Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart, the Winter King and Queen

Following the destruction of Heidelberg Castle and the pillaging of its furnishings by troops of King Louis XIV of France in 1689 and 1693, during the Palatine War of Succession, the fact that the Counts Palatine and Electors of the Rhine had assembled in their residence one of the most splendid collections of tapestries in Germany fell into oblivion. The counts' self-image, derived from their royal lineage, did not mean that they were exempt from permanent competition for status, rank, and prestige with other princely families, such as the Habsburgs and their rival Wittelsbach cousins, the dukes of Bavaria. Therefore, the Counts Palatine could not neglect the use of the richest and most prestigious pictorial medium of the time and the preferred means of princely propaganda to further promote their family reputation. Unlike most of their German peers, they had begun to summon master weavers to work in Heidelberg in the 1430s. This explains the enthusiasm with which the size and the richness of the Palatine tapestry collection were praised by Antoine de Lalaing, count of Hoogstraten and Culemborg, chamberlain to the court of Duke Philip the Handsome, the son of Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I. De Lalaing was thus very well acquainted with the current standards of Burgundian court culture, against which all other forms of princely display were measured. On the occasion of the duke's visit to the Palatinate to meet with Elector Philip in the fall of 1503, de Lalaing acknowledged in his diary that Heidelberg Castle and its furnishings completely matched the requirements of splendor, even royal splendor, a judgment based primarily on the fact that he found all apartments and halls lavishly hung with expensive tapestries. During the first half of the sixteenth century, the Counts Palatine kept buying complete tapestry sets of biblical and mythological stories directly from the Netherlands. The acquisitions of Electors Frederick II and Otto Henry, both great admirers and passionate collectors of every kind of woven splendor, added considerably to what their predecessors had brought together since the reign of King Rupert I at the beginning of the fifteenth century.

The collection was further augmented when, in the early 1560s, Elector Frederick III succeeded in encouraging refugees from religious persecution in the southern Netherlands to settle in Frankenthal, a small town halfway between Heidelberg and Worms. Among them came numbers of artists and craftsmen: famous painters such as Gillis van Coninxloo and Pieter Schoubroeck, goldsmiths, jewelers, and tapestry weavers, most of the last coming
directly from Oudenaarde or having close ties to that city. Those weavers quickly installed new workshops in Frankenthal, which for about half a century made the town the most important center of tapestry production in Germany. Under the guidance of master weaver Paulus Rubentz, these local workshops were soon, and at an increasing rate, able to supply the Heidelberg court with new, high-quality tapestries. In an inventory of 1584, there are listed almost 450 figurative wall hangings, 263 of which are explicitly described as tabetzeren (tapestries) and 183 called Rücktücher (dossals). It is a fair guess that thirty years later, in 1613, when Frederick V took his wife, Elizabeth Stuart, to Heidelberg, the tapestry stock of the Counts Palatine well exceeded 500 pieces.

To satisfy his indulged wife’s expectations, to enable her to continue the royal lifestyle to which she was accustomed, the young Pfalsgrave accommodated his beloved “Englisch cleinod und Perlein” (English jewel and pearl) in a newly erected palace, the “Englische Bau,” which included a spectacular theater and ballroom on top of the “Dicker Turm” (giant tower), and he assigned Salomon de Caus to add an expansive terrace garden, the famous Hortus Palatinus (fig. 1). When she arrived, Elizabeth found that the interior of Heidelberg Castle “was superb beyond description: the ceiling was painted al fresco, the walls were hung with tapestry; and a suite of ten rooms, including the knight’s hall, the royal saloon, the silver chamber, and ante rooms, formed a complete Gothic palace.” Her own apartment was lavishly furnished; it is said that “two Rubens glowed upon her walls. Turkey carpets were strewn upon the floors of rooms hung with red and brown gilded leather. She was surrounded by

---

Fig. 1. Jacques Fouquières, View of the Hortus Palatinus and Heidelberg Castle, ca. 1620. Oil on canvas, 178.5 x 263 cm. Kurpfälzisches Museum der Stadt Heidelberg (G 1822)
wrought-iron work from Nürnberg, heavily carved furniture covered with velvets and silks or elaborately inlaid and many exquisite bibelots of ivory and goldsmith’s work. Her table was adorned with massive silver plate and Munich and Bohemian glass. . . . The figures in the tapestries and on the plate and furniture were not like those displayed in her father’s palaces. 13) Those were the happy, lighthearted days of a dawning new golden age, when art, literature, music, and science flourished in Heidelberg,14 which unfortunately did not last even for a decade. Frederick’s finally agreeing to accept the crown of Bohemia in 1618 led straight into the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War. It was during this short period of lavish extravagance that the Heidelberg tapestry collection reached its peak. At this time, too, our story begins but with a prologue, staged in London on Saint Valentine’s Day, Sunday, February 14, 1613: the wedding day of Frederick and Elizabeth.

THE PALATINE WEDDING OF 1613
The marriage of the handsome Frederick V, future elector of the Rhine and presumed leader of the Protestant Union, and Elizabeth Stuart, the beautiful daughter of King James I of England and Ireland (James VI of Scotland), in London in 1613, was a spectacular event,15 and it was treated as such by the press. Publishing houses immediately covered the story in great detail, spreading it across all Europe in several languages, just the way the international networks would do today.16 To scholars of cultural history, these texts together with their illustrations offer an almost inexhaustible body of information about early seventeenth-century princely life and court ceremonies. To art historians interested primarily in paintings and sculpture, however, the reports are a bit of a disappointment because even the famous examples that once decorated the palaces and chapels went uncommented on in these accounts. If, on the other hand, we shift our attention to the alternative pictorial medium that at the time actually mat-

In public opinion today, tapestry qualifies as a minor or an applied art, inferior in status to the fine arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture, an attitude that is out of step with the opinions prevailing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To better understand the phenomenon, it is necessary to look at sociohistorical, artistic, and cultural developments of the period. In the first place, tapestries were not hung for art’s sake, not even if they were designed by famous artists and woven in top-quality workshops. Instead, they were symbols of power and wealth, of the most virtuous princely magnificenza, as well as a means of education and, as will be argued here, as sophisticated statecraft and shrewd diplomacy.17 For centuries, tapestries were considered to be the most cherished possessions of the nobility. They represented the richest and most prestigious pictorial medium of the time, and consequently they developed into the artifacts most fit to exemplify the prevailing princely self-images. Therefore, the display of carefully chosen narrative sets was a serious and well-planned visual statement by their owners, a strong and widely recognized act of selective propaganda that had to be taken seriously by the audiences. In fact, it is precisely because of their generally acknowledged public character that the chroniclers of the Palatine wedding told their readers about the tapestry decorations.

