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This paper affords a complete analysis of the construction of the original Northampton (later Northumberland) House in the Strand (demolished in 1874), which has never been fully investigated. It begins with an examination of the little-known architectural patronage of its builder, Lord Henry Howard, 1st Earl of Northampton from 1603, one of the most interesting figures of the early Stuart era. With reference to the building of the contemporary Salisbury House by Sir Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, the only other Strand palace to be built in the early seventeenth century, textual and visual evidence are closely investigated. A rediscovered elevational drawing of the original front of Northampton House is also discussed. By associating it with other sources, such as the first inventory of the house (transcribed in the Appendix), the inside and outside of Northampton House as Henry Howard left it in 1614 are re-configured for the first time.

Northumberland House was the greatest representative of the old aristocratic mansions on the Strand – the almost uninterrupted series of waterfront palaces and large gardens that stretched from Westminster to the City of London, the political and economic centres of the country, respectively. Northumberland House was also the only one to have survived into the age of photography. Indeed, one could argue that the extraordinary scale and position of this house, which became the primary London residence of one of the kingdom’s most influential and wealthiest families, were valued for so long by its owners that, with the exception of Somerset House, it was the only Strand palace to survive the turn of the seventeenth century.

By the time of its demolition in 1874, when a new street called Northumberland Avenue was built on its site to connect Trafalgar Square with the newly created Victoria Embankment, Northumberland House had become a hybrid of many styles, since those called on to design or alter it over a long period included Bernard Janssen, Gerard Christmas, John Smythson, John Thorpe, Edward Carter, John Webb, Daniel Garrett, James Paine, Robert Adam, C R Cockerell, Thomas Hardwick, Thomas Cundy and Sir Charles Barry. All together, they epitomized three centuries of architectural practice of the highest sort, from the extravagant Jacobean of the original design to Barry’s remarkable solutions in a grand Italian Renaissance manner. Starting with a complete analysis of the architectural patronage of its first builder, Lord Henry Howard, 1st Earl of Northampton, this study is concerned with the construction of the original Northampton House, which has never been fully investigated.

2. Guerci 2008. For an important chapter of the 18th-century history of this house, see Aymonino 2009.
On 9 June 1614, John Chamberlain thus commented on what would be the last glorious gesture in the life of Henry Howard:

Sic transit gloria mundi: the Lord Privie Seale that hath languished a long time, and lien [lay] at Greenwich above this moneth, came home yesterday all along towne with more than forty horse, which was much noted for the manner and the time.\(^3\)

On 14 June, the seventy-four-year-old Northampton had to be urged to make his will by Robert Cotton, for ‘there was no other way’, as the scholar put it to his old friend.\(^4\) The next day, Northampton passed away in his newly built Strand palace, amid tapestries, paintings and furniture which he had bought with an extravagant hand. For the occasion, the Spanish Ambassador, Don Diego Sarmiento, wrote to Philip III considering that ‘he [Northampton] was unique in his qualities and virtues and his devotion to your Majesty’s service’, adding that he was ‘a connoisseur whose London residence was one of the finest in Europe’.\(^5\) In effect, his household goods, together with silver, gilt plates and jewels, amounted to the stunning sum of £8,150, nearly half of what Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland, would pay for the acquisition of the whole of Northampton House in the 1640s.\(^6\)

Henry Howard (fig 1) was the second son of the poet Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and younger brother of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk.\(^7\) Born in 1540 at the zenith of his family’s influence under Henry VIII, he suffered the trauma of his father’s execution for treason in 1547 and his grandfather’s imprisonment. Under Edward VI he was tutored by the Protestant John Fox. After the accession of the Catholic Mary, and the subsequent restoration of his grandfather as duke of Norfolk, he was placed in the household of the Marian Bishop, John White. White was to exercise a deep influence on the young Howard, both on his religious outlook and on his penchant for learning. It was Elizabeth I who provided for Howard’s university education,\(^8\) possibly as a calculated gesture to seek support from the

\(^3\) McClure 1939, i, 539.
\(^4\) Ibid, 541.
\(^5\) Quoted in Peck 1982, 212.
\(^6\) This amount was obtained by summing the value of every single item appraised in the inventory, at both London and Greenwich. Jewellery, gilt plates and silver vessels amounted to £4,925, whilst the household goods at London alone were worth £2,507, against £718 of the lodge at Greenwich.
\(^7\) For biographies of Henry Howard see Peck 1982 and Croft 2004. I am grateful to Pauline Croft, Linda Levy Peck and Mark Nicholls for discussions on several aspects of Howard’s life. For a comprehensive analysis of the early stages of Henry Howard’s life and works, including a fresh assessment of previous studies on the subject, see Andersson 2006. Many thanks are due to the latter scholar for providing me with a copy of both the introduction and the first chapter of this dissertation, entitled ‘“Beneath the COMPasse of his Birth”: birth, education and family fortunes 1540–74’, which, brought to my attention only towards the end of my research, elucidated parts of Howard’s education, particularly his university years.
\(^8\) Croft 2004; Peck 1982, 8. Andersson 2006 (32, no. 75) writes: ‘I have not been able to trace its origin, but it would appear to run counter to Howard’s comment in Dutifull Defence of the Lawfull Regiment of Women (BL, Add MS 24,652, fol 7v)’. The text, which Andersson provides, reads: ‘I may presume to my assured comfort to take notice of your Majesties most gracious and princely care of my bringing up, during the first five yeares of your raigne [ie until 1563].
Howard family. Henry studied at King’s College, Cambridge, went on to read Civil Law at Trinity Hall, and subsequently taught this subject together with Rhetoric; eventually, he was made Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. ‘Inter Nobiles Literatissimus’, Henry Howard wrote a number of treatises imbued with Renaissance scholarship aimed at reinforcing both the regime’s propaganda and his own position at court.

I was then mainteyned only at your chardge, enstructed by your appointment, and trained in your sight, at which time the tener shelles of childhood were seased with so strong a sent of your perfections, as neither can bee wore away by tract of time, nor diminsiehd by force of any accident. After my return from the universitie though I was but lately crept or rather swept out of the ruynes of my howse your Majestie most graciouslie admitted me to the kissing of your sacred hand, you regarded mee with pitie & relieved me with favour.

9. Elizabeth, and indeed Burghley, the architect of her policy, had shown some favour to the Howards from an early stage of her reign. The conciliation of so powerful a family might have seemed prudent to a regime desperately seeking support from all sides to bolster its legitimacy in the early years. I owe this information to Mark Nicholls. After Surrey’s execution in 1547, Edward VI had also supported the education of the Howard children with an annuity of £100.

10. As such he is remembered by William Camden in the effigy put up by Griffith on Northampton’s grave, discussed later in this paper.

