the Reformers' portraits looked like and who painted them thanks to Baron von Waldstein, who noted down the verses on the nine portraits when he saw them in 1600.[45] The verses von Waldstein recorded point very strongly to the so-called "Zurich Appelles" Hans Asper as the painter of the portraits, an identification that to my knowledge has not been made before. Comparing von Waldstein's transcriptions to the verses on surviving portraits of Bibliander, Bullinger (fig. 1), Oecolampadius (fig. 2), Pellikan, and Vermigli (fig. 3) reveals that they were nearly identical. The few small discrepancies can be attributed to transcription errors on von Waldstein's part, or on the part of a painter making a copy.

von Waldstein[46]	Portrait of Bibliander[47]	English translation[48]
Ex libris nomen, libri mea magna voluptas	Ex libris n… libri mea magna vol…s	My name and my great pleasure come from books
Qui summi tradunt iura colendi DEI	Qvi svmma tradvnt ivra colenda dei	That cultivate the study of God's law
Lustra decem vixi nunc quatuor insuper annos	Lustra decem …xi tvm qvattvor insvper annos	I have lived for fifty-four years
Quod superest Christus vindicat atque libri	Qvod svper est christvs vendicet atqve libri	What remains Christ and books shall claim
Baron von Waldstein[49]	Portrait of Bullinger (fig. 1)[50]	English translation
Undecimi iam nunc labuntur sidera lustri	Vndecimi iam nvnc labvntvr sydera lvstri,	For fifty-five years the stars glide by
Haec aetas; formam picta tabella doret	Hæc ætas, formam picta tabella refert	My age; this small painted board bears my form;
Nil ego vel formam vel vitae tempora specto	Nil ego vel formam vel vitæ tempora specto,	I want neither looks nor life
Sed CHRISTUM, vita et qui mihi forma mea est	Sed christvm, vitæ qvi mihi forma meæ est.	But Christ; my beauty and life are in him
von Waldstein[51]	Portrait of Oecolampadius (fig. 2)[52]	English translation
In Domini quondam fulsi lux splendida templo	In Domini qvondam fvlsi lvx spendida templo	Once I shone a splendid light into the temple of god's church
Cum coeli vultu conspiciendis eram	Cvm tali vvltv conspiciendvs eram	When I was gazing at the face of Heaven
Si veluti vultus potuissent pectora pingi	Si velvti vvltvs potvissent pectora pingi	If the soul could be

---

[45] See for example Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, p. 53, 55. Von Waldsein was an avid recorder of inscriptions. See ibid., pp. 127–9, 135, 161–3.

[46] Ibid., p. 55.

[47] Historischen Museum Thurgau, Inv. T 3130. The inscription is damaged.

[48] Translations mine unless otherwise indicated. More florid translations are given in Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, pp. 52, 54 (English) and Marianne Naegeli et al (ed.): Zürcher Kunst nach der Reformation. Hans Asper und seine Zeit, Zurich 1981, pp. 63–67, 69 (German).

[49] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, p. 55.

[50] Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Inv 8.

[51] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, p. 55.

[52] Kunstmuseum Basel. Inv. 12.

Starem doctrinae cum pietate typus	Starem doctrinæ cvm pietate typvs	depicted as clearly as the face I would stand for piety and doctrine
von Waldstein[53]	Portrait of Pellikan[54]	English translation
Bis septem lustris vixi, et quinque insuper annos Fatidico quare cum Simeone precor Nunc me dimitte in pace tenebrosa perire Vidimus et Christi regne redire tui	Bis septem ivstris vixi et qvinqve insvper annos Vatidico qvare cvm simeone precor Nvnc nos dimitte in pace devs tenebrosa perire Petimvs et Christi regna redire tvi	Above seventy years have I lived And like Simeon the prophet I pray Release me now into peace, oh lord, the darkness has gone And I have seen Christ's reign restored
von Waldstein[55]	Portrait of Vermigli (fig. 3)[56]	English translation[57]
Hunc genuit Florentia; nunc peregrinus oberrat Quo stabilis fiat civis apud superos. Illius effigies haec mentem scripta recondunt Integritas pietas pingier arte nequit	Hvnc genvit florentia, nvnc peregrinvs oberrat, Qvo stabilis fiat civis apvd svperos. Illivs effigies hæc, mentem scripta recondvnt Integritas, pietas, pingier arte neqvit	Florence brought him forth; now he wanders as a pilgrim That he might become an established citizen of the house of god This is his image; his writings conceal his mind Integrity and piety cannot be portrayed in art.