It goes without saying that such a noteworthy royal ceremony required the use of a vast number of tapestries to embellish both the private lodgings and the official sites related to the event.18 Right from the start, when Frederick paid an informal call on Elizabeth the day after his arrival and reception in London, the princess and her parents received him at Whitehall Palace, where Elizabeth’s “apartments had been remodeled in honour of his coming, and hung with fresh tapestries of the history of Abel” especially for the occasion.19 On February 7, 1613, the day of Frederick’s investi-
In the Order of the Garter, Elizabeth took up residence at Saint James’s Palace in the apartments last occupied by her brother the late Prince Henry Frederick, which were also fitted with tapestries especially for her. For the wedding, Whitehall Chapel was decorated with at least two, possibly three, pieces from the famous Acts of the Apostle tapestries, a series originally designed by Raphael in 1515 for Pope Leo X for the Sistine Chapel. The full-size cartoons were initially woven in Brussels, the renowned center of tapestry production, in the workshop of the master weaver and entrepreneur Pieter van Aelst. Later the cartoons were sold, most likely to the workshop run by the Dermoyen family, although one of them was bought by a private collector from Venice and was subsequently lost. During the course of the sixteenth century, several more sets were woven from the Raphael cartoons—or from meticulous copies of them—in different Brussels workshops, including the set purchased by King Henry VIII of England in 1542, part of this set was hung in Whitehall Chapel on

Fig. 2. Gerrit van Honthorst, *Frederick V as King of Bohemia*, 1634. Oil on canvas, 212 x 143 cm. Kurpfälzisches Museum der Stadt Heidelberg (L 156)

Fig. 3. Gerrit van Honthorst, *Elizabeth Stuart as Queen of Bohemia*, 1634. Oil on canvas, 212 x 143 cm. Kurpfälzisches Museum der Stadt Heidelberg (L 157)
Fig. 4. *The Healing of the Lame Man* from Henry VIII’s set of the *Acts of the Apostles.* Tapestry design by Raphael, woven in an unidentified Brussels workshop, ca. 1540–42. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 386 × 566 cm (after removal of outer borders). Formerly Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin; present whereabouts unknown. Photograph: © J. Paul Getty Trust

Fig. 5. *Christ’s Charge to Peter* from Henry VIII’s set of the *Acts of the Apostles.* Tapestry design by Raphael, woven in an unidentified Brussels workshop, ca. 1540–42. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 386 × 566 cm (after removal of outer borders). Formerly Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin; present whereabouts unknown. Photograph: © J. Paul Getty Trust
the day of the Palatine wedding. From the rather ambiguous description of the furnishings by an anonymous chronicler from the Palatinate, two scenes can be identified: the Healing of the Lame Man (fig. 4), with Saints Peter and John prominently in the center, was behind the altar; to the right was Christ's Charge to Peter (fig. 5), which, probably because of the flock of sheep behind Christ, was misinterpreted as the "Good Shepherd." The tapestry to the left, called the "Wedding at Cana," cannot be linked beyond doubt to any of the remaining pieces in the Acts of the Apostles series.24

Frederick and Elizabeth probably learned even more about the clever use of figurative tapestries as means of sophisticated statecraft from the decoration of the new banqueting hall, an ephemeral structure built to host the state dinners that were part of the celebration of the betrothal as well as the wedding itself. There the throne canopy was lavishly adorned with golden tapestries, and the benches were covered with precious carpets. In addition, the master of ceremonies, Sir Lewis Lewkenor, ordered the display of a magnificent set of ten tapestries of the Defeat of the Spanish Armada, which represented one of England's greatest victories at sea.25
These highly praised tapestries did not belong to the English monarch. They were made for Lord Charles Howard of Effingham, Lord High Admiral and commander of the English naval forces against the Armada. Queen Elizabeth I dearly admired the set, and, attending a feast at Lord Howard's residence, wished to have it, but he was unwilling to share. The court officials who organized the wedding festivities now borrowed the Armada tapestries and had them taken to Whitehall Palace for the occasion. Three years later, in 1616, Lord Howard, who had fallen into adverse financial circumstances, sold the set to King James, who transferred it to the Royal Wardrobe in the Tower of London. On behalf of Oliver Cromwell, the set was hung permanently in the House of Lords, and it was lost in the Westminster Palace fire of 1834. The impression of the 1613 interior decoration of the improvised banqueting hall with its lavishly carpeted floor and benches, throne canopy, and the Armada tapestries hung closely around the walls must not have differed much from what is known of the furnishing of the House of Lords shortly before its destruction (fig. 6).

The Armada set illustrated with great care and accuracy the successive engagements and tactical maneuvers of the two fleets in

Tapestry in the Baroque
the English Channel, from the first appearance of the Spanish ships thirty miles southeast of The Lizard in Cornwall to their defeat off the coast of Gravelines near Calais and their disastrous retreat around Scotland and Ireland and back to Spain. The tapestries were designed by the Dutch draftsman Hendrick Cornelisz Vroom, who also painted the cartoons, and they were woven over a period of four years, 1592-95, in the studio of the master weaver François Spiering of Delft. They cost the enormous sum of £1,582 pounds. The focus of Vroom’s compositions was the sailing formation of the ships, which were depicted from the open sea in a panoramic view and at a scale large enough for the inclusion of detailed events. As a guideline for his designs, Vroom received chart drawings by Robert Adams, Supervisor of the Queen’s Buildings and renowned painter-cartographer, who had sailed with the English fleet and witnessed its epic victory. His records are probably the best contemporary evidence of the two fleets’ sailing orders. Two years later, Adams’s charts were published by Augustine Ryther to illustrate the English translation of Petruccio Ubaldini’s treatise Expeditonis Hispaniorum in Angliam Vera Descriptio Anno Domini MDLXXXVIII (fig. 7).

Thanks to John Pine’s engravings in his 1739 monograph The Tapestry Hangings of the
House of Lords, we know the appearance of each individual tapestry in the set. Pine showed almost prophetic insight into the fate of the set in the preface to this ambitious publication when he wrote, "because Time, or Accident, or Moth may deface these valuable Shadows, we have endeavoured to preserve their likeness."31

Juxtaposing Pine's engraving of the tapestry Sir Francis Drake Takes de Valdez's Gal- leon, and the Bear and Mary Rose Pursue the Enemy (fig. 8) with Ryther's engraving of Adams's chart of the same episode (fig. 7), one admires the skill and ingenuity of Vroom's translation of his models into large-scale tapestry cartoons. Although faithful to Adams's minute cartographic records of the military strategies of attack and retreat, Vroom's designs succeeded magnificently in converting Adam's bird's-eye layouts into vividly descriptive panoramic scenes. Most of the charts depicted two consecutive actions on one map, and Vroom followed that pattern. Occasionally, however, he emulated coastal scenes in his cartoons, pictured the ships as observed from open shore, and added picturesque topographical details of the distant coastline along the horizon. In addition, each tapestry was surrounded by a wide decorative border containing lifesize portraits of the commanders of the English fleet, each set in a medallion inscribed with the officer's name and that of his ship; on each piece, the English coat of arms and the device DIEU ET MON DROIT hover above the battle scenes.32

The idea of commemorating a military victory in the tapestry medium was not new, but one might wonder why the display of the Armada tapestries during a wedding ceremony was so important that the king would agree to borrow tapestries from the Lord High Admiral. Everybody knew that they were not the property of the crown. Further, we must remember that at the death of King Henry VIII in 1547 the stock of pictorial tapestry administered by the Royal Wardrobe contained more than 2,700 pieces, some of which had been designed explicitly to suit the size and needs of the old Banqueting Hall.33 Although the collection may have been depleted over the past decades,34 it definitely was not for a lack of choice that led to the king's borrowing of the Armada set. So why would the master of ceremonies, Sir Lewis Lewkenor, and his officer of assistance, Sir John Finet, have proposed to James I to pick such a martial theme to frame a happy party gathered to enjoy the king's only daughter's wedding banquet? The answer is brief: The decision to display the Armada tapestries resulted from the highly stylized customs of diplomacy and its common code of conduct; it was meant and understood as a means of sophisticated statecraft.

