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This article explores the inscriptions and material metamorphoses of Henry VII in Horace Walpole’s ‘paper fabric’, a reversible world of writing, collecting, and book-making. In *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762), Walpole celebrates the funerary monument of Henry VII by Pietro Torrigiano at Westminster Abbey. In *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* (1768), conjecture and speculation become methodological prompts to unveil the textual and architectural discontinuities of history. Walpole’s next historical experiment consists in placing a bust of Henry VII in the agonies of death in the Star Chamber at his house at Strawberry Hill in Twickenham. The bust’s importance is captured by its reappearance propped on top of a frontispiece and its dissemination in other reproductions in extra-illustrated copies of *A Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole, Youngest Son of Sir Robert Walpole Earl of Oxford, at Strawberry-Hill near Twickenham, Middlesex* ... (1784). A dramatic representation of the bust in John Carter’s extra-illustrated copy of *A Description*, later engraved in his *Specimens of the Ancient Sculpture and Painting now remaining in this Kingdom* (1790–94), shows the alternative trajectories of Henry VII from Westminster Abbey to Strawberry Hill, from Walpole’s cosmopolitan collection of curiosities to Carter’s paper collection of national gothic specimens.

**Abstract**

This article explores the inscriptions and material metamorphoses of Henry VII in Horace Walpole’s ‘paper fabric’, a reversible world of writing, collecting, and book-making. In *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762), Walpole celebrates the funerary monument of Henry VII by Pietro Torrigiano at Westminster Abbey. In *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* (1768), conjecture and speculation become methodological prompts to unveil the textual and architectural discontinuities of history. Walpole’s next historical experiment consists in placing a bust of Henry VII in the agonies of death in the Star Chamber at his house at Strawberry Hill in Twickenham. The bust’s importance is captured by its reappearance propped on top of a frontispiece and its dissemination in other reproductions in extra-illustrated copies of *A Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole, Youngest Son of Sir Robert Walpole Earl of Oxford, at Strawberry-Hill near Twickenham, Middlesex* ... (1784). A dramatic representation of the bust in John Carter’s extra-illustrated copy of *A Description*, later engraved in his *Specimens of the Ancient Sculpture and Painting now remaining in this Kingdom* (1790–94), shows the alternative trajectories of Henry VII from Westminster Abbey to Strawberry Hill, from Walpole’s cosmopolitan collection of curiosities to Carter’s paper collection of national gothic specimens.
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This paper explores the material metamorphoses of Horace Walpole’s historical imagination through the inscriptions and wanderings of Henry VII in Walpole’s ‘paper fabric’. I will start with Henry VII’s chapel at Westminster Abbey in Walpole’s *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762) and then turn to his reappearance in Walpole’s *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* (1768). Moving from Walpole’s historical writing to his architectural inventions and his collection, I will explore the dissemination of Henry VII’s chapel and sculpture, focusing on the inscription of a bust of Henry VII in the agonies of death in the Star Chamber at Strawberry Hill. Finally, I will return to paper inscriptions to consider the reappearance of Henry VII in the monumental paratext of *A Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole, Youngest Son of Sir Robert Walpole Earl of Oxford, at Strawberry-Hill near Twickenham, Middlesex* ... (1774, 1784), and to trace the sculpture in the augmented form of the extra-illustrated book.

**In the paper fabric**

In his preface to *A Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole, Youngest Son of Sir Robert Walpole Earl of Oxford, at Strawberry-Hill* ... (1784), Walpole describes his house as ‘a paper fabric and an assemblage of curious Trifles, made by an insignificant Man’. Walpole’s material imagination draws on the description of the historian and the antiquarian in John Dart’s *Westmonasterium* ... (1723): ‘the first builds a new Fabrick, (which, if he’s skilful, he may do regularly, having the Materials provided him,) while the latter is gathering the broken and irregular Fragments of an old one’. The textual and architectural dimensions of Dart’s ‘fabric’ are critical to Walpole’s ‘fictive architectural history’. For architectural historian Kevin Rogers, it consisted in the invention of a fictive ‘ancient seat, developed and extended over generations’; yet Walpole’s ostentatious ‘pastiche of architectural quotations’, his deliberate appropriations, resizing, and repurposing of gothic specimens, spell out an ironic visual history.