Despite his efforts, Howard’s allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church caused problems during most of his life, leading to his arrest and imprisonment on five occasions. His brother, Norfolk, was executed in 1572 for plotting to put Mary Queen of Scots on the English throne, while he was himself suspected of actively corresponding with, and even of being a possible husband for, that queen. His later lifestyle and regal grandeur, as we shall see, would have been appropriate for a monarch. The execution of Mary in 1587 removed a source of suspicion, while Howard’s position at court improved throughout the 1590s with the emergence of his cousin, Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, as Elizabeth’s favourite. His skills as a masterful manipulator proved most useful in maintaining good relations with both Essex and Robert Cecil. However, it was only after the accession in 1603 of James VI of Scotland to the English throne as James I that Howard’s political career reached its peak. Alongside Cecil, he had played an important role in the delicate affair of the queen’s succession. The new king restored his properties and position and made Henry Howard one of his most important ministers. In January 1604 Howard was made Constable of Dover Castle and Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports. In February he became a joint commissioner for the office of Earl Marshal, while in March he was created baron of Marnhull and earl of Northampton. One year later, as a further indication of royal favour, Northampton was installed as a Knight of the Garter, just after being made Steward of Greenwich Park.

According to a mid-seventeenth-century source, Henry Howard was ‘of a subtile and fine wit, of a good proportion, excellent in outward courtship, famous for secret insinuation and fortuning flatteries, and by reason of those qualities, became a fit man for the condition of these times’. This condition, as far as the visual arts were concerned, reflected an eclecticism which had characterized English architecture since Henry VIII’s reign up until at least the first decades of the seventeenth century, with its sophisticated combinations of, and periodic shift between, classical and Gothic idioms. Thus, as in

12. Howard’s religious outlook accommodated inner commitment to the Roman Catholic Church with a later acceptance of the need for outward conformity to the worship of the Church of England (Croft 2004, 366). As stated in his will, he died ‘a member of the Chatholicke and Apostolike churche, saying with Saint Jerome, In qua fide puer natus fui in eadem senex morior’ (Shirley 1869, 375).

13. Bossy 2001. Andersson 2006 (47 and no. 151) has pointed out that Howard’s ambitions at this time went beyond the secular spectrum. Thus, when the see of York became vacant in 1570, after the death of Archbishop Thomas Young, it was rumoured that such an influential position might fall to Howard. We know, of course, that he did not become king of England, nor archbishop of York, though clearly the expectations and possibilities for a figure of his lineage were as high and as diverse.

14. In this, and in the successive development of Northampton’s political career, the role of his nephew, the 1st earl of Suffolk (1561–1626), may have been an important one. Suffolk was a close ally of Robert Cecil, both politically and personally. As with Elizabeth, Henry Howard was thought to be ‘scarce true unto his soveraign’ (Scott 1809–15, ii, 267), Thomas Howard possibly being responsible for the shift. I am grateful to Mark Nicholls for a discussion on this matter.

15. Scott 1809–15, ii, 267, quoted in Peck 1982, 3. A portrait of Henry Howard as a middle-aged man, made by a follower of H Custodis in 1594 and now part of the art collection of the Mercers’ Company, London, is reproduced here as fig 1. An image of him in his later years is provided by the celebrated painting of the Somerset House Conference of 1604, preserved in the National Portrait Gallery in London. Howard’s tracts are also shown in his funeral effigy, now in the chapel of Trinity Hospital, Greenwich.

16. Adamson (1996) argues that ‘The premium placed by English gentlemen on the association between the antiquity of a family seat and the antiquity (and hence the illustriousness) of its
the case of the contemporary Salisbury House, the only other Strand palace to be built at the beginning of the seventeenth century – by Sir Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury – early Stuart houses often maintained an established layout of Tudor origin, while presenting a tour de force of continental decorative patterns.  

Our purpose here is to assess and understand Henry Howard’s building activities, carried out at a later stage of his life in a relatively short time. The question must be related to Howard’s need for, even obsession with, self-representation and lineage, in an age increasingly dominated by a new entrepreneurial elite. Despite his significant ascent at court, the political status of Henry Howard remained inferior to that of Robert Cecil, who kept his uncontested position of Secretary of State.

The relation between the two men, though ‘hardly a friendship’, as Pauline Croft remarks, was consolidated between 1603 and 1605 and survived until at least 1611, contributing significantly to the effectiveness and cohesion of the Privy Council. Cecil and Howard, different as they were, were ‘two big fishes in a small pond’ where every movement had to be carefully planned. Howard succeeded in acting in the shadow of the ‘little lord’, though there is evidence to measure his struggle and bitterness at a personal level. One way of investigating the issue, most relevant to our study, is to compare the architectural activity of the two patrons, with particular attention to their respective London residences. For, if we extended the argument outside the Strand, the Cecils would certainly stand as unrivalled within their own time. However, the original Salisbury House (1599–1605), which only later became Great Salisbury House as part of a palatial complex including the adjoining Little Salisbury House (1611–13), must have looked small in comparison to the enormous and almost contemporary pile of Northampton House, the courtyard of which could contain the whole of Robert Cecil’s first house. This attempt at grandeur, clearly expressed in the scale and treatment of Northampton House, cannot be simply dismissed as a general trend of the period. Nor can it be accidental that Cecil himself, aiming to echo the palatial scale of his nearby rival’s residence, continued to enlarge his house, despite the strict limitations of the original site and regardless of his other building activities in London and elsewhere. If other existing houses along the Strand provided a model in palatial scale, Somerset House lineage had implications for its architecture and made, if not for stylistic conservatism, then at least for a vigorous interest in architectural gestures which alluded back to early Tudor or even more antiquated styles.’ For further analysis of ‘the condition of these times’, see Peck 1991 and 2005; Adamson 1999a and 1999b. Aspects of the Stuart court are also analysed in Parry 1981, Howarth 1993 and 1997. For a general reference on the development of Tudor and Jacobean styles see Mowl 2001 and Girouard 2009.
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19. Quote from a letter by Robin Harcourt-Williams to the present writer (2 Dec 2005). I am grateful to the former for his suggestions on the matter.

20. Croft 1991, 63: Northampton usually described Salisbury as the ‘little lord’, or ‘little man’, which once became ‘the little one itself’ (TNA, SP1/4/71/16). Following Cecil’s death in 1612, he wrote to Viscount Rochester remarking that ‘so many rejoice, and so few seem to be sorry […] Is near his mistress [Elizabeth I], and wishes Rochester as near his, if any one can love so ugly and deformed a fellow’ (Cal State P Dom 1611–18, 26 May 1612, 133). These types of comments, though common at the time, offer a glimpse into Howard’s private feelings toward Cecil.