Four of these paintings have been identified as the work of Hans Asper. They were included in an exhibition in Zurich centred around the artist's work in 1981, as was the portrait of Vermigli, which the curators accepted as by Asper's hand, despite Roy Strong's doubts about the longstanding attribution to Asper.[58] Asper was Zurich's town painter from the early 1530s and served on its Great Council from 1545. Thirty portraits by him survive. Among them are important Zurich civic figures such as the soldier and diplomat Wilhelm Fröhlich and the councillor and diplomat Andreas Schmidt.[59] Asper also painted several reformers linked to Zurich, some of which formed the basis for prints and medals executed by other artists.

---

[53] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, p. 55.

[54] Museum zu Allerheiligen, Schaffhausen, Inv A 395.

[55] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, p. 55.

[56] National Portrait Gallery London, NPG 195.

[57] A similar translation is given in Torrance Kirby: The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology, Leiden 2007, p. 240.

[58] Roy Strong: Tudor and Stuart Portraits 1530–1660, London 1995, pp. 319–20, judged that the portrait was a workshop quality copy. For a discussion see Kirby: Zurich Connection, pp. 235, 240.

[59] Naegeli et al (ed.): Zürcher Kunst, pp. 54, 60.

Fig. 1: Hans Asper, Heinrich Bullinger, 1559, Zentralbibliothek, Zurich

Fig. 2: Hans Asper, Johannes Oecolampadius, Kunstmuseum Basel

Fig. 3: Hans Asper, Peter Martyr Vermigli, National Portrait Gallery, London

It seems safe to conclude that the portraits of Bibliander, Bullinger, Oecolampadius, Pellikan, and Vermigli were either by Asper's hand, or copied from original portraits by him. I have been unable to trace portraits of Grynaeus, Gualther, Musculus, or Zwingli by Asper or any other artist which have verses matching von Waldstein's transcriptions. Asper did, however, produce portraits of the four reformers, including several of

Zwingli, and one of Gualther (whose wife and child he also painted).[60] The correspondence of an English evangelical, Christopher Hales provides evidence that Asper painted Grynaeus and Musculus. In March 1550 Hales asked Gualther to procure portraits of Bibliander, Bullinger, Gualther, Pellikan, Zwingli and, if possible, also Oecolampadius from Asper. The iconography he requested was similar to the surviving paintings: each reformer was to have a book in his hand and a four line verse.[61] Despite some hand-wringing over whether it was appropriate for anyone to display images of reformers—some thought it should be avoided, lest it be a path to idolatry—the portraits were painted and at least some made their way to England.[62]

The portraits that Hales commissioned were not those in Whitehall, for the verses von Waldstein recorded date several of the paintings to 1559. The inscription on Vermigli's portrait "Anno 1559, Aetat 58", leaves no room for doubt.[63] Other verses indicate that several of the paintings were also produced in 1559. On the portrait of Gualther (b. 1519) it is said that forty years have passed, while Bullinger, who was born in 1504, is recorded as being fifty-five.[64] Taking the inscriptions at face value—and there is no compelling reason not to—the Whitehall paintings cannot have been Hales's.[65] Nor were they the surviving portraits: von Wedel noted that the verses were contained in scrolls, which does not correspond to the surviving portraits, while von Waldstein gives a different age and date for the Vermigli portrait. The portraits were either produced in 1559, then, or were copies of paintings that were. It is not possible to say when they were acquired, but they formed part of the palatial display for over three decades. Comparing von Waldstein's list with that of the duke of Saxe Weimar from 1613 suggests that their display was largely consistent: only Bullinger and Vermigli may have been moved earlier in the sequence.[66]