Dart’s *Westmonasterium* was a key source for Walpole. In 1762 Walpole quoted it in his *Anecdotes for Painting in England* as a source for the sepulchral monument of Henry VII at Westminster Abbey. In 1766 he sent *Westmonasterium* to architect Robert Adam together with William Dugdale’s *History of St Paul’s Cathedral in London* (1658), indicating the specific plates that should be taken as models for architectural inventions at Strawberry Hill. Once abstracted from their original forms and translated into prints in books, gothic specimens could be adapted to new assemblages. In 1764, ‘paper fabric’ reflects on the materiality of his antiquarian practice. Books work as engines for experiments in scale and miniaturization; they mediate the adaptation of the public monument into the domestic interior. In turn, Strawberry Hill is documented through paper specimens that fit the house back within the bindings of a book, as copies of *A Description* are augmented with a growing visual apparatus to document the house on paper.

In the preface to *Anecdotes of Painting in Britain* (1762) Walpole acknowledges the antiquarian practice of the engraver George Vertue, emphasizing the meticulous and repetitive nature of the antiquarian tour, his methodical gathering, minced, and cataloguing activities.
Mr. Vertue had for several years been collecting materials for his work; he conversed and corresponded with most of the virtuosi in England; he was personally acquainted with the oldest performers in the science; he minutely down every thing he heard from them. He visited every collection, made catalogues of them, attended sales, copied every paper he could find relative to the art, searched offices, registers of parishes and registers of wills for births and deaths, turned over all our own authors, and translated those of other countries which related to his subject. He wrote down every thing he heard, saw, or read. His collections amounted to near forty volumes large and small.\(^7\)

Walpole’s praise of Vertue highlights the tension between the orders of collecting and writing. Against the meticulous accuracy of the archival researcher, the evidence of reading turns method into confusion: Vertue’s writing has ‘no order, no connection, no accuracy.’\(^8\) When writing follows the order of discovery, the methodical attention to the archival record is contrasted with the ‘indigested method of his collections, registered occasionally as he learned every circumstance’, which obliges Walpole to ‘turn over every volume many and many times, as they laid in confusion, to collect the articles I wanted.’\(^9\) The mediations of writing involve another act of collecting for the *Anecdotes* to emerge out of the manuscripts’ ‘heap of immethodic confusion.’\(^10\)

The vocabulary of speculation marks the field of enquiry and the diverging methodological approaches of the antiquarian and the historian.\(^11\) ‘Hypothesis’, ‘conjecture’, and ‘imagination’ work as counterpoints in Walpole’s account of Vertue’s collecting practices:

> He did not even deal in hypothesis, scarce in conjecture. He visited and revisited every picture, every monument, that was an object of his researches; and being so little a slave of his own imagination, he was cautious of trusting to that of others. In his memorandums he always put a quaere against whatever was told him of suspicious aspect.\(^12\)

‘Quaere’ marks the *disjecta membra* of Vertue’s enquiries. By signalling their uncertain status as interim entries in a work in progress, Vertue controls the urge to fill in the gaps through conjecture and keeps the imagination in check, broken knowledge being better than the illusion of a seamless whole. ‘There is no Danger in Conjecture, if it be proposed as Conjecture,’ argues Samuel Johnson, so long as the collator confines the imagination to the margin, and thus contains the excesses of conjectural criticism.\(^13\)

Henry VII’s funerary monument exemplifies the contrast between the practice of the antiquarian and the historian described by Dart. In a notebook dating from 1713 Vertue documents Henry VII’s funerary monument drawing on John Stowe’s *Chronicles* for the monument’s date, then tracks Stowe’s identification of the sculptor’s name as ‘one Peter T. . . a Painter of Florence’ in Giorgio Vasari’s *Lives*, and proceeds to sum up his life.\(^14\) In a notebook dated 1721 containing notes on the lives of painters Vertue mentions that Francis Barlow had drawn monuments in Westminster Abbey and Henry VII’s Chapel ‘for a Large Edition of Mr Keep’s *Monumenta Westmonastericiæ*’ and records information about Wenceslaus Hollar.\(^15\) Finally, in a notebook dating from 1736–41 he draws from Benvenuto Cellini’s autobiography: ‘his acquaintance at Florence with Piero Torrigiano. Scultore, del Re’ (‘[sic] a later entry mentions Torrigiano’s trouble with the Inquisition for making a sculpture of the Madonna and then taking it to pieces, and acknowledges Uvedale Price, ‘who had been lately in Spain’, as his source.\(^16\) Apart from the initial entry on the monument, all other information is scattered across miscellaneous notebooks.