22. Guerci 2007, 1, pt 1, 20–86. See also Guerci 2006.
being the obvious one, Salisbury and Northampton Houses represented the state of the arts in the early 1600s. Their near-contemporary erection must have caused an inevitable sense of comparison, and, as it were, architectural antagonism.
Fig 2 (continued)
From 1598 up to his death in 1612, Cecil took up as his private architect Simon Basil, the Comptroller and (from 1606) Surveyor of the King’s Works, and virtually monopolized the Royal Office of Works. By contrast, Howard had to rely for his house on somewhat minor figures. Did this increase the sense of competition, considering that Cecil regarded himself, and was regarded as, the ‘architector’ of his own houses? While the answer, on stylistic grounds, can only be speculative, the distinctive impact of Northampton House must have been clear to contemporaries: as a bachelor’s house in London, Northampton House would not need the separate apartments and bedrooms of married households and royal houses. This did not prevent its builder from creating a palace with a double version of all the state rooms, similar in purpose and arrangement to some very special country houses such as Holdenby and Hardwick Hall, which had been built on a grand scale by a bachelor and a widow in her seventies respectively.

Within the Cecil/Howard competition, it is perhaps not a coincidence that the surveyor of Salisbury House, Simon Basil, in a letter of 2 October 1611, lamented to Cecil that the Lord Privy Seal wished him to pull down and alter his own house to such an extent that it would be detrimental to his estate. The house in question, one of three erected by Basil in the proximity of Scotland Yard, was probably next to Northampton’s contemporary enlargement of the garden. Whether or not Basil was successful in getting Salisbury to intercede, his property had clearly been targeted by the earl, who continued to increase his holdings in the area. Another interesting parallel in the Cecil/Howard architectural competition, to which we shall return, is provided by their respective country seats, Theobalds and Hatfield Houses in Hertfordshire, and Audley End in Essex (fig 2a). The last, although officially built by Northampton’s nephew, the earl of Suffolk, may have been part of Northampton’s political agenda of re-establishing his name and position at court. It is indeed likely that Henry Howard played some part in the reconstruction and enlargement of Audley End. Thus, the seat of his principal heir, Thomas Howard, would

24. This judgement refers to the two principal figures – Bernard Jansen and Gerard Christmas – associated with the design of Northampton House. As we shall see, Henry Howard himself and John Thorpe may have had an important role too. The latter had a considerable reputation in the early 17th century. See Colvin 2008, 1041–2.
26. This is documented by the 1614 inventory of Northampton House, which is discussed later in this paper.
27. In addition to a similar internal arrangement, Hardwick Hall has a double version of some of the state rooms; see Girouard 2004 and 2009. I am grateful to Mark Girouard for a discussion on this matter.
28. TNA, SP14/66, 98–9. At ‘his hon.r pleasure’, Basil had taken down part of the upper garret and a second storey of his house, which had resulted in the loss of two good rooms and in the building being disfigured. Not satisfied with that, Northampton now insisted that Basil take down at his own expense the whole side of that wing, which he could not afford, having placed ‘the greatest part of my poore Estate on that peece of ground’.
29. See Colvin 1963–82, iii, pt 1, 107. Peck 1982, 74, includes Basil among the Greenwich landowners whose properties had also been targeted by the earl, thus relating the issue to the enlargement of the lodge there. This is unlikely to have been the case.
30. The long period of disfavour had made Henry Howard a spiteful and vindictive person and it is not impossible that he deliberately targeted Basil as a protégé of his rival.
31. This is first suggested by a mid-17th-century source attributed to W Anderson and P Heylin in *Aulicus Coquinariae; or a vindication in answer to a pamphlet entitled The Court and Character of King James*, London 1650 (see Drury 1980, 18, no. 120). Northampton’s probable involvement
compete with the almost unrivalled Theobalds as well as with the contemporary Hatfield House (1607–12), which had become Robert Cecil’s main seat after Theobalds had been given to the king. At the same time, Northampton’s association with Audley End, and the architectural similarities between this building and his London house, also point to his involvement at Northampton House, a suggestion that can now be fully stressed.

According to George Vertue, the early historian of English art whose notes were the core of Horace Walpole’s *Anecdotes of Painting* (1762–71), the construction of Northampton House was the joint achievement of Bernard Janssen and Gerard Christmas – the first as its surveyor, the second as the carver of its elaborate frontispiece. Janssen was a surveyor of Netherlands origin and ‘a great imitator of Dietterling, the famous builder in the Netherlands of whom there are many books of this Art’, as Vertue pointed out, claiming Janssen’s responsibility of ‘many other buildings’, including, interestingly, Audley End. Vertue’s source was Charles Stoakes, the great-nephew of Nicholas Stone.

The surveyor Bernard Janssen may be identical with two other figures: Bernard Johnson, the king’s engineer who designed and surveyed royal forts; and the sculptor Bernard Janssen who, in 1616, made a finely carved altar tomb in Redgrave Church, Suffolk, to support the effigies of Sir Nicholas and Lady Bacon made by Nicholas Stone. Gerard Christmas (1575/6–1633/4), described as a carver of some note who may have come from northern Europe, was credited by Vertue with having ‘finished’ the frontispiece of Northampton House. In 1614 Christmas was appointed Carver of the Navy, a post that he combined with special commissions, such as those by Robert Cecil at the New Exchange in the Strand (1608–9), and at Hatfield House. Finally, John Thorpe (c 1565–?1655), whose famous book of architectural plans survives in Sir John Soane’s Museum, can also be linked to Northampton House. As an eminent land surveyor, with a manifest interest in architecture, he was in the Office of Works from 1583 to 1601 and was later involved with such important houses as Aston Hall, Warwickshire (1618–35), perhaps Dowsby Hall, Lincolnshire (soon after 1610), and Somerhill, Kent (c 1610–13). Interestingly, like Janssen, his name is also associated with the enlargement of Audley End in around 1608.

Henry Howard’s building activities were not just focused on Northampton House and Audley End; they extended to a wider domain, both private and public, related to the restoration of his status and fortunes. The visual, if not architectural background of the soon-to-be great builder can be followed up until at least the 1580s. As a young boy, Howard lived in Kenninghall Palace, Norfolk, built between 1505 and c 1525 by his
grandfather, the 3rd duke, and furnished in such a way as to compete with Cardinal Wolsey’s Hampton Court and York Place. One of the remarkable H-planned houses so characteristic of the Elizabethan era, Kenninghall had two wings joined by a central hall. After Surrey’s execution, the young clan was removed to Reigate in Surrey, a former priory founded in 1235 as a monastery for the canons of the Order of St Augustine. In 1541, after the dissolution of the monasteries, Henry VIII granted the estate to Lord William Howard, 1st Baron Howard of Effingham (c 1510–73), who converted the priory into a Tudor house. The duchess of Richmond, in whose care the children had been put, resided at Reigate. Henry Howard remained there until 1553, while in 1556 he is thought to have followed his tutor, Bishop White, to Winchester. Another building he may have been associated with in these years is Tendring Hall, Suffolk, bequeathed to him by his grandfather in 1547. At the time of Queen Elizabeth’s visit to King’s College, Cambridge, in 1564, Howard was probably already a student there. Between 1566 and 1569 he moved to Trinity Hall where he remained until at least 1571. After that, the thirty-one-year-old Henry seems to have been living at Audley End, since the whole of his letters from that period are written from there.