When word started to spread that Frederick and Elizabeth, both representing powerful Protestant countries, were about to marry, Spain and the Habsburgs, and behind them the pope, became allies in trying to prevent the wedding. They ordered their respective ambassadors at the English court—Don Alonso de Velasco (May 1610–August 1613) and ambassador extraordinary Don Pedro de Zúñiga (July 1612–July 1613) from Spain, and Ferdinand de Boischat (January 1610–December 1615) from the Spanish Netherlands—to sabotage the negotiations. Surprisingly, they were supported not only by the king's favorite and privy councillor Robert Carr, but also by Queen Anne, who would rather have had Elizabeth convert to Catholicism and marry a Spanish prince than see her daughter become Godewife Palgrave, forced to live at a shabby court "without enough tapestry to cover the bare walls."35

After these machinations failed, the ambassadors were not very well liked by the Protestant party supporting the match of Frederick and Elizabeth, and their participation in the wedding ceremonies probably lessened.37 On the other hand, as accredited diplomatic representatives of important European states, they could not simply not be invited, so they were asked, along with
other ambassadors in London at the time—Samuel Spifame, Seigneur de Bisseaux et Passy from France;38 Antonio Foscarini from Venice (July 1611–December 1615);39 and Noel Caron from the States-General40—to join the party at Whitehall on two consecutive days. In the new banqueting hall, the ambassadors had to sit together in a special loge closest to the royal couple and therefore right underneath the Armada tapestries. There is no doubt that everybody who experienced the feasting in this environment laden with meaning, Protestants and Catholics alike, clearly understood the underlying message of the Palatine wedding: the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth was not only an affair of personal affection, it also confirmed the alliance of two powerful Protestant states as part of a political strategy meant to secure the supremacy of the Protestant cause in central and northern Europe, of which at the time the defeat of the Spanish Armada had become the most proudly cherished turning point in history.

Since neither Don Velasco nor de Boischot was keen to confess to his sovereign that he had participated in an official royal event at which the most shameful and disgraceful defeat of his home country and its ruling family was celebrated in such a prominent way, both stayed home voluntarily. The Spanish ambassador excused himself because of sudden illness, a tactic that had worked for him before. But word spread early that “the Spanish was, or would be sick,” and that the ambassador of Archduke Albert of Austria, who governed the southern Netherlands,41 had also made a “sullen excuse.”42 To Sir John Finet, the apparently furious de Boischot produced a rather strange and embarrassing excuse: that he, being ambassador of a sovereign monarch—which, by the way, was not true—would not accept that the representative of Venice, “a meane Republique, governed by a sort of Burghers, who had but an handful of Territory,” had also been asked to the festivities.43 This was not a very compelling argument, but rather an obvious pretext not

fit to fool anybody. Everybody at court immediately recognized this shallow excuse to be sheer rhetoric. Indeed the ambassadors of the doge of Venice were always very well received and respected at every princely court in Europe and beyond, and that included Habsburg territories such as Spain, Austria, and the southern Netherlands.44 One could even say that the demeanor of the Venetian ambassadors belonged among the most splendid performances at any stately court ceremony. Evidently, the subliminal message of the Armada tapestries lent for the Palatine wedding was well understood by its first and foremost addressees, Don Alonso de Velasco and Ferdinand de Boischot, and acted on properly by their absence. As a result, appearances were formally kept up and both sides saved face, avoiding all serious misunderstandings that might easily have ended in a diplomatic disaster.

FREDERICK V AND ELIZABETH STUART AS COLLECTORS OF TAPESTRIES

With Frederick and Elizabeth, the prospects of increasing the tapestry collection of the Counts Palatine were most favorable. Designated among the entourage to accompany the princess to her new home in Heidelberg were two “Bett- und Tapetzerey verwalter” (bed and tapestry curators) as well as “zwey diener so Tapetzerey uffhengen” (two valets specializing in the hanging of tapestries).45 There was no shortage of work for these specialists, given that on the occasion of Elizabeth’s wedding, the Dutch States-General had lavishly bestowed her with tapestries from the workshop of François Spiering of Delft: a ten-piece set of the Deeds of Scipio (see Ebeltje Hartkamp-Jonxis, “Mannerist, Baroque, and Classicist,” fig. 2)46 and a six-piece set of the Story of Diana (fig. 9). The designs for the Deeds of Scipio are attributed to Karel van Mander II. The Diana set is most likely to be identified with the editio princeps of Spiering’s so-called small Diana series, which might have been designed by David Vinckboons.47

Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart
These tapestries were soon augmented by a set of ten panels of the *Story of Samson* that Frederick purchased from Dutch dealers who had come to the Palatinate: Daniel Steurbout, who had relatives in Frankenthal, and Bartolommeo Balbani, both from Antwerp. It turned out that they had deceived the elector by overstating the quality and inflating the price. The *Story of Samson* set was one of several reeditions (see Nello Forti Grazzini, “On the Tapestries in Seventeenth-Century Milan,” fig. 1) of a series first woven in 1610 by the master weaver Jan Raes II in Brussels for Cardinal Scipione Borghese, nephew of Pope Paul V. The cartoons had been commissioned a half century earlier by Henry II of France but were left unfinished when the king died in 1559. They remained in Brussels until the early seventeenth century, when they came to the attention of the papal nuncio Guido Bentivoglio, who was acting as Cardinal Borghese’s agent in Flanders and brokered the deal. Steurbout and Balbani had bought their set from Frans Sweerts in Antwerp, a frequent business partner of the Raes family workshop, and they later resold it to Frederick V. This set matched in height and quality the *Story of Samson* tapestries now in the Philadelphia Museum of Art (figs. 10, 11).

To maintain their growing inventory, in 1616 Frederick and Elizabeth named the master weaver Justus Fankans (Josse van Kaens), from nearby Frankenthal, to be *tapissier de cour* at Heidelberg, and three years later one Pierre Bonjour assumed the same position, similarly holding the post of court tailor, which also put him in charge of the administration and preservation of the tapestry stock in the *Tapezerey-Gewölbe*.

The prince and princess shared a great personal interest in tapestries and their use as meaningful room decorations. We can infer this from letters that Frederick wrote to his wife when he traveled without her, to keep her informed about his trips and related occurrences. For example, in 1620, when he was visiting the Grand Marshal of Bohemia, Baronet Bertold Bohobud of Leipa (Česká Lípa), he reported how richly his host’s palace was decorated with tapestries: “I visited the house of the Baron of Leipa, which is certainly very beautiful with a good number of tapestries, and none more beautiful. I can truly say that except for Heidelberg and Munich I know of few houses that have so many.” From Wolfenbüttel, Frederick wrote dully to his wife, that Duke Friedrich Ulrich of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel possessed fine paintings but no tapestries at all, an odd observation since his host’s ancestors had long ago established at their court a professional workshop run by Flemish master weavers that was still operating under the direction of Boldewin of Brussels during the first decade of the seventeenth century.

A particular highlight in the history of the electoral tapestry collection is indicated by two letters sent to Heidelberg by Frans Sweerts in the summer of 1618. In them Sweerts requested that his personal friend Jan Gruter, the learned librarian of the Bibliotheca Palatina, assist him in his efforts to broker tapestries for the elector. Sweerts was in possession of tempting pieces, among them reweavings of a new series designed by Peter Paul Rubens, the *Story of Decius Mus*, as well as yet another reedition of Raphael’s *Acts of the Apostles*. While we do not know whether Frederick and Elizabeth were interested in Sweerts’s offer, it is certain that no such transaction was ever carried out. The troubles rising from the gathering storm of the Thirty Years’ War were to alter substantially and permanently the young elector’s preoccupations.

When Frederick was proclaimed king by the Protestant estates of Bohemia in 1619, the court relocated from Heidelberg to Prague. The new royal status was memorialized by a rectangular armorial tapestry and two table carpets, on both of which the Palatine and Bohemian coats of arms were combined with the Order of the Garter.
which King James I had bestowed personally on his son-in-law. When Frederick accepted the Bohemian crown, he led his country straight into the Thirty Years' War. After his troops lost the decisive Battle at White Mountain in 1620, the unfortunate Winter King and his family had to leave Prague and flee to exile in the Netherlands, where his uncle Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange, was the stadtholder. At first, the couple, now royal but nearly broke, lived in a town house in The Hague called the Wassenaer Hof, and later they moved during the summers to a small, newly built castle at Rhenen on the river Rhine. To decorate these lodgings with at least some degree of dignity, they had sent from Heidelberg the most valuable tapestry sets of the Palatine collection—valuable in the sense both of monetary worth and of historical and emotional significance because of their subjects, which were taken from the history of the ruling Wittelsbach family. The tapestries that remained in Heidelberg were completely lost in the ensuing three decades of wartime chaos. The latest biographical account of a Heidelberg tapestry weaver from this period deals with the tapissier de cour: soon after the capital of the Palatinate was conquered by Imperial and Bavarian troops in 1622, Justus Fankans returned to Frankenthal.