In *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762) Walpole reworks Vertue’s scattered notes, gleans anecdotes from Vasari’s *Lives* and Cellini’s autobiography, and integrates them with information about the monument’s expenses. Walpole’s account of Henry VII’s funerary monument at Westminster Abbey is split into two. While Vertue’s ‘indigested’ information is brought together in the life of Torrigiano and arranged under the reign of Henry VIII, the first mention of the monument occurs in the chapter on Henry VII, and prompts the sketch of a historical character:

> Henry VII seems never to have laid out any money so willingly, as on what he could never enjoy, his tomb—on that he was profuse; but the very service for which it was intended, probably comforted him with the thought that it would not be paid for till after his death. Being neither ostentatious nor liberal, genius had no favour from him: he reigned as an attorney would have reigned, and would have preferred a conveyancer to Praxiteles.\(^17\)

Walpole’s writing departs from the mould of the lives of the painters. The King’s profile is closer to the tradition of the moral biography embodied in Francis Bacon’s ‘Civil Character of Henry VII, an extract of *The History of the Reign of King Henry VII*, which was included in an edition of his *Philosophical Works* dedicated to the young Walpole in 1735.\(^18\) David Hume also discusses the character of Henry VII in his *History of England*, confirming ‘his natural propensity’: ‘avarice, which had ever been his predominant passion, being encreased by age, and encouraged by absolute authority, broke all restraint of shame or justice.’\(^19\) The hoarder’s reckoning acquires dramatic depth with sickness: ‘remorse even seized him at intervals […] till death, by its nearer approaches, impressed new terror upon him’.\(^20\) Hume’s final assessment of the King’s character spells out

> private interest, rather than the motives of public spirit; and where he deviated from selfish regards, it was unknown to himself, and ever from the malignant prejudices of faction or the mean prospects of avarice; not from the sallies of passion, or allurements of pleasure; still less, from the benign motives of friendship and generosity.\(^21\)

From Bacon and Hume Walpole derives the elements of the King’s ruling passion. Walpole’s ironic take on the King’s investment in something that he would only be able to enjoy because payment would be due posthumously corresponds to the dynamics of character sketched by Hume. However, Walpole’s application of the King’s avarice to the monument is his own.\(^22\)
A footnote defers description of the monument itself to Dart’s *Westmonasterium*. Walpole’s page reference leads to Dart’s chapter on church donations, where Dart details Henry VII’s complex negotiations to endow his chapel with revenue sufficient to provide monks who ‘were to say daily Mass for his Soul, and the Souls of his Wife and Children’, endowing £5000 for masses and alms, sermons on ‘Good Friday, Monday in Easter Week, and Lady-Day, and every Sunday’. Dart’s later discussion of the chapel focuses on the burial ritual of Henry VII’s Queen, the emblems and iconography of the hss-reliefs around the tomb, and their genealogical significance. Eighteenth-century sources stress Henry VII’s focus on the strategic need to embody the line of succession through the sequential arrangement of funerary monuments, pointing out that the plan for the chapel originated in his desire to be buried next to Henry VI to assert his royal lineage, and suggesting that a royal chapel would provide genealogical justification for his reign.

Walpole’s engagement with Henry VII takes on a practical dimension in the paper fabric of his house a year after the publication of *Anecdotes*, when he announces the latest papier-mâché decoration in the gallery: ‘the ceiling is Harry VII’s chapel in *propria persona*: the canopys are all placed’. Abstraction from the funerary function and complex, reduced to its *disiecta membra*, as an element of style the gothic specimen can take on a new life. Transferred from the chapel at Westminster Abbey to a private picture gallery, it now symbolizes the flourishing of the arts, embodying the narrative of *Anecdotes* in the paper fabric of the house. The transition from the chapel to the gothic villa is symptomatic of different economies of viewing; it marks a secularization of the cult economy of the dead, a transition from cult to exhibition value, from worship to aesthetic, historical, and architectural practice. Walpole’s art-historical investigation informs his choice of specimens for the house. His letters duly note provenance and express his delight in the practice of architectural quotation. Consider Bishop Wareham’s tomb, ‘the last example of unharbored gothic’, metamorphosed into a chimney. Walpole’s play with style depends on recognition and the discontinuous effects of heterotopia.

Where antiquarians and textual editors critique conjecture for its false continuities, dealing in hypotheses acquires an opposite function in Walpole’s *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* (1768). Going against genealogical narratives, Walpole’s conjecture is part of a sceptical practice; it breaks up their continuum, and dwells in their discontinuities: ‘the attempt,’ Walpole claimed, ‘was mere matter of curiosity and speculation’. This seemingly amateur gesture points to a historiographical hermeneutics. In a passage that Walpole chooses as his epigraph for *Historic Doubts* the French Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (1733) emphasizes the need to focus on the motivations of authors. Walpole’s thought experiment addresses Lancastrian historiography and asks the reader to ‘read this history with much distrust’.