This account provides at least a partial idea of the locations and houses with which Henry Howard had been closely familiar when, at different stages from 1603, he began to acquire land in Greenwich in order to improve a house referred to in its inventory of 1614 as ‘The Lodge in the Parke’, equally named in the documents as ‘Court House’ or ‘manor of Old Court’. This was a royal lodge of Henry VIII’s time, which lay to the east of Greenwich Park, on the site of the present observatory shown in Hollar’s view of 1637 (fig 3). Henry Howard had spent both his childhood and some of his adult years in the lodge and was determined, as he put it, ‘to lay his bones there’. In 1605 he thus obtained the stewardship of the park, confirmed in 1613, despite a claim by Queen Anne to the same office, while the lease of the building had been secured from Viscount Cranborne, Cecil’s son, for £1,500. Up until his death in 1614, Howard kept improving the property, on which he was thought to have spent upwards of £2,000.

Judging from its inventory, the lodge at Greenwich was probably composed of three buildings, perhaps added at different stages and possibly adapted to a sloping site, in a process of accretion typical of medieval structures. The first part had three storeys, mainly occupied by rooms of state, while the ‘Courte Lodgeinge’ featured a second gallery, a bed chamber and rooms for the earl’s servants. Then came the ‘Lower House’, which appears

40. See Pevsner and Wilson 1999, 451, and Head 1995, 83–4. Today only a fragment of a service wing survives, the main mansion having been demolished c 1650.
41. Howard 187, 216. The house survives with a late Palladian elevation put up in 1779.
42. This house was replaced in 1784 by Sir John Soane and subsequently demolished. See Dean 1999, 24 and 169–70.
43. Howard graduated MA in 1566 and was incorporated MA at Oxford in 1568, but remained at Cambridge as Reader in Rhetoric until at least 1569, the only nobleman to teach at both universities in the Tudor and early Stuart periods.
44. I owe this information to Daniel C Andersson.
45. This house is referred to in several letters of Henry Howard: see Cal State P Dom 1611–18, 44, 52, 214 and 216. On the history of the lodge see Drake 1886, pt 1, 43–62; Colvin 1963–82, iv, 122–3.
46. See Godfrey 1995, 66, pl 32. Hollar depicted the house after a fire destroyed part of it in 1617. It is therefore unlikely that the view shows the house as left by Henry Howard.
47. Cal State P Dom 1611–18, 214: Northampton to Thomas Lake, 9 Dec 1613.
48. Ibid, 216. See also Drake 1886, pt 1, 61, no. 6.
49. Cal State P Dom 1611–18, 44.
as the main part of the complex with a complete set of state and service quarters. There was also a prominent tower, since Northampton’s lodge at Greenwich was sometimes described as ‘the Tower’. After Northampton’s death, the reversion of the office of Keeper of Greenwich Park and Tower was granted to William Cecil, Viscount Cranborne, who surrendered it in favour of Theophilus, 2nd Earl of Suffolk and Northampton’s great-nephew. Elizabeth, Countess of Suffolk, died in the Tower at Greenwich in 1633. It is possible that only this part of the complex had gone into the Suffolk line of the Howards, the rest being in the hands of the earl of Arundel, Thomas Howard, another of Northampton’s great-nephews. The latter had made it ‘one of the best houses of the new century’, filled with treasures acquired in Italy, all sadly lost in a fire of 1617.

At Greenwich, Northampton also established his greatest institution of a public nature: Trinity Hospital (1613), which survives to this day. The hospital was to care for twenty poor men from the traditional Howard counties of Suffolk and Norfolk, and was endowed with much of the land Northampton had purchased at Greenwich, in addition to some of the rents from the dwellings surrounding his London house acquired piece-meal until his death in 1614. Trinity Hospital, much altered in the nineteenth century, was designed round a quadrangular plan like the two other almshouses, both called Trinity Hospital, founded by the earl at Castle Rising, Norfolk, and Clun, Shropshire, which feature gables, turrets and dormer windows.

At Greenwich, the chapel of Trinity Hospital contains a fragment of the monument to the earl of Northampton (fig 4), moved there in 1696 from the chapel of St Mary in Castro, at Dover Castle, of which Henry Howard, as Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports (from 1604),

50. See Shirley 1869, 369–74.
51. Cal State P Dom 1611–18, 52.
52. Ibid.
53. See the discussion later in this paper.
54. John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 4 Jan 1617: ‘Yesterday there fell a great mischance to the Earl of Arundell by the burning of his house (built and left him by the Earl of Northampton) at Greenwich where he likewise lost a great deale of household stuffe and rich furniture, the fury of the fire being such that noting could be saved: no doubt the Papists will ascribe and publish yt as a punishment for his dissembling of falling from them’ (McClure 1939, ii, 47). Carleton must have been sorry for such a loss, for it was from him that Arundel had acquired the collection of paintings at Greenwich. See Hervey 1921, 93; Howarth 1985, 57–61.
55. See Shirley 1869, 375–8. A copy of the will is in the archives of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick Castle (Sy:D.XVII.2e).
was the Constable. In his will, the earl had given instruction for a ‘Tombe there to be made … at the charge and discretion of myne executors’. Among those were his secretary, John Griffith, who arranged for the erection of the monument with an epitaph composed by William Camden, the famous author of *Britannia* who held the second highest heraldic office in the Office of Arms, that of Clarenceux King of Arms. As for the design, it was the earl of Arundel who commissioned the work from no less than Nicholas Stone (?1586/7–1647), the celebrated tomb sculptor and master mason of Inigo Jones’s Banqueting House at Whitehall. He collaborated on the earl of Northampton’s tomb with Isaac James, a sculptor of Dutch origin working in Southwark of whom Stone had been an apprentice.