Fig. 9. The Story of Diana and Callisto from the so-called small set of the Story of Diana. Tapestry design attributed to David Vinckboons, woven in the workshop of François Spiering, Delft, ca. 1613–20. Wool and silk, 260 × 390 cm. Present whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after sale cat., Sotheby's, Amsterdam, December 3, 2002, no. 12

Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart
Fig. 10. *Samson Offers Honey to His Parents* from a set of the *Story of Samson*. Tapestry design by Gillisz Mechelaon, woven in the workshop of Jan Raes, Brussels, ca. 1625. Wool and silk, 396.2 × 467 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art (1945-82-1)

Fig. 11. *Delilah Cutting Samson’s Hair* from a set of the *Story of Samson*. Tapestry design by Gillisz Mechelaon, woven in the workshop of Jan Raes, Brussels, ca. 1625. Wool and silk, 396.2 × 670.6 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Gift of Clifford Lewis Jr. (1946-81-1). Photograph: Rich Echelmeyer
Yet neither financial hardship nor the tribulations that inevitably arose from exile could prevent the Winter King and Queen from the purchase of new tapestries on a large scale. The painter and master weaver Karel van Mander II, who, together with his knighted partner Nicolaas Snouckerk von Schrapau, had run a tapestry workshop in the former Saint Anna monastery in Delft since 1615, died in February 1623. Probably soon thereafter, Frederick V bought a set of cartoons of the *Story of Alexander the Great* from Van Mander's estate for the sum of 2,000 guilders. The set consisted of nine pieces adding up to a total of more than 190 square ells for the main narrative scenes and another 67½ square ells for two different designs for the borders; it had already been used four times as a weaving model.65 Unfortunately, the *Alexander* series turned out to be a classic shelf warmer, and when, in 1624, the firm was finally taken over by the Spiering family, they found three complete sets still unsold.66 Today Van Mander's *Alexander* tapestries are best known from a complete set of nine signed pieces woven between 1617 and 1619 that once hung in the Villa San Donato, near Florence, as part of the collection of Prince Anatole Demidoff until it was auctioned in 1880 and subsequently spread among various museums and institutions in Europe and the United States.67 We do not know why Frederick preferred acquiring the cartoons rather than the already finished and easily available tapestries from the Van Mander workshop, especially since he evidently never presented them to any other weaver for execution.

In addition, there was a very rich canopy draped over a bedstead, which Frederick presented as a gift to his uncle the stadholder.68 On special occasions, the alliance between the two princes, both leaders of major Protestant states, was further displayed by the use of two table carpets that showed the coats of arms of both families.69 An anonymous dealer from Leiden delivered a six-piece set of the *Story of Joseph* for the substantial sum of 8,000 talers, which embellished the rooms of Rhenen Castle in 1633.70 And even after Frederick's premature death in 1632, when the family's already precarious financial situation deteriorated further, Elizabeth continued to buy tapestries. At least three expensive sets, which in 1661 qualified as "newe tapezerey," most likely were recent acquisitions and should therefore be associated with the patronage of the Winter Queen: nine hangings portrayed landscapes with hunting scenes,71 a set of eight represented the *Story of Tobias,*72 and an eight-piece set of the *Story of Cleopatra* hung in Elizabeth's private dining room (fig. 12).73 The last was bought in The Hague, likely from Pieter de Cracht, a tapestry dealer from Amsterdam, who ran workshops in Gouda and nearby Schoonhoven. In 1646 De Cracht had taken over the tapestry workshop that belonged to his father-in-law, Jacques Nauwincx, who long had owned the cartoons of the *Cleopatra* series. But it was again Karel van Mander II, who had initiated the design of the set to be woven in his own studio in Delft; yet the project failed because of Karel's death in 1623. His cartoons passed into the ownership of the Spiering workshop, where they were adapted by an unknown painter, who extended the series to a total of eight pieces. In 1631 the whole set of cartoons was owned by the Nauwincx studio, whence, shortly after 1645, Pieter de Cracht started to produce the *Cleopatra* series not only for the Winter Queen but also for many other customers.74

**RAPHAEL'S ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND RUBENS'S STORY OF DECIUS MUS: AN OFFER ONE COULD NOT REFUSE?**

To date, more than fifty individual tapestries can be identified in the Palatine inventories and linked beyond doubt to acquisitions made by Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart. However, even though the purchase of Raphael's *Acts of the Apostles* and Rubens's *Story of Decius Mus* never materialized, the 1618 offer by Frans Sweerts to deliver to Heidelberg complete sets of those
tapestries marks the zenith of the history of the Palatine tapestry collection. Praise for Raphael’s series was boundless at the time, particularly at the English court. For the poet Henry Peacham, who had had a great affection for painting and the arts since he was a young boy, the Acts of the Apostles set that was purchased by Henry VIII and hung in Whitehall Palace was the work most likely to ensure the fame of that artist for eternity: “The fame of Raphael Vbine at this time [1518] was so great, that he was sought for and employed by the greatest Princes of Europe, as namely, the Popes, Adrian and Leo: Francis the first, King of France: Henry the eight, King of England; the Dukes of Florence, Vbine, Mantua, and divers others. Those stately hangings of Arras, containing the Histoire of Saint Paul out of the Acts (than which, eye never beheld more absolute Art, and which long since you might have seen in the banqueting house at White-hall) were wholly of his invention, bought (if I bee not deceived) by King Henry the eight of the State of Venice, where Raphaell Vbine died; I have no certainty: but sure I am, his memory and immortall Fame are like to live in the world for ever.”

Sweerts’s letters to Jan Gruter concerning the Acts and Decius Mus sets are also of interest as sources of factual material concerning tapestry production. First, Sweerts, in uncovering the swindlers Steurbout and Balbani, who had sold the Samson tapestries to the elector, revealed the pricing system of the Antwerp tapestry merchants: one square ell, roughly 70 by 70 centimeters, could be woven for 18, 20, or 24 guilders, depending on the quality of the weaving and the materials used. At the end of Sweerts’s second letter, there is an extraordinary detail. He wrote of a set of some “gouwden tapissereyen” (golden tapestries) that Archduke Albert of Austria had recently bestowed on Archbishop Johann Schweikhard von Kronberg, the elector of Mainz, neighboring the Palatinate. If Frederick wished to draw level, and Sweerts of course hoped he would, the dealer would be happy to deliver exactly the same high quality for the breathtaking price of 66 guilders per square ell.79

Second, and more important, Sweerts claimed that he owned the cartoons of Raphael’s Acts of the Apostles series: “Ick heb tot Brussel eenen patroon de Acts Apostolorum geschildert van Raphaël Urbin.” It is hard to decide whether he was referring to the original cartoons or to copies that had been used in the production of various later editions of the set. The phrasing, “geschildert” (painted) by Raphael of Urbino, should probably not be taken literally. In 1573, the original cartoons were described in a letter written to Cardinal Granvelle, archbishop of Mechelen and adviser to the Spanish Crown, as still in Brussels but as far too damaged to be used any longer for weaving. Leaving Sweerts’s letter aside, the next documentary evidence reveals that in 1623 the cartoons were in Genoa, probably in the possession of the nobleman Andrea Imperiale,80 and were sold to Prince Charles, the younger brother of Elizabeth Stuart, to be further used in the newly founded Royal Tapestry Manufactory at Mortlake.81 Interestingly, in the very same letter of July 18, 1618, Sweerts reported back to Gruter about his intention to sell the first two editions of Rubens’s Decius Mus tapestries to customers in Genoa.82