The picture of Richard the Third, as drawn by historians, was a character formed by prejudice and invention. I did not take Shakespeare’s tragedy for a genuine representation, but I did take the story of that reign for a tragedy of imagination. Many of the crimes imputed to Richard seemed improbable. […] As it was easy to perceive, under all the glare of excusiums which historians have heaped on the wisdom of Henry the Seventh, that he was a mean and unfeeling tyrant, I suspected that they had blackened his rival, till Henry, by the contrast, should appear in a kind of amiable light.

Walpole’s historiographical experiment has a precedent in a query sketched in Vertue’s notebooks, prompted by shifts in the appreciation of Richard III and Henry VII:

> ...now for novelty 3 all old Authors that have represented R. 3d to be cruel. unhandsom and wicked—now make him out to be fair Gentle humane coragious & wholly wrongd in his character—and that H.7 is the wicked barbarous King [sic].

Walpole’s critical history aims to ‘see a foolish and absurd tale removed from the pages of the gravest historians’. Chief among them are Bacon and Hume, who is criticized for his reliance on the dubious authority of authors writing in the Lancastrian line: Hume claims that the authority of Thomas More is ‘irresistible’; it ‘ought to weigh over an hundred light doubts’; Walpole mistrusts More and challenges the idea that ‘assertions and repetitions will serve for proofs, where facts and reasons are wanting’.

Walpole’s polemic with Hume is expressed through an architectural metaphor, which rearticulates Dart’s between the fabric of the antiquarian and the historian. In an earlier letter to Walpole, Hume had brushed off Walpole’s demand for sources and the need for references in the margins of the text, comparing his historical narrative to a house and the proliferation of documents and sources to a quarry. By contrast, in a supplement to *Historic Doubts* Walpole defines his ‘service to our history in clearing away a load of rubbish […] carelessly thrown there by writers, whose very dirt and mortar passed for buildings’. While he later expresses admiration for Hume’s account of Charles II as an ‘ingenious fabric’, he questions the underlying principles of Hume’s historical writing: ‘must he have an unbroken chain of history reposited in his head […]?’ Walpole’s denunciation of the smooth edifice of history ought not to be taken for an endorsement of Dart’s antiquarian fabric and conflated with antiquarian critiques of hypothetical thinking. His critical approach to historical records depends on the practice of conjectural thinking and sceptic philosophy. Against negative reviews read at the Society of Antiquaries, including one by the Society’s President Jeremiah Milles, and published in *Archaeologia*, Walpole’s response was scathing: ‘their understandings seem as much in ruin as the things they describe’.

Walpole’s critique of the historian and the antiquarian identifies a different paper fabric: his practice of discontinuity corresponds to the material dynamics of print culture. The
process of producing specimens copied and abstracted from their intended destinations enabled their dissemination and rearrangement in new spatial economies. In Walpole’s house Henry VII’s Chapel is reduced to a series of fragments that can be distributed and repurposed in new spatial narratives. This process of sculptural and architectural remediation responds to the logic of deferral that governs the discussion of the monument in Anecdotes. The king’s head is separated from the vaulted ceiling that frames the funerary monument in Westminster Abbey just as discussion of his mausoleum is separated from the sketch of his character, postponed, and resumed under the age of Henry VIII, when the work was executed and finished.  

**In the Star Chamber**

Henry VII is entered in the Star Chamber in the first edition of A Description in 1774: ‘a bust of Henry 7th, in stone, a model in great taste for his tomb, by Torregiano’.  

Walpole’s description makes us see the bust in relation to the monument at Westminster Abbey, as if inviting us to reposition the king from the vertical orientation of the bust to the horizontal, recumbent form of the funerary sculpture, restoring the head to the whole body in its sepulchral and monumental setting. By entering a reference to Westminster Abbey Walpole’s writing evokes additional architectural and sculptural forms, virtually superimposing them on the object’s material properties as a bust situated in the specific architectural setting of the house.

No explanation is given for the Star Chamber’s name. While reflecting the ‘golden stars in mosaics’ that decorate it, it also involves a political allusion to the Camera Stellata at Westminster. Known as Star Chamber because of the stars that may have once decorated the room where the meetings took place,  

it identified a council of state whose judicial remit was defined during Henry VII’s reign by what came to be known as the Star Chamber Act (1487).  

Bacon judged it ‘one of the sagest and noblest institutions of this kingdom’.  

Hume noted that ‘Lord Bacon extols the use of this court; but men began, during the age of that historian, to feel that so arbitrary a jurisdiction was totally incompatible with liberty.’  