III The Reformers' Portraits at Whitehall Palace: Meaning

Surviving descriptions of the portraits at Whitehall indicate that they were arranged in the same space and displayed as a set. They were grouped together at one end of a long gallery, most likely near the Holbein Gate.[67] The iconography of the five surviving portraits suggest that the Whitehall portraits were visually identifiable as a separate set: they are very similar in size and the inclusion of a tetrastich in the same place on each suggests a coherent iconographical scheme. Each depicts a reformer with a book in hand, against a plain background, the name of the sitter is top and centre and underneath, also centred, are the Latin verses, with an indentation on the second and fourth lines.

Series of portraits in galleries could be forms of memory politics to align the owner with a particular partisan religious position.[68] In this case, the display linked Elizabeth to leading Swiss reformers, several of whom had influenced the Edwardian church that had inspired many aspects of Elizabeth's own church settlement. Given the dating of the portraits to 1559, the year in which Elizabeth's religious settlement was passed, could this have been intended to link Elizabeth's church to Edward's? Of the nine reformers, Vermigli had had

---

[60] Ibid., pp. 46–47, 50, 62–6, 68–9, 179–80, 196–7, 208–9.

[61] Robinson Hastings (ed.): Original Letters, pp. 185–6.

[62] Ibid., pp. 190–1. For a fuller discussion see Mary G. Winkler: A Divided Heart. Idolatry and the Portraiture of Hans Asper, The Sixteenth Century Journal 18/2 (1987), pp. 213–30.

[63] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, p. 55.

[64] Ibid., p. 55.

[65] Not least because the verses on Hales's portraits could not have included these specific temporal indicators. See Kirby: Zurich Connection, p. 239.

[66] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, pp. 53, 55; Rye: England, p. 161. The duke of Saxe-Weimar omitted Oecolampadius.

[67] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, pp. 51–3.

[68] For example David van der Linden: Memorializing the French Wars of Religion in Early Seventeenth-century French Picture Galleries. Protestants and Catholics Painting the Contested Past, in Renaissance Quarterly 70 (2017), pp. 132–78.

the strongest influence on the Elizabethan church. Thomas Cranmer sought out his views on doctrine and liturgy. Vermigli's input proved influential on both the second Edwardian Prayer Book that formed the basis of Elizabethan worship and the reformation of ecclesiastical laws.[69] Displaying Vermigli's portrait created associations between Elizabeth and her brother's religious legacy. Yet Vermigli was not privileged over the others, nor were other reformist exiles such as Martin Bucer, who had influenced Cranmer and the Edwardian church, included in the display.[70] If the purpose of the reformers gallery was to emphasize continuities between the Elizabethan and Edwardian churches, then surely the portraits of the main architects of Edwardian religious policy such as Cranmer would have been included.

The portrait series emphasized the Swiss connection. It could have been intended to suggest that Elizabeth was an ally of the Helvetic confession and that the Elizabethan Religious Settlement of 1559 was a Swiss one. Indeed, a striking feature of this particular series is the omissions. It would have been easy to add portraits of Luther or Calvin or both to the display. But none of the travellers' accounts of the palace that I have consulted records the presence of the likenesses of either reformer. There were certainly strong links between the Elizabethan religious establishment and Zurich. A number of Elizabeth's bishops had sought refuge from Mary I's persecution of Protestants in Zurich. Several senior ecclesiastics corresponded with Zurich religious figures in the early years of Elizabeth's reign.[71] Elizabeth herself received letters from Vermigli, Gualther, and Bullinger.[72] She sent Bullinger a silver-gilt cup, to thank him for aiding English Protestants during her sister's reign.[73]