The agreement for the weaving of the Decius Mus series was drawn up in Antwerp in November 1616 by Frans Sweerts and Jan Raes II on the one hand, and Franco Cattaneo, a merchant from Genoa, on the other. The contract covered the making of two sets of tapestries representing the “History of the Roman Consul Decius Mus,” who voluntarily lay down his life for the sake of his troops and his home country.83 The theme, borrowed from the Roman historian Livy and interpreted by Rubens as an exemplary act of patriotism,84 was not a common one in art. But when Sweerts first
took the initiative for having it designed, he might well have been inspired by his friend Gruter, who recently had published a critical edition of Livy. The Decius Mus cycle marks Rubens's successful debut into tapestry design. The preparatory work lasted for almost two years but finally resulted in eight monumental cartoons, all painted exquisitely in oil on fine canvas by the artist and his workshop: six models for big hangings with scenic episodes of the narrative action and two entrefenêtres. The cartoons would later become one of the greatest glories of the Princely Collections of Liechtenstein.

One might ask whether it is so unlikely an assumption that Sweerts could have sold the Acts of the Apostles cartoons along with sets of Rubens's Decius Mus to his Genoese customers as part of the same deal. If he had done so, it would have meant that his
statement given to Gruter was correct and that he did indeed own the originals of the Acts cartoons in 1618. This is an issue not of mere academic interest but of major significance, especially for its consequences concerning the oeuvre of Rubens. Jeremy Wood has recently sketched the benefits to our understanding of Rubens’s stylistic development as a draftsman if he had had the opportunity to study Raphael’s original cartoons in Brussels before 1600 and before his own travels in Italy.37

Whatever the eventual results of this unexplored area might be, in retrospect the fact that neither Raphael’s Acts of the Apostles nor Rubens’s Decius Mus tapestries became part of the Palatine collection is sadly felt as a great opportunity lost.

TROUBLED FINALE

After the treaties of Münster and Osnabrück, which ended the Thirty Years’ War in 1648, Charles Louis, the eldest surviving son of the Winter King and Queen and heir of the electorate of the Rhine, finally returned to Heidelberg from The Hague. He took with him the major portion of what was left of his ancestors’ exiled tapestry collection, along with many paintings, the library, the renowned collection of antique coins and medals, and part of the Kunst- und Wunderkammer. The first shipment was sent to Frankfurt in September 1649.88 A perfectly preserved shipping note reveals the meticulous accuracy with which the transport was planned (fig. 13). Eleven huge chests were packed with textile furnishings (see appendix): eight with tapestry, two with throne and bed canopies, and one with “türkische tappich” (Turkish tapestries), a term that in the inventories of the Palatine collection refers to technique rather than to provenance. It was usually applied not to Oriental rugs but to all sorts of knotted

Fig. 13. Shipping note concerning the first transport of tapestries and other household stuff of the Elector Palatine Charles Louis from The Hague to Frankfurt in September 1649. Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich, Abt. III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Schatzakten, S 601, fols. 135v–136r.
hangings, carpets, and tablecloths. Yet, as a result of the Palatine War of Succession in 1693, most of these pieces would be destroyed, pillaged, or simply sold at an improvised auction by the trustees of the French king Louis XIV before the turn of the century. 

The loss of the collection is almost complete. Today only about twenty pieces exist that can be traced back to the once great Palatine collection, that is, less than 4 percent of the hangings listed in the preserved inventories.

For her part, Elizabeth, even though she had to fight hard with her son Charles Louis over this issue, held back more than 140 individual tapestries in the Wassenaer Hof in The Hague and in Rhenen Castle to meet her representational needs as a queen. In the letters to her son, who urged her to send these tapestries to Heidelberg as well, the Winter Queen stated very clearly that she would not back off. When Elizabeth gave a ten-piece set of the Story of Abraham as a wedding present to one of her younger sons, Prince Edward, who converted to Catholicism and married Anna Gonzaga, Charles Louis sullenly complained about his mother’s depriving him of his rightful heritage. Indeed, his anger seemed justified by the fact that the Abraham set, a reweaving of the famous series originally designed by Pieter Coecke van Aelst and woven in the workshop of Willem de Kempeneer on behalf of King Henry VIII, had been purchased shortly after 1556 by Elector Otto Henry to decorate his new palace at Heidelberg Castle. In his will, Otto Henry specified explicitly that all tapestries acquired during his reign were to be part of the inalienable assets of the electorate in perpetuity. Therefore, Elizabeth had no right to give away the Abraham set. The queen’s response was to accuse the new elector of stinginess, arguing that he would make a fool of himself if anybody realized how poorly he treated his mother. A second attempt by Charles Louis to recover tapestries was more successful: in 1655 Elizabeth agreed to send five “suits of hangings” and some paintings to Heidelberg. In the end, however, the Winter Queen’s headstrong persistence prevailed. She had “her” tapestries sent to London to furnish Exeter House, where she was to reside after her return to England in 1661. Among them were all the sets that she had acquired personally during exile and also the Story of Scipio set, the prestigious wedding present that she and her husband had received from the States-General in 1613. To her son she explained haughtily, “If I had as much means to buy hangings as my Lo[rd] Craven has, I should not have bene so rigorous as to take what is my right.”

Obviously, even toward the end of her life, the ever status-conscious Queen of Bohemia was still keen on buying expensive tapestries of the highest quality, even though she could no longer afford them. William Craven was long a friend of Frederick and Elizabeth, and he remained a staunch supporter of the Palatine cause throughout his life. When King Charles II failed to provide an adequate residence for the queen of Bohemia after her arrival in London, Elizabeth lived in Craven’s house in Drury Lane.

The following year, Elizabeth died in the arms of her son Prince Rupert the Cavalier, who inherited the precious tapestries as part of his mother’s bequeathed “Meubles.” After Rupert’s death in 1682, they were owned by his mistress Margaret Hughes, a renowned stage beauty, who vies with Anne Marshall over the privilege of being the first woman to perform publicly on stage in the role of Desdemona in William Shakespeare’s play Othello. Prince Rupert and the actress had an illegitimate daughter, Ruperta, born in 1671, who later married Lieutenant General Emanuel Scrope Howe. In the end, it was from their household that what was left of Ruperta’s royal grandmother’s inheritance irretrievably vanished.

To date, not a single tapestry of the Winter King and Queen’s collection has surfaced again.
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10. For the cultural standards of the English court, see Graham Parry, The Golden Age Restor’d: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603—42 (Manchester, 1981); Linda Levy Peck, Consuming Splendor;
Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart


Nevertheless, the author of *Beschreibung der Reiss* might well be right in his observation. The hanging of a tapestry depicting the Wedding at Cana would have made perfect sense, because Dr. James Montague, bishop of Bath and Wells and dean of the Chapel Royal, had chosen the very topic to preach upon in his sermon as part of the wedding ceremonies: John Nichols, *Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court* (London, 1828), vol. 2, pp. 346–47.