In the Commentaries on the Laws of England Sir William Blackstone quoted Clarendon’s History of the Rebellion on the court’s stretched jurisdiction ‘becoming both a court of law to determine civil rights, and court of revenue to enrich the treasury’; he remarked on the ‘enormous oppression’ and the ‘just odium’ it provoked until it was abolished by the Long Parliament during Charles I’s reign.  

By anchoring Henry VII to the institution of the Star Chamber, Walpole emphasized the gothic possibilities suggested in historiographical accounts of Henry VII’s dark temper.  

From Westminster to Strawberry Hill the room of state council undergoes significant change. While its star-vaulted decoration at Westminster pointed to the exercise of public judgement, drawing on the iconography of medieval palaces of reason, the Star Chamber at Strawberry Hill is ‘a small anti-room’.  

This resizing and repurposing can be read in the light of Walpole’s displacement of public signifiers, from a site associated with the exercise of juridical power to ‘an assemblage of curious trifles made by an insignificant man’, from the public commemoration of Westminster Abbey to the ‘little play-thing-house’ he claimed to have got from the shop of Mrs Chevenix.  

The room’s diminutive dimensions offer an alternative architectural setting, which expresses the king’s character captured by Hume: ‘his capacity was excellent, but somewhat contracted, by the narrowness of his heart [...] he was always extremely attentive to his affairs, but possessed not the faculty of seeing far into futurity.’  

Represented in the ‘agonies of death’, the king’s head is confined in narrow room and denied the grandeur of his planned sepulchral afterlife. As a transitional space belonging to the older structure of the original house, the Star Chamber also functions as an allegory of discontinuity, a threshold that refuses to smooth away the abrupt transition from one kingdom to the next.

The Star Chamber was remodelled in 1759, together with the Holbein Chamber, and the ‘dusky passage’ ‘to prepare you for solemnity’; as Walpole argued in 1772, ‘the dusky passage makes the richness & largeness of the gallery appear much more considerable’. Just as the narrative of Anecdotes isolates the climactic moment of the king faced with the terrifying prospects of his afterlife from his planned monument, the bust capturing his tortured reflections on futurity is embedded in a space named after the institution that emblematized his reign and clearly distinct from the gallery.

The effect achieved is captured in Walpole’s humorous depiction of visitors walking through Strawberry Hill at night:  

Imagine, Madam, what I could show them when it was pitch dark! Of all the houses upon earth mine, from the painted glass and overhanging trees, wants the sun the most, besides the Star Chamber and passage being obscured on purpose to raise the gallery. They ran their foreheads against Henry VII and took the grated door of the Tribune for the dungeon of the castle. I mustered all the candlesticks in the house, but before they could be lighted up, the young ladies, who by the way are extremely natural, agreeable and civil, were seized with a panic of highwaymen and wanted to go.  

The letter’s mise en scène captures the gothic potential of Walpole’s house, where a careful study of atmospheres and lighting effects produces an aesthetics of surprise and wonder. The medium of darkness contributes to Henry VII’s recalcitrant agency. The abrupt transition from darkness to light disrupts spatial continuity. Placed in a deliberately obscure passage of the house, the bust halts the narrative continuum.

Walpole’s strategy of collecting and display privileges objects that appear out of place, subvert categories, series, and historical narratives. In 1773 Walpole bought family portraits of Henry V and Henry VIII, which ‘with my Marriages of Henry VI and VII’ would ‘compose a suite of the House of Lancaster’. Yet even this desire to complete the series resists
the pressure of linear narrative. As Sean Silver notes, ‘he seems to have purchased them together in order to have the privilege of displaying them apart’. Fragmenting and disrupting the genealogical line, Walpole’s curatorial imagination ‘opens up the possibility of a radical, and material, counter-history’. His specimens work against progressive histories.

The choice of gothic architecture is central to Walpole’s strategy of display. When he visited the ‘new office of state papers’ at Versailles in 1765, Walpole commented on its ‘perspective of seven or eight large chambers’. The architectural form of the enfilade arranged a suite of rooms into a visual continuum that was ideally suited to walk the eye through a visible history of art arranged systematically in chronological succession. By contrast, the uncanny effects of the bust of Henry VII interrupt the movement from room to room, and from one reign to another. Instead of signalling the emergence of Renaissance art and patronage under the Tudors and Jacobins exhibited in the gallery, the encounter with Henry VII functions as a stumbling block, generates heterogeneous gothic architectures, and turns Walpole’s version of the Tribuna of the Uffizi into a gothic dungeon. Walpole’s gothic architecture spells out his recalcitrance to systematic arrangements, pre-empts attempts to subsume heterogeneous objects in a historical sequence, and subverts linear succession.