Nevertheless, the display was not an overwhelming endorsement of Swiss theology, as most of the verses had little, if anything, to say about the theological contributions of their subjects.[74] The verses on Bibliander, Grynaeus and Musculus's pictures played on their names' association with books, Apollo, and mice respectively. No mention was made of Grynaeus's contribution to religion. In contrast, Bibliander was praised for his devotion to the study of God's law, while Musculus was celebrated for his antipapalism, as a 'mouse' who had undermined the papal walls. Pellikan was portrayed as a witness to the restoration of Christ's reign while the verses on Gualther's portrait emphasized the importance of living in Christ. Vermigli was celebrated for his piety and doctrine, as was Oecolampadius, who was further praised for shining a splendid light into God's temple. In neither case was any mention of their specific theological positions made. Finally, the verse on Zwingli's portrait commemorated his sacrifice for Christ and country. One reason why the doctrinal contributions of reformers were not mentioned may be that they disagreed on some issues, as for instance did Bibliander and Vermigli on the nature of predestination.[75]

---

[69] Diarmaid MacCulloch: Thomas Cranmer. A Life, London 1996, pp. 380–3, 407–9, 412, 425, 432, 435–6, 467–71, 480, 482, 487–88, 491, 493, 501, 505, 511–12, 524, 526, 533, 539, 551–54, 567, 573–4. See also Anne Overell: Italian Reform and English Reformations, c.1535–c.1585, Aldershot 2008, pp. 81–124.

[70] See MacCulloch: Thomas Cranmer, pp. 380–83, 399–416, 460–2, 469–83. N. Scott Amos: Martin Bucer and the Revision of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer. Reform of Ceremonies and the Didactic Use of Ritual, in Reformation & Renaissance Review 2 (1999), pp. 107–26.

[71] Ken MacMillan: Zurich Reform and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559, Anglican and Episcopal History 68/3 (1999), pp. 285–311.

[72] Kirby: Zurich Connection, pp. 181–202. Diarmaid MacCulloch: Henrich Bullinger and the English-Speaking World, in Emidio Campi and Peter Opitz (eds.): Heinrich Bullinger Life – Thought – Influence (Zurich, Aug. 25–29, 2004, International Congress Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575)), Zurich 2007, pp. 891–930.

[73] Fritz Büsser, Wurzeln der Reformation in Zürich. Zum 500. Geburtstag des Reformators Huldrych Zwingli, Leiden 1985, p. 183. The cup is now in the Swiss National Museum in Zurich, DIG-30691.

[74] Grynaeus has been identified as the author of the verses on Bibliander, Bullinger, Musculus, Oecolampadius, Pellikan, and Vermigli. See Kirby: Zurich Connection, p. 240. Musculus see Reinhard Bodenmann: Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563). Destin d'un autodidacte lorrain au siècle des Réformes, Geneva 2000, p. 105–6. Bodenmann discussed the verse, which Musuculus's sone recorded, but did not know about the painting.

[75] See Joachim Staedke: Der Zürcher Prädestinationsstreit von 1560, in Zwingliana 9/9 (1953), pp. 536–46.

An ecumenical display of reformers that agreed on many, but not all, doctrines and were united in their anti-Catholicism and support for scripture was compatible with Elizabeth's broader diplomatic strategy. The queen's diplomatic efforts suggest a desire to forge a pan-Protestant alliance with both Reformed and Lutheran princes and polities. When Elizabeth corresponded with Lutheran princes, she presented herself and her church as closer to Lutheran doctrine than its official statements suggest.[76] The queen took a positive attitude to the Augsburg confession when dealing with the German Princes and her regime consistently worked with both Calvinists and Lutherans, emphasizing the common Catholic threat and their shared commitment to the gospel.[77]