25. Green, *Elizabeth, Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia*, p. 53, with reference to the accounts of the Master of Works 1612–13 (Audit Office); *Beschreibung der Reiss*, pp. 29, 43: “und darauf von den Königlichen Officiern der Grosse Audientz Saal in gemeldetem Pallast mit einem Königlichen Thron, drey Staffeln erhaben und mit Türkischen Teppichen belegt: Oben uff ist der himmel mit guldinen gewückten Stücken umbhengt, der Stuhl aber mit sehr köstlichen und künstlichen, von Seiden, Gold und Silber gewückten Tapezereien bekleidet worden. In welchen die Victoria Navalis und in dem Meer erhaltene Schlacht und Sieg, welche in Anno 1588 vorgangen, da die Spanischen mit Ihrer starcken Schiff Armada die in Gott ruhende Königin Elisabeth, Christselstgen Andencenks, und ganz Engeland zu überfallen vogeht, gantz artig und in voller Ordnung ihres gehaltenen Zuges, darauf erfolgtes Treffen und schendliche Flucht kunstreich repraesentirt und abgebild, auch die Bildnuß der Königin und aller Landshern, General Obristen und vornehmen Captainien an den Leisten gedachter Tapezerey nach dem leben zierlich eingewuckt zu sehen gewesen sind... Und ist erstlichen in Hoff und uff der Mawern, so den Vor- und Mittel-Hoff underscheiden, ein grosser Saal von holzwerk, ungefehrtlichnen 140 schuch lang und 40 schuch breit, ugebewhat, welcher inwendig stattlich mit Tapezereyen und eben denselben, so bey der Verlöbnuß im grossen Saal gewesen, die Victoriun wider die Spanische Schiff Armada repraesentirende, bekleidet gewesen...”


27. John Chamberlain to an anonymous friend, London, December 23, 1602, in John Nichols, *Progress and Public Processions of Elizabeth* (London, 1823), vol. 3, pp. 601–3: “At the Lord Admiral’s feasting the Queen had nothing extraordinary, neither were his presents so precious as was expected, being only a whole suit of apparel, whereas it was thought he would have bestowed his rich hangings of all the fights with the Spanish Armada in eighty eight...”

28. Russell, *Visions of the Sea*, p. 121. Because of its removal in 1831 to make way for the construction of the Strangers’ Gallery, one of the Armada tapestries probably survived the fire, but its current depository is unknown; Rogers, “‘The Armada Tapestries in the House of Lords,’” p. 735.


34. Ibid., pp. 347–55.


37. The ambassador extraordinary Don Pedro de Zúñiga was not welcome at court right from the beginning and was later even attacked and robbed in his carriage; see the letter from George Calvert to Thomas Edmondes, Charing Cross, August 1, 1612, in Thomas Birch, comp., and Robert Williams, ed., The Court and Times of James the First (London, 1849), vol. 1, pp. 190–92.


42. Letter from John Chamberlain to Dudley Carlton, London, February 25, 1613; Nichols, Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, vol. 2, pp. 601–5: “The Ambassadors that were at the Wedding and Shews were the French, Venetian, Count Henry, and [Sir Noël] Caron for the States. The Spanish was, or would be, sick; and the Archduke’s Ambassador being invited for the second day, made a sullen excuse. . . .” See also the anonymous letter, London, February 7 (?) 1613; Nichols, Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, vol. 2, pp. 123–26: “The Ambassadors make frequent visits at this time, both to the Queen and Prince, hoping to be invited to the Feast. On Sunday last, the Archduke’s Ambassador’s Lady danced before the Queen at Somerset House, and the day following, the Ambassador himself had audience of her at Whitehall; which officiousness proceedeth from his concurrence with the Venetian, fearing that Foscarini may be invited, and he left out. But as yet it is resolved to invite none, though if the Spanish Ambassador continue sick, as he is at this present, perhaps another resolution may be taken, and the French may be there, when there will be no strife for place. . . .”

43. Not without irony, John Finet later published an accurate report about this farce of international diplomacy: Sir John Finet, Knight and Master of the Ceremonies to the two last Kings, Touching the Reception, and Precedence, the Treatment and Audience, the Puntillios and Contests of Forren Ambassadors in England (London, 1636); for the complete text, all in English, see Nichols, Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, vol. 2, pp. 603–6.

44. For the continuous presence of Venetian ambassadors at German courts, see Stefan Matthias Zucchi, Deutschland und die Deutschen im Spiegel venezianischer Berichte des 16. Jahrhunderts (Berlin, 2003), pp. 515–17.


48. In 1574, one Anthonis Steurbout owned a house there; Stadarchiv, Frankenthal, I.82, Statutenbuch 1573–1578 (January 1574).


52. Samson Offers Honey to His Parents (fig. 10), Delilah Cutting Samson’s Hair (fig. 11), and two entretenêtres (Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1947–93/1–2).


55. Both Elizabeth and her late brother Prince Henry Frederick had become familiar with the use of tapestries at very young ages, when they were still in the care of their wardens. When their father announced his going to Scotland in 1617, the Scottish Privy Council ordered the king’s house­hold stuff to be assembled at Glasgow Castle. Among the nobility reporting on June 18, 1616, to the council about the royal tapestries in their possession were the Lord High Chancellor Alexander, Earl of Dunfermline, and Alexander, Earl of Linlithgow. Asked “yf they had one of his Majesties tapestrie, moveables, or houshold stuff in their keiping, the said Alexander, E r l of Dum­ferdling, granted and confessit that their was in his possession dun in Dumfermling ten pieces of auld and worne tapestrie of the storie of Æneas, the storie of Troy, and of the storie of Mankyd, and denyt the having of any farther of his Majestie’s tapestrie, bedding, or household stuff. The said Alexander, Er l of Lynlythqw, grantit and confes-


60. Universitätsbibliothek, Heidelberg, Cpg 8, fol. 210r–v, Frans Sweerts to Jan Gruter, Antwerp, July 18, 1618: "[R]ughenius heeft voor my gschildert eenen patroon [faded to illegible] ende wort gemaect op [?] ellen diep voor Genaue. Bone Deus wat fraey tapisserije is daer naer gemaect! Cost 25 floreyen d'elhe. Soo daer van gelijken yemant waer in curia, men soude hem oock een camer naer den selven patroon connen doen maecten per advys, sed omnia in silentio, ne isti resciscant, ende soo van noode waer soude lichelycken eens overliegen ad nudinas, want ben vast van opinie datse Electorem Palatinum dapper bedrogen sullen hebben. Ick heb tot Brussel eenen patroon de Actis Apostolorum gesigniert van Raphaël Uribin, den welken men lichelycken op 7 oft 7½ ellen hooch soude connen doen maecten. Ick hebbe 800 ellen voor Duc de Larma te maecten, 7½ diep oft hooghe. Men can dyen patroon maecten op 15, 16, 18 jye 20 gulden ende oock op 24 gulden d'elhe, maer dan souwe wtnemende fraey werck wesn. ..."

61. See the 1631 and 1661 inventories of Rhenen Castle in Johann Kretzschmar, "Das kurpfälzische Schloss zu Rhenen, Provinz Utrecht," Mittheilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses 4 (1903), pp. 109, 122: "Zwem Tischeppich von Tapierei werck, iedes 3 Ellen breit en lang, inmitten eines ieden das böhmische und pfälzliche Wappen, darauf der ordre 'hony soit qui mal y pense', mit Jahrzahlen 1620 und 1621"; "30. Rth.: Ein türkischer Teppich, 3 Ellen breit en lang, von Tapierei; in der Mitten das böhmischen und pfälzischen Wappen, darauf der Ordre 'hony soit qui mal y pense.'"


63. Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague"; Groenveld, "König ohne Staat."

64. This can be deduced from the individual sets listed in the 1633 inventory of Rhenen Castle; see Kretzschmar, "Das kurpfälzische Schloss zu Rhenen," pp. 107–9.