---

57. Shirley 1869, 375.
The original monument, of which Northampton’s kneeling figure is now the only remnant, is known from two early seventeenth-century drawings (fig 5) where the earl is placed above an arched canopy decorated with human faces and surrounded by the Cardinal Virtues.60

60. See White 1999, 129, no. 42; Cherry and Pevsner 2002, 31 and 271.
These are regarded as being ‘the earliest response amongst English artists to the Arundel marbles’.\(^{61}\) It is not known whether the executors, or possibly the witnesses, of Northampton’s will, amongst whom figured celebrated scholars of the circle of Lord Arundel, such as Robert Cotton, pointed to Arundel as the best commissioner for the task, given his established reputation of expertise in the arts. In any case, the choice made sense for it was Northampton himself who introduced Cotton to his great-nephew, teaching him the value of becoming a patron.\(^{62}\)

Before his death Northampton also made provision for his father’s remains, buried in the church of All Hallows in Tower Street, London, to be removed to Framlingham, Suffolk, site of other sixteenth-century Howard monuments. Here, in the church of St Michael the Archangel, an effigy (fig 6) was erected in 1614, extolling the virtues of Northampton’s own family. The tomb of alabaster shows the recumbent figures of the earl of Surrey and Frances de Vere, daughter of the 15th earl of Oxford, surrounded by their five kneeling children: Henry himself and Thomas, 4th Duke of Norfolk, in the front of the chest, Jane, Countess of Westmorland, Katherine, Lady Berkeley, and Margaret, Lady Scrope of Bolton, at the back.

Northampton’s public buildings and endowments amounted to ‘upwards of £9,000’.\(^{63}\) The money came from a series of lucrative offices, from shares in several trades and, not least, from brilliant diplomatic activities, which had seen him amongst the five principal commissioners appointed to treat with Spain in the negotiations of 1604.\(^{64}\) This brought him a valuable Spanish pension, which, though not paid regularly, contributed to the rumour that his London house had been built with ‘Spanish gold’.\(^{65}\)

**THE HOUSE OF HENRY HOWARD**

In both Elizabethan and early Stuart England, the role of the courtier demanded a display of lavishness equal to his political importance, an activity that Howard was eager to undertake.\(^{66}\) In addition, without a family to maintain, Northampton’s expenses could be concentrated upon the single household of a bachelor, allowing him to construct an elaborate establishment in a short space of time. Together with a suburban villa for private pleasure and entertainment, for which Howard had focused on Greenwich, a house in London was not only the appropriate domicile for the dignity of an earl, but more importantly an essential base for any courtier who wished to pursue a political career, and hence directly cultivate royal favour.\(^{67}\) In 1605, shortly after he was created earl of

---

62. The earl of Arundel was also involved with carrying out Northampton’s wishes in relation to the Hospital of the Holy Trinity at Clun. See NLW, Carreglwyl MSS 1152.
64. Henry Howard figures prominently at the table of the Somerset House Conference for the peace treaty with Spain in 1604.
65. This allegation came from Francis Osborne’s *Traditional Memoirs of the Reign of James I*, published in Scott 1819. I am grateful to Pauline Croft for providing me with an evaluation of this source. As she argues, Osborne’s book ‘is gossip and popular opinion rather than eyewitness history’.
67. The choice of a suburban villa rather than a country seat may be justified by the fact that Howard, being a bachelor, did not need a dynastic investment (see Cooper 1999, 109–54).
Northampton, Howard began buying properties in the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields, concentrating on an area in close proximity to Whitehall. This abutted southward on the Thames, while it was bounded by Charing Cross on the north, York House on the east, and Scotland Yard on the west. In 1600, as Norden’s map shows (fig 7), the site consisted of different properties with buildings and gardens of various sizes, together with some land which had partly belonged to a monastic order.

The first indenture, dated 1 October 1605, was made between Henry Howard and the family of Sir William Cooke, which appeared to have held several properties in the area from the mid-1500s. By a disbursement of £1,500 the earl secured a large house with all its premises adjoining Scotland Yard on the Charing Cross side: its northern boundary was the Strand, the ‘highe Streeete there Leadinge from London towards Westminster’, whilst its eastern and western boundaries were two tenements in the tenure of Robert Scott and Richard Reed respectively.68 The following year, the property of Robert Scott was bought for £1,350 by an indenture dated 2 January 1606. This sale included a house with its gardens and premises known by the name of ‘Crosse Keys’, together with five other dwellings with their respective yards and gardens.69 The Cross Keys was an inn, probably one of the main parts of the sale adjoining the high street. It appears in several contracts from at least 1572, reminding us of the old character of the Strand, once mainly typified by small tenements and inns of various sizes, some of which had been the town houses of the higher clergy in the Middle Ages. In 1606 Northampton also secured several leases of neighbouring dwellings,70 while in 1608 he bought from Richard Cox three chambers or rooms together with a parcel of ground ‘of 12 foot Square’, formerly part of a house known by the name of St Mary Rounceval ‘otherwise called the Angell’.71 This was part of the old Hospital of Roncesvalles established by a foreign monastic house at Charing Cross, recorded since at least the thirteenth century and passed to private hands after the dissolution of the monasteries.72

The series of acquisitions from 1605 to 1608 – namely eight tenements of different sizes with their respective premises – constituted the site for the erection of Northampton House. By about 1608, the general structure of the house must have been well under way, for one year later it is recorded as the western boundary of the properties of Robert Reed, which Northampton was about to acquire. The deed, dated 6 June 1609, conveyed to the earl three further tenements with their shops and premises, two garden plots of considerable size and other connected properties ‘adjoin[ing] next unto the house of the said Earle called North[ampt]on house near Charing Cross’.73 Thus, Howard had bought almost everything that bounded his original acquisitions of 1605, with a final disbursement that must have been considerable, for he later claimed to be ‘eaten up by debts incurred in building his new house’.74

However, as we shall see, he would be actively involved in the construction of Audley End for his nephew, Thomas Howard, in an attempt to re-establish his family’s position in earnest.

68. Alnwick Castle, Sy:D.XVII.2a. It is interesting to note how the City of Westminster was regarded as separate from London. For a discussion on the matter see Merritt 2005.
69. Alnwick Castle, Sy:D.XVII.2b.
70. Alnwick Castle, Sy:D.XVII.2.
71. Alnwick Castle, Sy:D.XVII.2c.
73. Alnwick Castle, Sy:D.XVII.2c.
74. Cal State P Dom 1611–18, 145: letter to viscount [Rochester], 20 Aug 1612. The final cost of this enterprise is not known. However, the two main acquisitions of the earl of Northampton for which a sum is provided amounted to nearly £3,000, a figure that may be doubled considering
Fig 7. a) Map of London and Westminster by J Norden (1600): facsimile of map AA.72.96.2, Cambridge University Library; b) detail, showing the site of Northumberland House, between Scotland Yard, Charing Cross and York House. Photograph: reproduced by courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library
The sale of 1609 and further purchases in 1611 were connected to the enlargement of the garden of Northampton House. As one can extrapolate from Hollar's depiction of the house in the 1640s (fig 8), only the south-eastern end of that garden faced the river. This is evident from the earliest available layout of the property (fig 9), produced by John Hutchinson in 1706 to indicate the 'Houses & Lanes purchas'd by Henry Earl of Northampton', which shows that the main or 'upper garden' featured a large rectangular addition with a terrace overlooking the Thames, with summer houses at its angles (not seen in the plan but shown by Hollar) and a water gate reached by steps from its centre. Later successive plans of the estate (fig 10), as well as different plans of London produced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, confirm these characteristics. The last relevant acquisition to be made by the earl of Northampton is dated 6 July 1611. The conveyance from Robert Brett, a close ally of the earl and a later witness to his will, provided him with a portion of a building near Charing Cross called the 'Chappell of St Mary Rouncevall' which lay on the north-easter side of the garden wall of the newly built Northampton House and included three poles and further grounds. The length of the garden, from north to south, seemed then to have been 375ft. In around 1611, Northampton House must have reached its final form, extending from Charing Cross towards the Thames, with an enclosed garden of considerable length.