On the frontispiece

Drawings and prints multiply the permutations of objects when the collection is inscribed in the paper fabric of the book. The role played by the head of Henry VII in the gothic effects of the house is heightened by its startling appearance on top of a gothic structure depicted in a watercolour by Edward Edwards, which was engraved by Thomas Morris and used as a monumental frontispiece for Walpole’s A Description (figure 1). The head’s gigantic proportions and its prominent position in the paratext indicate its metonymical relationship to the house. Placed on the threshold of the house’s ‘paper fabric’, the head stands as chief representative of the collection, literally above the bronze saint from the oratory and the armour of Francis I from the staircase, which are inscribed in the niches to the sides of the window. The choice to feature such objects on the frontispiece suggests their status of ‘Principal Curiosities’. Their heterogeneity is subsumed to the composition—the stone, bronze, gilt steel of the originals homogenized by the uniform medium of the drawing and the hand of the draughtsman and engraver.

Proposed on the threshold of the text, the head also points outside the house, following the trajectories of busts of Henry VII in earlier architectures of London. Another bust of Henry VII used to be housed in the so-called Holbein Gate, a structure built during the reign of Henry VIII to connect east and west buildings of Whitehall, engraved by George Vertue in 1725 and published by the Society of Antiquaries in Vetusta Monumenta in 1747 before it was demolished (figure 2). In his antiquarian tour of November 1779 the Reverend William Cole noted three busts in terracotta of Henry VII, Bishop Fisher, and Henry VIII in the hall of Mr Wright’s house at Hatfield Priory: ‘They are said to be the work of Pietro Torregiano, who executed the magnificent tomb of Henry VII, and were taken out of the room over the Holbein gate at Whitehall.’ Walpole replied:

The three heads I remember on the gate of Whitehall; there were five more. The demolished structure was transported to the Great Park at Windsor by the late Duke of Cumberland, who intended to re-erect it, but never did; and now I suppose its ruins ruined, as its place no more.

I did not know what was become of the heads, and am glad any are preserved. I should doubt their being the works of Torregiano.

The head’s association with the Holbein gate, and its transposition from urban to garden architecture, may have suggested the outdoor composition of Walpole’s frontispiece two years later. The gate became associated with Charles I, who had walked through the gallery built inside the gate to reach the scaffold on the day of his execution, an association marked by the publication of King Charles his speech made upon the scaffold at Whitehall Gate immediately before his execution (1649). Such a scene of beheading casts the shadow of the regicide on the head of Henry VII propped on the frontispiece of A Description.

Although Walpole expressed admiration for Holbein’s Gate in Anecdotes, for the frontispiece of Strawberry Hill he harks back to the earlier gothic architecture flourishing under the reigns of Henry VI and Henry VII. The title is inscribed in a large window whose form recalls King’s College Chapel in Cambridge, Walpole’s college. Work on the College Chapel had begun under the reign of Henry VI, who had founded the college, but it was interrupted; its continuation and completion were funded by Henry VII towards the end of his life. An eighteenth-century historian of the chapel explained such an uncharacteristic expense with the desire to express the power of the Lancastrian line; and, drawing on Hume’s account, to ‘allay the terrors under which he laboured’. Placing the head of Henry VII in the agonies of death above the gothic structure of the frontispiece sums up the king’s investment in gothic architecture and the gothic aesthetic of Walpole’s house.

Extra-illustrations and the wanderings of Walpole’s principal curiosities

Henry VII’s multiple trajectories in Walpole’s ‘paper fabric’ take on new forms through the practice of extra-illustration. Associated with James Granger’s Biographical History of England (1769) and the rage for collecting heads of illustrious people, this practice is particularly well documented in copies of A Description altered by a coterie of people gathered around Walpole and his private press at Strawberry Hill. At the intersection of reading and collecting, words and images, extra-illustration is driven by the desire to
document the text with visual evidence; it is an exercise in denotation, which turns words into prompts to gather a repository of images to be housed within the work’s bindings, pasting them into the margins of the letterpress or onto additional leaves. At its most extreme, the act of anchoring words to images of their referents ends up disarticulating the book as a material object, breaking up its original gatherings to host a proliferating corpus of illustrations interleaved between pages of letterpress, and thus potentially multiplying the work into a number of volumes. Such insertions interrupt the transition between pages of letterpress and disrupt the act of reading. The collection then overpowers the text and subverts the book’s function as a support for reading. In other cases extra-illustration curates the text, putting certain elements into relief and silencing others.