67. Once again it was the notary Harmann van Ceel, who, at the request of Snouckaert, witnessed the depositions of Aert and Pieter Spierink about the content of the tapestry stock from his and the late Van Mander’s firm: “Compareerde den xxviiijt Maart anno xivc vyre ende twintich . . . de eersame Aert en Pieter Spierink, zoonen van Franschois binnen Delfl, dewelcke ter requisitiye van Joncheer Snouckaert, heere tot Schraplauw, verclaerde . . . waerachtich te wesen, dat de tapitzereyen als noch op dese uyer unvercoft zijn, die ten tyde als hy, Aert Spierinkx, de winckel overbracht, dyne ten huyse van Maerten Boucholt ende Carel Vermander binnen Delfl bevonden werden, als namelijck drye kamermen van Alexander, een met rood, een met blauwe, een met oranje boorden, met noch een stukkye van Sint Joris, met noch eenige stitssens ende noch dey camer van Cleopatra, daer toen ter tijt noch weynich op geamaect was. Wyders niet”; Van Ysselsteyn, *Geschiedenis der tapijweverijen in de noordelijke Nederlanden*, vol. 2, pp. 188–89, no. 407; Bredius, “De tapijtfabriek van Karel van Mander de Jonge,” p. 21.


73. See the inventory of Rhenen Castle in 1661, in Kretzschmar, “Das kurpfälzische Schloss zu Rhenen,” p. 120: “Ein Kammber von acht Stücken, noch new, die Historia von Tobia, jedes Stück hoch 4½ Ellen, zusammen weit [?].” This set was obviously meant to replace the much larger suite of “neun Stücken, von Tobiae, iedes hoch 6 Ellen,
sind zusammen weit 56½ Ellen,” which was sent back to Heidelberg in 1650.


76. Peacham’s Compleat Gentleman, 1634 (London, 1634; facsimile reprint, Oxford, 1906), p. 126: “Painting is a quality I love (I confess) and admire in others, because naturally from a child, I have been addicted to the practice hereof: yet when I was young I have been cruelly beaten by ill and ignorant Schoolemasters, when I have been taking, in white and blacke, the countenance of some one or other (which I could doe at thirteene and fourteene yeeres of age: beside the Mappe of any Towne according to Geometrical proportion, as I did of Cambridge when I was of Trinity Collidge, and a Junior Sophister;) yet could they never beate it out of me.”


78. See notes 59 and 60 above.

79. Universitätssbibliothek, Heidelberg, Cpg 834, fol. 228r–v, Frans Sweerts to Jan Gruter, Antwerp, July 25, 1618: “Soo verre oock eenigh ghoude tappiseryen behgeert gemaect te hebben, salse doen maecken ryck van ghoude to 66 gulden d'elle, oft zoo eenigh begeert te coopen, hier synder differente gemaecckt. Dat my maer impoyere, sal maecken ende sorge dragen syn gelt wel zal impoyeren. Osnen Archidux Albertus heeft over sommighe jaren eene ghoue came geschoncken Archiepiscopo Moguntino [Johann Schweichhard von Kronberg], deselve quam wt mynnen winckel, aende selve soude Comes Palatinus mogen de deucht ende fynste van d’werck sien.”


82. See note 60 above.


90. Kretzschmar, “Das kurfürzische Schloss zu Rhenen,” pp. 120–32. Elizabeth’s attitude might have been influenced by her mother’s example. Denmark House (better known as Somerset House), Queen Anne’s foremost London residence, was lavishly embellished with more than a hundred tapestries of different sizes and quality, of which only two sets actually came from the Royal Wardrobe—four pieces of the Story of David and seven of the Story of Heracles—and one from the stock of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk; M. T. W. Payne, “An Inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark’s ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcelles’ at Denmark House, 1619,” Journal of the History of Collections 13 (2001), pp. 23–44.

“[Michel] Vanderheck has done nothing but what I commanded him, and he hath vnder my hande, neither haue I taken all the stuff, for I haue left my oulde rotten black hangings and two or three suites of oulde hangings that are in my hall anf the courtesses chamber[s] and the trants chamber but if I haue need of them I will send for them to. I haue taken the best as good reason, I shouldie it, being in my power, and my right as I writ to you by my last.” See also Melissa Lili Baker, ed., *The Letters of Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia* (London, 1953), pp. 346–47.

92. Charles Louis to his mother, Elizabeth, Heidelberg, August 6/16, 1650; Wendland, ed., *Brieve der Elisabeth Stuart*, pp. 5–7, no. 3: “As for the Stuffs and Jewels which you let me have of my owne, thy are mine as well as the Stuffe and plate which still remains in Yr Mties hands, . . . I can finde noe ground of Justice that you should keepe it vntill you had Yr yointure. . . . I can finde the Stuffe you gave away to my Brother Edward but could not expect that, though in reason you ought to have what is for Yr daily use which I shall never dispute, yet you cannot pretend to keepe all from mee upon any ground of Law or equity.” See appendix 2, no. 24.


95. Elizabeth Stuart to her son Charles Louis, The Hague, August 19/29, 1650; Wendland, ed., *Brieve der Elisabeth Stuart*, pp. 7–10, no. 4: “All this I tell you, not, that I meant to dispute it, but onelie to tell you that I might finde reasons enough to doe it, . . . as for the stuff, that which I haue in my oune chambers, you haue nothing to doe ither with it, having bought them myself, what is yours is onlie in the dinnyn room and your Sisters chambers and yours below, the rest are the states hangings, . . . I must have more, for Rhene, if I should say for whom the king your father has often saide it was built and furnishid, you wouldt not beleue me; . . . as for the hangings Ned had, I did promiss you to repaye them, which by the grace of God I will, it is all I haue gven from the house and if the worlde shoulde know that you take exceptions at an oulde rotten shoot of hangings given away you will be lauged at . . .” See also Baker, ed., *The Letters of Elizabeth*, pp. 177–78.

96. Charles Louis to his mother, Elizabeth, Heidelberg, 1655 (?); Wendland, ed., *Brieve der Elisabeth Stuart*, p. 62, no. 41: “Madame. The want we haue here of hangings and other Chamber furniture made me desire the last yeare Yr Mties approba­tion for the transport of what is at Rhenen hither because you did not make use of them, but Yr Mty not beening then well pleased with it, . . . I am confident Yr Mty will not disapprove that I have sent Walter to Rhenen to get them packt up and bring them away in the ship I have appointed for it here and to satisfy the Castellain for his arreares, upon the receit of the said furnitures and howshold stuffe, I beleue Yr Mty will thinke it fitter that they should be made use of here for the honour of the familie, where they will be better looked to, then in the hands of that drunken fellow that keeps them now, since Yr Mty hath noe use of them there, but I hope will shortly have heere. . . .” Elizabeth Stuart to her son Charles Louis, The Hague, November 2/12, 1655; Wendland, ed., *Brieve der Elisabeth Stuart*, pp. 67–68, no. 44: “I have sent you from hence [The Hague] two suits of hangings as I urritt last and pictures; from Rhene, you will receaue three suits of hangings and a bed meane, those that were at the end of the dining room, and that chamber aboue staires, for the pictures, that are there, I keep them all to sett out the emptie roomes, thus I have tru­lie sent you all I can spare, I must desire to you to put out the concierge, for he is theveriest beast in the worlde and knave besides as Walter can tell you and the sooner you doe it, it will be the better, for he spoiles all the house. The Princesse of Orenge tolde me, she had a minde to crie, to see the house so spoiled, she dined there as she came hither. . . .” See also Baker, ed., *The Letters of Elizabeth*, pp. 251–52.


104. Lemberg, Eine Königin ohne Reich, pp. 82–86; Rebitsch, Rupert von der Pfalz, p. 151.

Appendix

1. Inventory of the first portion of tapestries shipped to Heidelberg by Charles Louis, The Hague, September 14/4, 1649; Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich, Abt. III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Schatzakten, S 601, fols. 137v–138r:

Verzeichnus der mobilien, tapezureyen undt anders, so ihrer churfürstlichen durchlaucht seindt nach Frankfurth gesandt worden, den 14/4 Septembris 1649.