Evidence of the original layout of Northampton House comes from the following sources: a ground plan by John Smythson (fig 11); ground- and second-floor plans by John Thorpe (figs 12 and 13); and a rediscovered elevational drawing representing the Strand front virtually as built by Henry Howard, though drafted at a much later stage (fig 14). There also exists an unpublished elevational drawing of the south-west front of Northampton House (fig 15), executed in 1717 with a layout of the tenements which adjoined the property. This drawing, apart from three new windows at gallery level, and those of the reconstructed staircase, opened by Algernon Percy in the 1640s, shows the wing as it originally appeared. Furthermore, a series of views depicted the house in the course of the seventeenth century: Wenceslaus Hollar's in the 1640s (fig 8) and 1670s, Richard Newcourt's and William Faithorne's in 1658 (fig 16) and William Morgan's in 1682 (fig 17). Those images consistently show a house with turrets and a courtyard with a garden running down to the river. Finally, detailed information on the internal arrangement of Northampton House is provided by its first inventory (see Appendix), made subsequent to the death of Henry Howard in 1614. The following sources, combined together and assessed with evidence from the first complete series of plans executed in c 1750 (fig 18), allow conjectural reconstruction drawings of the original plans and elevations of the house (figs 19–22 and 24–26).

Smythson's plan (fig 11) is a scaled survey of, rather than a design for, Northampton House, which probably depicts the ground floor as completed in around 1609. This was a large, symmetrical courtyard house with an overall length, from the Strand to the

75. See both John Rocque's Plan of the Cities of London and Westminster (originally published in 1747, in Hyde 1982, pl 11) and Richard Horwood's Map and Face of London (of 1799–1819) in Horwood 1985, pl 23. Rocque's plan shows an elaborate alley which linked the garden of Northampton (then Northumberland) House to the river, while in Horwood's time, half a century later, that garden was surrounded by buildings.

76. Alnwick Castle, Sy:D.XVII.2c.

77. See Shirley 1869, 353–69.

78. I am grateful to Mark Girouard for a discussion on the original purpose of this plan.
Fig 8. A view of the river front of Northumberland House (inscribed ‘Suffolke house’), London. Engraving by W Hollar (1647):
opposite end of the garden, of 500ft. Its plan was an almost perfect square of 162ft, obtained by the introduction of corner turrets which made both north and south fronts equal the length of the side wings. Likewise, the courtyard was almost a square, 86 by 90ft wide, while it featured a loggia with a central projection that not only marked the main entrance to the house, but also contributed to the perception of a perfect square court.

It is fascinating to note that Inigo Jones took an interest in Northampton House for in a manuscript note by him in his copy of I Quattro Libri (1601), preserved at Worcester College, Oxford, he recorded that the Strand front of Northampton House was 162ft long, and that the courtyard was 81ft square. The former measurement corresponds to the figure worked out from Smythson’s plan, whilst the courtyard is drawn and figured as 90 by 86ft. As W H Godfrey remarked in 1911, examining Smythson’s drawing when it was still in the possession of Colonel Coke at Brookhill Hall, Alfreton, ‘its careful delineation of the garden makes it probable that it is a copy of a drawing prepared to show

79. See Allsop 1970, 1, 1.
the design for the general lay-out of the grounds'.

80 Godfrey went on, suggesting that the length of the front of the house as indicated by Jones was ‘exactly borne out’ by Smythson’s plan, while the differences between Jones’s measurements of the court and its actual size could be accounted for by the presence of two projecting windows and a porch on the eastern, western and southern sides respectively, which made the dimensions slightly shorter if Jones had taken them from these points.

Inigo Jones’s brief note on Northampton House has been considered as evidence for his involvement in the later alterations to the south front, carried out by Algernon Percy in the 1640s, with much confusion as to whether that front existed or not in the original layout of the house.81 Though this theory has subsequently been discarded for lack of firm evidence,82 no one seems to have noticed so far that Jones’s connection to the house, if any, should instead be

81. Dodsley and Dodsley 1761, iii, 51–2; Harrison 1776, 527; Anon 1866, 1; Fontblanque 1887, ii, 446; Hughson 1805–9, iv, 228; Brenan 1902, ii, 256; Chancellor 1908, 54; Godfrey 1911, 308: though suggesting the likelihood of Jones’s involvement in some of the alterations of 1642, Godfrey doubted whether he really rebuilt the garden front; Cowie 1977, 118; Peck 2005, 206–7.
82. Gater and Wheeler 1937, 12–13, reads thus: ‘though it is possible that a design executed by him [Jones] may have been utilised by Northumberland the probabilities are against it’; Allardyce 1987 also discards Jones’s involvement at the house.
Fig 11. Survey of the ground floor of Northumberland (then still Northampton) House, London, from the Strand on the north (right) to the Thames on the south (left), by J Smythson (1609): SC 229 I/12. Photograph: © RIBA Library Drawings Collection
referred to the period of Northampton’s ownership or shortly after. The name used in Jones’s inscription is in fact ‘Northamton’, rather than any of the others which the house assumed in its later history, while the evidence suggests that it can be datable to the period 1619–25.