There may have been further reasons why Elizabeth found it desirable to display these particular portraits. Zwingli, Oecolampadius, and Grynaeus had all supported Henry VIII's annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon (which left him free to marry Elizabeth's mother, Anne Boleyn), even if they had different justifications for doing so.[78] When Elizabeth's legitimacy and right to rule was being challenged by her Catholic opponents, a reminder that scholars across Europe had judged her parents' marriage valid was useful.[79] Perhaps more significant, however, was the recent role of several of the reformers in defending the Elizabethan Settlement. Diarmaid MacCulloch has categorised Bullinger and Gualther as critical friends of the Elizabethan church.[80] The responses of Vermigli, Bullinger and Gualther to appeals for assistance by the crown's opponents in the vestiarian controversy will have given the inclusion of their portraits in the display at Whitehall a further meaning. All three sided with archbishop Matthew Parker and the Queen against those who wished to remove remaining adiaphora from the Elizabethan church. Some of their interventions were targeted at precisely those English bishops who had spent part of Mary's reign in exile in Zurich, such as Edmund Grindal, Robert Horne, John Jewel, John Parkhurst, John Pilkington, and Edmund Sandys, and Bullinger and Gualther became associated with conformity to the Settlement following the publication of their open letter to Horne in 1566.[81] In this context, the presence of images of Bullinger, Gualther, and Vermigli served to remind audiences, both domestic and foreign, that the queen's eclectic religious settlement had been defended by leading Swiss theologians. This might explain why their portraits were also displayed at the London seat of the archbishop of Canterbury, Lambeth Palace, where they were seen by von Waldstein alongside an image of Zwingli.[82] In more academic contexts, the Swiss reformers took their place alongside a wider array of theologians: the portrait frieze in the Bodleian library, placed seven of the same reformers—Bullinger, Gualther, Musculus, Oecolampadius, Pellikan, Vermigli and Zwingli—among patristic, medieval and contemporary English theologians.[83]

---

[76] Susan Doran, Elizabeth I'd Religion. The Evidence of her Letters, in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 31 (2000), pp. 699–720.

[77] David Scott Gehring, *Anglo-German Relations and the Protestant Cause: Elizabethan Foreign Policy and Pan-Protestantism* (London, 2013).

[78] Carrie Euler: Couriers of the Gospel. England and Zurich 1531–1558, Zurich 2006, p. 55. Wolfgang Simon: Der Basler Gräzist Simon Grynaeus und die Eheangelegenheit König Heinrichs VIII. Im Spiegel der Bucerbriefe, in Basel als Zentrum des geistigen Austauchs in der frühen Reformationszeit, ed. Christine Christ-von Wedel, Sven Grosse and Berndt Hamm, Tübingen 2014, pp. 203–214.

[79] On an early challenge to Elizabeth's position see Steven Thiry, "In Open Shew to the World". Mary Stuart's Armorial Claim to the English Throne and Anglo-French Relations (1559−1561), in *The English Historical Review*, 132 (2017), pp. 1405–1439.

[80] MacCulloch: Henrich Bullinger.

[81] Kirby: Zurich Connection, pp. 203–220.

[82] Groos (ed. and trans.): Diary of Baron von Waldstein, p. 61 and other preachers.

[83] Myers: Thomas James, p. 41. Thomas Hearne: A Letter, Containing an Account of Some Antiquities between Windsor and Oxford, with a List of the Several Pictures in the School-gallery adjoining to the Bodleian Library, Oxford 1725, p. 36.

Conclusion

The reformers' portraits at Whitehall reminded foreign and domestic visitors of the legitimacy of both Elizabeth I and her church. How these portraits came to be in the palace remains unclear. It has been shown that they cannot have been Christopher Hales's pictures and the identification of the pictures as likely by Zurich's town painter Hans Asper means that it is possible that they were a gift from Zurich, but this must remain conjecture unless further evidence is discovered. What is indisputable is that the queen, whose religious settlement is best described as eclectic, chose to display the portraits of the reformers—and thereby associate her own church with the Swiss reformation in the minds of visitors who saw the pictures—throughout much of her reign. Rather than view the series as evidence of an immutable commitment to the Helvetic confession, it might be better to view it as part of a more ecumenical strategy that emphasised what Protestants had in common, rather than their differences. Looked at this way, the diplomatic signalling of the reformers' portraits was compatible with Elizabeth's broader diplomatic strategy, which saw her pursue alliances with princes belonging to all of the main protestant confessions.