[Mark] Zehen stückh tapezurey, historia des Samsons, mitt seiden undt wüllen eingewirckt. [Mark]


[Mark] Ein cammer von 5 stücken, hoch 2½ ellen, zusammen weit 28 ellen, seindt schön undt reich von seiden, jacht undt gartenwerckh. //


[Mark] Drey schöne große newe türkische teppich, davon hernacher weiter bericht geschicht.

2. Inventory of the tapestries shipped to England by Elizabeth Stuart, The Hague and Rhenen, 1661; Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich, Abt. III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Korrespondenzakten, no. 1022½ (2), pp. 1–4. 2

Verzeichnus derienigen mobilien, welche Michael Ahselier in s’Graffhenhag, und Antoni Alberts de Beer im hauß zu Rhenen, vermöng eines ieden inventory, in verwahrung gehabt, aber nicht nacher Heydelberg gekommen, sondern alda verplrieben, undt nachgehendes in anno 1661 nach Englandt überbracht worden.

Tapezureyen

1 Zwey stück von der Medora undt Angelica, von seiden gewürckt, welche vor diesem zu Heydelberg in der königin cammer geweßen, davon irzend ein stück in der englischen kirchen. (800) 3

2 Sieben stück tapezurey in dem gemach an der königin anti cammer, da die trabanten stehn, historia Achabs undt Jesabel. (300)

3 Zwey fensterstück, auß der historia Salomonis. (200)

4 Sieben stück rodgülten leder, darunder ein fensterstück.
Tapestry in the Baroque

5 Daß gülden leder uff der langen galerie, in der langen 25 ellen, in der breit 2½ ellen.
6 Einundzweittzig bletter gülden und silber leders, der grund colombine, wie in ihrer maystätens taffelstuben, fünff halbe bletter von gleichem leder, undt vier schmale leisten, selbigen leders. (700)
7 Sechs stück tapezereyen in einer cammer, von allerhandt jagten und fischereyen, uff jedem stück dafs bayerisch wappen, in der hohe iedes 3 ellen, zusammen weit 29¾ ellen. E (1000)
8 Eine cammer von zehn stücken, Frantz Spirings arbeit, von großem bildwerck, reich von seiden, iedes stück hoch 5¾ ellen, zusammen weit 58½ ellen. P (6000)⁴
10 Ein cammer von sieben stücken, groß bildwerck, so etwas alt und schadhaft, hoch 4½ ellen, zusammen weit 36½ ellen. b.b. (1200) //
11 Zwey schöne stück von kayer Augusto, mit seiden vermischt, hoch 5 ellen, zusammen weit 7½ ellen. F.f. (1000)
12 Ein stück allein von großem bildwerck, die historie von der königin von Saba, 4½ ellen hoch, 3½ ellen weit. (200)
13 Ein stück allein die historia von Joseph, ist mit seiden vermischt, hoch 4½ ellen, lang 6 ellen. (200)
14 Ein stücklein, in der mitten Fama, und uff beiden seiten blumenpott, hoch 2 ellen, lang 3 ellen. (100)
15 Ein stück, darauff drey blumenpott, hoch 1½ ellen, lang 2½ ellen. (50)
16 Sechs fensterstück, von zerstörhung Troia, 2 ellen hoch und zusammen lang 28 ellen. (400)
17 Ein new fensterstück von laubwerk, darinnen daß pfälzische und sächsische wapen, breit 1½ ellen, lang 5 ellen. (50)
18 Ein stück, so auch von Salomon und der königin von Saba, reich von goldt und silber, breit 3½ ellen, hoch 2½ ellen. (400)
19 Ein cammer von vier stücken, so oben jägerey, undt unter allerhandt wilde thier, sind alle einer Höhe, nemlich 4½ ellen, zusammen weit 24 ellen. (600)
20 Acht stück newe tapezerey, so von einem von Schunhoven in dem Ha[a]lge erkauft worden, in ihrer maystätens taﬄesaal gehörig, historia Pompeij und Cleopatrae.⁵
21 Acht stück tapezerey, die historie von Elia, im vorhaß bey ihrer mayestät gemach, und acht stück tapezerey von grün und gelb gewirffeltem zeug, darunter gerechnet ein fensterstück und ein stück über dem camin. //

Zu Rhenen seind vermöge dês inventarij de anno 1633 geblieben und nicht nach Heydelberg gekommen alß:
22 Sechs stück von Joseph, welche von Leiden geholet worden, 5 ellen hoch und alle zusammen weit 36½ ellen. C. C. (8000)⁶
23 Eine cammer von neun stücken brüße- lische arbeit, so landschaft und geliagt, jed-wedes stück hoch 5 ellen undt alle zusammen weit 44 ellen. A (4000)
24 Eine cammer von zehn stücken, die historia von Abraham, iedes stück hoch 5 ellen, zusammen weit 53½ ellen, ist etwa schadhaft. K (Prince Edward 4000)⁷
25 Eine cammer von zwolf stücken, ver mischt mit seiden, von großem bildwerck, die erschaffung der welt und des menschen fall, hoch 5 ellen undt zusammen weit 53½ ellen. S (5000)
26 Zwey stück, uff einem stück die historie von Dido, Enea undt Achate, uff dem anderen ein panquet mit einem harfenisten; sind an allen beiden stücken leisten mit sonnen, die stück mit goldt und seiden vermischt, iedes hoch 4½ ellen, zusammen breit 8 ellen. H. h. (1000)
27 Vier stück so von tournier, mit gold undt silber vermischt, iedes hoch 4 ellen, weit 15 ellen. (1000)
28 Eine cammer tapezerey, die historia von Jacob, 5 ellen hoch, bestehet in 8 stücken. (4000)
30 Blau und gülden leder zu ihrer mayestät cabinet. (400)
31 Fünff stück grob iagtwerk. nro.: 5 mit A.a. gezeichnet, hoch 5 ellen. (1000) //

An türkischen teppichen seindt im Hag undt Rhenen zurückgeblieben, alß: . . .
11 Ein türckischer teppich, 3 ellen breitt und lang, von tapezerey, in mitten daß bóhmisch undt pfälzische wapen, darauf der orden 'HONY SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE'. (30) . . .

An sammeten und anderen teppichen, alß . . .
27 Zwey tischteppiche von tapezerey, in der mitten das churpfälzische unndt nassausiche wapen, mitt gelb, grün und rodt seidenen franzen und mitt blauem schechter gefüttert. (60).
1. The set Frederick V bought from Steurbout and Balbani.
2. See also Johann Kretzschmar, "Das kurpfälzische Schloss zu Rhenen, Provinz Utrecht," Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses 4 (1903), pp. 120–23.
3. The estimated value of the tapestry sets is given in thalers (Reichsthalern).
4. The Deeds of Scipio from the workshop of François Spiering, given to Frederick and Elizabeth in 1613 as a wedding present from the States-General. The dimensions (approx. 400 x 407 cm) fit with those of known pieces from the series; the entry proves that the newlyweds received a set of not just eight but, indeed, ten pieces.
5. The Story of Cleopatra from the workshop of Pieter de Cracht of Schoonhoven (formerly owned by Jacques Nauwincx). The set was bought by Elizabeth between 1650 and 1660.
6. The set was bought by Elizabeth between 1650 and 1660.
7. The Abraham set acquired by Elector Otto Henry that Elizabeth wrongfully gave to her son Prince Edward as a wedding present in 1645.
8. The set was bought by Elizabeth between 1650 and 1660.
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