The note by Inigo Jones on Northampton House is related to those he made at a group of royal palaces – Windsor, Theobalds and Hampton Court – of which he measured
the courts. The first entry on Windsor Castle, where he clearly writes ‘this I measured’, was made in December 1619; the second, on Theobalds, in June 1621, while the third, that on Northampton House, is not dated. However, the handwriting appears to belong

83. See Allsop 1970, 1, 1.

Photograph: Collection of The Duke of Northumberland
Fig 15. ‘A view of the Southwest Front [that is, the right-hand side when looking from the Strand to the north] of his Grace the Duke of Somerset House at Charing Cross’ (1717): Alnwick Castle, Sy:B.XV.2.b/2. Photograph: Collection of The Duke of Northumberland
Fig 16. a) ‘An exact delineation of the city of London and Westminster’, drawn by R Newcourt and engraved by W Faithorne (1658): facsimile of map BB.77.90.14, Cambridge University Library; b) detail, showing Northumberland House (marked as ‘Suffolk house’), London, from Charing Cross on the north to the Thames on the south. Photograph: reproduced by courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library
Fig 17. a) A view of London and Westminster. Engraving by W Morgan (1682): ‘London and Westminster’, I, 2972, fols 38–9; b) detail, showing Northumberland House (the last on the left). Photograph: © The Pepys Library, Magdalene College, Cambridge
to the last entries of the group on Hampton Court, dated September 1625.\textsuperscript{84} In the early 1620s Northampton House was a potential royal palace due to the fall in 1619 of the 1st earl of Suffolk, who had inherited the house from his uncle.\textsuperscript{85} This may explain its presence amongst a group of royal houses, as well as Jones’s association with it as Surveyor of the King’s Works. Northampton House is the only one of the group where Jones measured the court as well as the entrance front, for the proportional relationship between the two must have struck him as significant.\textsuperscript{86} In effect, his interest in that house within a group of royal houses not only is indicative of its high architectural status, but may have been written with a larger purpose in mind. In December 1619, the date of his first note, Jones was rebuilding the Banqueting House, while the possibility of a great design for Whitehall Palace may indicate why he was establishing the dimensions of a typical royal court.\textsuperscript{87}

The general layout of Smythson’s plan clearly echoed the conventional Elizabethan or early Stuart arrangement: the Hall, shown without a screen, was asymmetrically placed on

\textsuperscript{84} I owe this information to Gordon Higgott.
\textsuperscript{85} Guerci 2007, i, pt 2, 129–36.
\textsuperscript{86} I am grateful to Gordon Higgott and the late Howard Colvin for a discussion on this matter.
\textsuperscript{87} I owe this suggestion to Gordon Higgott.
Fig 19. Northumberland House: reconstructed plan of the basement as originally built, with proposed identification of rooms as listed in the first inventory of 1614. The presence and delineation of the main staircase in the west wing (middle left) are based on conjectural assumptions, while the delineation of the service stair adjacent to the 'Kitchen related rooms' in the south wing (centre) refers to the survey of the ground floor by John Thorpe. *Drawing: author*
the south-eastern side of the building, followed by the usual set of service rooms, the buttery and pantry, on its south-western side. The latter rooms were flanked by two

88. On account of the difference in level between hall and terrace a true screens passage was not possible. However, its presence is registered by Thorpe, and is justified by the fact that, without a
small staircases which led to the kitchen and its related areas in the basement, occasioned
by the southward slope of the site. One of these staircases may also have climbed to the
rooms above the buttery and pantry, as will become apparent. The south wing of

screen, one would have entered directly into the hall, which in turn would not have been screened
by the adjacent service rooms. In any case, Smythson’s surveys are not always accurate, and he may
simply not have shown it. Likewise, the screen may not yet have been installed.
Northampton House featured a loggia on the courtyard (that is the street) side, while the garden front overlooking the river faced a terrace at basement level the width of the house, preceded by an arcaded loggia, as at Salisbury House. An elaborate formal garden extending 318ft towards the Thames followed. Access to it was provided by the staircases in the turrets. This is confirmed by later documents. See Alnwick Castle, Sy:U.III.2 (British Library Microfilm 394), Building Accounts up to 1649 (discussed in Guerci 2007, I, pt 2, 137–61).
and, perhaps, by way of the basement, if the great staircase, a convenient three flights of steps in the east wing, went down to this floor, as it does for instance at Hatfield House. Albeit uncommon, this would have eased an otherwise cramped descent to the garden. The east and west wings contained lodgings and a series of staircases that led to the upper floors, whereas the street front on the north included the porter’s lodge, together with one more lodging connected to a further staircase. It will be noticed that outlined projecting windows, which relate to the upper floors, feature both in the courtyard and in the street front, and that the gate here is flanked by coupled columns, suggesting that the frontispiece was elaborately decorated. A similar though less elaborate treatment was to be found in the middle of the loggia in the courtyard, which had a symmetrical projection in the garden front.

The plan is inscribed ‘The Platforme of my Lo: of Northamtons house: in London:’ but, like most of the drawings in the Smythson collection (preserved in the RIBA Library Drawings Collection), is not dated or signed. In 1962 Mark Girouard located this plan amongst the surveys of London buildings carried out during the visit of 1609 by Robert Smythson, John’s father, even if, as he pointed out, ‘it is hard to distinguish styles of draughtsmanship in the case of a father and son who are known to have worked together for a considerable period’. John Summerson, commenting in 1966 on this plan in comparison with the two drawings by Thorpe, placed it among John Smythson’s works after the visit to London of 1619. Following Adrian Woodhouse’s article, Girouard has now changed his opinion, and thinks that the visit of 1609 was by John Smythson. By comparing the inscription on the ground plan of Northampton House with the handwriting of John Smythson as it appears in the only signed drawing in the Smythson collection, and in a recently identified estate plan, it can in fact be concluded that the inscription is in John’s hand. As for the date of this survey, Girouard is right to associate it with the visit of 1609, which could have taken place either in November of that year, or in early March 1610, considering that another drawing from the same series – ‘the platteforme of my lo of Exceters house at Wymbellton 1609’ (I/24) – is inscribed as ‘a greate Orcharde with walkes nowe in Plantinge’. November or March would have been the time to plant the orchard. By then, the garden of Northampton House was being extended so that in 1611 its dimensions were comparable to, if slightly larger than, those indicated by Smythson. This would support a date for the plan prior to 1611. At the same time, the

90. This limitation would not be fully surpassed until the 1650s, when John Webb designed the garden staircase for Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland, who wanted to connect his newly built state rooms in the south wing to the garden. See Wood 1993, 55–80; Guerci 2007, I, pt 2, 137–61.
93. See Woodhouse 1999, 125–9; Girouard 2009, 491, no. 4.
94. I owe this information to Mark Girouard. The estate plan is in the great atlas of surveys of William, Earl of Newcastle, identified as John Smythson’s by Adrian Woodhouse (see Woodhouse 1999, 125–9). The other is the only signed drawing in the Smythson collection (III/13). It is by John in 1618 and shows the elevation of panelling at Theobalds House (see Girouard 1962, 24).
95. I owe this information to Adrian Woodhouse, to whom I am grateful for bringing drawing I/24 to my attention, for discussing it with me, for narrowing down the period of the 1609 visit of John Smythson and for elucidating aspects of his career.
96. The 1611 deed reads thus: ‘And also all that Soyl and Ground of the Sd Jn Baron whereon any parts of the House of the S.d E. near Charing Cross aforesaid called Northton house is Built or is inclosd within the Brickwall of the Garden of the said E. w.ch Garden wall doth extend f.m
date of 1619 suggested by Summerson would appear too late, for the house was then owned by the earl of Suffolk and had changed its name. The title of the survey referred instead to Northampton and should therefore pre-date his death in 1614.97