Edwards’s watercolour frontispiece is inserted in Walpole’s own extra-illustrated copy of *A Description*, whereas copies of the engraved frontispiece can be found in the augmented para-text of other extra-illustrated copies of *A Description* alongside portraits of Walpole, views of the house, and other visual records that provide documentary evidence for the words on the page, anchoring the text to its referents. Yet this multiplication of images destabilizes the order of the book, blurring the distinction between its component parts. As the frontispiece changes position in the paratext of the extra-illustrated book, its dislocation undermines its very function as a frontispiece: instead of establishing the boundaries of the text, it points to the book’s broken gatherings and its unstable place inside and outside the book.

A ‘Busto of Henry VII [drawn to half the size of the original and finish’d on the spot] in the Starr-Chamber at Strawberry Hill’ by John Carter, architectural draughtsman for the Society of Antiquaries, is inserted in his extra-illustrated copy of Walpole’s *A Description* ([figure 3]). At the back of the book, Carter itemizes specimens from the Strawberry Hill collection and their prices in a hand-written ‘list sent to Mr Bull’. These entries suggest that Carter’s copy functions as a sampler of designs to be executed for Richard Bull, an extra-illustrator associated with Granger and the Walpole set, who ‘ereected for himself a monument of taste unequalled in Europe’. Edwards’s profile drawing is inscribed at the bottom of a number of drawings inserted in the book, including his ink and wash drawing of the bust of Henry VII ([figure 1]). Edwards’s portrait illustrates the contents of the Star Chamber detailed in the text below it and the letterpress in turn becomes a plinth for the portrait as the sculptural bust is evoked in the flat medium of the page. Difference in size produces very different effects. On the frontispiece the head is gigantic compared with the other elements of the composition, but small compared with the size of Bawtree’s drawing, let alone Carter’s dramatic full-page portrait ([figure 3]). Carter’s portrait is faithful to the most striking feature of the bust’s tortured physiognomy: the king’s parted lips. This feature of the bust corresponds to an aesthetics of pain embodied in the expression of the Laocoon, which Walpole displayed in a bronze reproduction in the Gallery. In distorting the lines of the face, the Laocoon had generated a discussion about whether violent suffering was compatible with visual representation. Edwards and Bawtree choose to compose the king’s facial expression, closing his lips, but emphasizing the down-turned corners of his mouth. Carter’s bolder choice to reproduce the bust’s open mouth emphasizes the subject’s break from convention, departing from the genre of the sculptural portrait.

A more finished version of Henry VII faces the page of letterpress listing the contents of the Star Chamber. While other pages are mounted with a proliferation of images, the large head of Henry VII acquires dramatic depth by occupying a whole page. Another leaf extra-illustrated to document the contents of the Star Chamber, taken from a catalogue of the collection of classical coins owned by Dr Conyer Middleton, brings to light the allegorical dimension of Walpole’s display: in the Star Chamber the bust of the avaricious hoarder king is placed on top of a ‘collection of English and foreign coins’.

Compared with Carter’s focus on architectural detail, ‘antiques and curiosities’, aesthetic miscellaneity characterizes Bull’s choice of extra-illustrations, which document a variety of subjects in a variety of media and on different qualities and sizes of paper. Henry VII’s bust does not make it into Walpole’s own extra-illustrated copy of *A Description*, where the coin collection of Dr Middleton takes centre stage. However, a very different delineation of the bust is pasted above the relevant letterpress in the expanded margin of the extra-illustrated page in a copy of the book owned by the Strawberry Hill engraver William Bawtree ([figure 4]).

These three extra-illustrated drawings show the radical change Henry VII’s portrait bust undergoes as a singular subject copied and embedded in the aesthetics of the codex. In placing his drawing above the relevant page of letterpress, Bawtree’s layout evokes the placement of the head in Edwards’s frontispiece ([figures 1 and 3]). His portrait illustrates the contents of the Star Chamber detailed in the text below it and the letterpress in turn becomes a plinth for the portrait as the sculptural bust is evoked in the flat medium of the page. Difference in size produces very different effects. On the frontispiece the head is gigantic compared with the other elements of the composition, but small compared with the size of Bawtree’s drawing, let alone Carter’s dramatic full-page portrait ([figure 3]). Carter alone is faithful to the most striking feature of the bust’s tortured physiognomy: the king’s parted lips. This feature of the bust corresponds to an aesthetics of pain embodied in the expression of the Laocoon, which Walpole displayed in a bronze reproduction in the Gallery. In distorting the lines of the face, the Laocoon had generated a discussion about whether violent suffering was compatible with visual representation. Edwards and Bawtree choose to compose the king’s facial expression, closing his lips, but emphasizing the down-turned corners of his mouth. Carter’s bolder choice to reproduce the bust’s open mouth emphasizes the subject’s break from convention, departing from the genre of the sculptural portrait. The open mouth is even less compatible with the monumental composure of the king’s sepulchral monument. Carter’s draughtsmanship challenges Walpole’s reception of the bust as a model for the tomb.

In 1792 Carter published an etching of Henry VII’s head in the second volume of *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture and Painting*, with a notice mentioning the owners of the original bust (Walpole) and of the drawing (Bull), as well as the name of the sculptor; he then described the work and the circumstances of its production:

> This head is carved in stone by the famous Torregiani, and represents Henry in the agonies of death; the sculptor, who came over to make his majesty’s tomb in Westminster Abbey, being supposed to have seen the king as he was dying.

Compared with Walpole’s, Carter’s entry registers the visual evidence gathered in his work as a draughtsman, recording the difference between the portrait bust and the tomb. The two works are still attributed to the same sculptor, but their relationship is expressed in terms of their representation of...
different steps in the process of dying, making pain the pregnant moment captured by the bust, its dominant characteristic. Published in a number also containing plates of ‘Statues in Bassorelievo, on the High Altar of Christ Church, Hampshire’, ‘Statues & a Bassorelievo on the north side of the Chantry over the monumental chapel of Henry V, in Westminster Abbey’, and ‘A Brass, in the Church Hospital of St Cross, near Winchester’, Carter’s reproduction of the bust of Henry VII feels out of place. Yet the writing anchors the specimen to an economy of ownership and patronage, signalled by the dedication of the first volume of Specimens to Walpole.

Tracking the specimens from Walpole’s house that Carter includes in his repository of national treasures reveals a certain degree of permutation. Carter’s drawing of a ‘Head of Henry III carved in oak’ was sent to Walpole in 1780 with the suggestion that the item was available for purchase. The artist later produced an etching, which he published in Specimens in 1782, anchoring it to its original location in Barnwell as part of his record of the nation’s gothic treasures, but later noted its change of property. To document his acquisition of the head, Walpole inserted Carter’s drawing in his extra-illustrated copy of A Description. Bull, in turn, used Carter’s etching from Specimens to extra-illustrate the head into his copy of A Description. Following the paper trail reveals the object’s multiple inscriptions in changing public and private locations and public and private meanings. These paper exchanges delineate the social life of the object within a network of social relations shaped by an economy of patronage and gift exchange.

By the end of the 1790s, Carter acquired a public voice in advocating an emerging concept of public heritage. Writing on St George’s Day 1803 in the Gentleman’s Magazine, he defined his role as ‘literary defender of the Antiquities of this Kingdom’. Henry VII’s Chapel was a regular topic in the columns he published in Gentleman’s Magazine between 1797 and 1817. The chapel’s status is most clearly presented in the wake of the 1803 fire: ‘the public are highly interested in Henry’s chapel; it is a national glory, therefore shall it fade in man’s remembrance and be forgotten?’ Carter’s literary role consists in evoking a different response to the monuments. Laying aside the precision of the draughtsman, he switches to a more embodied register to convey the ‘religious awe’ experienced by seeing the ‘divine fabric’ and touching ‘each precious relic’: ‘my life has been, and still is devoted to be, the mental guardian of the place’.

The inscription of Walpole’s gothic specimen in Carter’s antiquities signals three stages in the appreciation of Henry VII’s funerary monument and chapel. Dart and Widmore inscribe the funerary sculpture in a royal economy of representation in which iconography and architectural contingency project claims about genealogy and the line of succession. By contrast, for Walpole the chapel and the bust become private curiosities, elements of style fit to be adapted to a private interior. Carter’s antiquarian practice bridges the private and public uses of Henry VII. In the context of Walpole’s collection at Strawberry Hill, Carter sees Henry VII within a cosmopolitan canon that situates antiquarian specimens of Britain’s past alongside the classical bust of Caligula, Renaissance treasures such as Cellini’s Bell and the armour of Francis I, and the ambition to produce a cosmopolitan Tribuna. When Carter abstracts Henry VII from Strawberry Hill and selects him for his collection of prints, the cosmopolitan world of Walpole’s collection is purified from the record. The King’s bust is turned into a specimen of the nation’s ancient sculpture and painting. As a draughtsman for the Society of Antiquaries, Carter is driven by the need to delineate, document, and preserve the nation’s monuments, which he inflects in a defence of the monuments’ historical integrity against restorations that might involve architectural innovation.
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