Like Smythson’s survey, the ground- and second-floor plans by John Thorpe (figs 12 and 13) would not seem to be designs for Northampton House.98 Their purpose may have been that of rough surveys, perhaps made at the same time as Thorpe’s involvement at Audley End,99 where sketched (and not quite resolved) alterations were added on an established layout. The plans both contain inscriptions in two apparently different styles: the one used to indicate the altered spaces is coarser than that of the name of each room, which Summerson classified as ‘small, cramped writing, probably the hand of the original draughtsman’.100 This led to the suggestion that the alterations on Thorpe’s plans may have been added by a second hand.101 However, a close examination of the two styles, together with a comprehensive analysis of the style of the inscriptions in a number of Thorpe’s drawings, has confirmed the presence of a single hand, which mainly varies in size, rather than style. In the plans of Northampton House, the hand is Thorpe’s throughout. Here he may have altered his writing to distinguish the alterations from the pre-existing state of the fabric. The same difference in the size of handwriting can nevertheless be found in a number of other inscriptions in Thorpe’s album, and it is possible that this was simply a peculiarity of the draughtsman. After all, he is known to have reworked the album at different stages of his life, and the handwriting may have evolved with time.

As for the date of the plans, this should be placed within Northampton’s lifetime, thus no later than 1614. The arrangement indicated by Thorpe is in fact comparable to our reconstruction of the interiors after the inventory of the house taken on Northampton’s death. The plan of the ground floor is also very similar to what Smythson recorded in 1609, which in turn disproves the claims that the south front was not part of the original house, but added either by Thomas Howard after Northampton’s death or by Algernon Percy in his alterations of the 1640s.102

Rough though they are, Thorpe’s plans are more detailed than the survey of John Smythson and provide fundamental elements for our understanding of the fabric. The plan of the ground floor (fig 12) features a number of hypothetical alterations which, if realized, would have considerably changed the way the building worked. They included the isolation of the top floor (third level from the ground) – where, as we shall see, the main rooms of state were located – from the more private middle floor (second level from

the South East end of the Garden Plott now in the Occupacon of the S.d S.r Rob.t Brett to the said wall of the s.d house And w.ch wall of the said house doth extend from the Sd Garden wall towards the street leading to Charing Cross and do both containe in length [365 erased] 375 foot of assize or thereab.ts’ (Alnwick Castle, Sy:D.XVII.2c, 6 July 8 Ja.). In the Smythson collection survey the length of the garden, inclusive of the terrace, is 338ft. This dimension is confirmed by a later account of the house by Thomas Williams (see note 120 below), which proves that the survey by Smythson is quite precise.

98. While the possibility that they were actually designs for Northampton House cannot be completely discarded in the absence of primary sources, external evidence from the plans would seem to support this hypothesis.
99. For a discussion on this house see Drury 1980.
100. Summerson 1966, 123.
102. See the discussion later in this paper.
the ground). This would have been made possible by reshaping the great staircase on the east wing, recorded by Smythson as a convenient set of three flights with a corridor on each floor (fig 11), for which Thorpe devised an elaborate and rather odd ‘zigzag’ staircase with several landings occupying the entire width of the wing (compare fig 12 with fig 23). The new stair would have been accessed from the loggia on the Hall side in the ground floor and would have climbed directly into an ‘Anticamera’ leading to the Great Chamber on the top floor, without stopping at the middle floor.
The idea of separating the public route from the more private ones in a great house became increasingly common in the seventeenth century, when most of the great staircases would only lead to the piano nobile. Few of these houses, however, had their piano nobile on the top floor, for it involved a longer and more complex route. But Thorpe’s sketched staircase remains unresolved, for he must have found it difficult to fit in the requisite number of treads. Other problems that a staircase directly leading to the top floor would have brought to the middle level include a little gallery with a single access from the west wing, thus ending on a wall. It should also be noticed that Thorpe is devising his new stair over another, which could either be the pre-existing one, or yet a

103. A remarkable exception is, of course, Hardwick Hall, the arrangement of which bears many similarities to that of Northampton House. The great staircase at Hardwick may even have been what Henry Howard had in mind when Thorpe attempted to devise the staircase discussed here. Unfortunately for Howard, the task turned out to be impossible. I am grateful to Deborah Howard for this suggestion.

104. Thorpe showed and numbered 30 treads, which would be insufficient to cover the distance between two floors, worked out as being in the order of 30ft (unless we assume a height of 1ft per rise). Neither is it conceivable that such a stair could be repeated for two storeys, imagining that what we see in the plan indicated the part of it which climbed up to the middle floor, since this would necessarily imply a way of turning back to the south front of the house where a new ascent would have to begin. But this was impossible without a corridor on one side of the stair, since the north-eastern part of the middle floor was isolated from the rest of the house, the central gateway occupying its first two storeys (fig 21). This is confirmed by a number of the sources analysed below.

Fig 24. Northumberland House: reconstructed elevation of the Strand front (north) as originally built, with conjectural inscription on the roofline. Drawing: author

---
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different solution (fig 12); in any case, it appears different from what Smythson recorded (fig 11). This stair, two parallel flights along a central well, each composed of three series of steps and two landings, also occupies the whole width of the wing. The absence of a side corridor is again problematic for, if entered from the loggia on the south front, as would be logical, this staircase would not reach the north side of the house where the rooms of state were located. Instead, it would end up on a single room, leading only to the leaded terrace. In effect, none of the stairs designed by Thorpe – neither the principal nor the secondary ones along the house – is carefully planned. All of them are either wrongly placed or ill-calculated and appear to be no more than scribbled ideas.

Other intended alterations to the plan of the ground floor are more plausible. The Hall, in which now features a screens passage, is divided into two parts to create a Parlour. Three sets of stairs in the north-west ranges would also appear to have been modified from double to single flights, unless Thorpe was recording just one flight, for the number of treads, as we pointed out, is insufficient. Finally, the rooms in the west wing are connected by a series of doors en enfilade.

Externally, the south front, facing the garden, no longer has a central projection so that it is flattened, as can be seen in the reconstructed elevation (fig 25). Inside the courtyard, the projecting part of the loggia, well marked by Smythson, is also flattened, while a series of dotted steps would suggest a difference of levels between the court and that loggia. This is not
recorded by Smythson, and neither is Thorpe consistent in adding steps to the other entrances at court level, a necessary feature in the event of different levels between the outside and inside of the house. Along the east side of the courtyard, the shape of those windows outlined by Smythson is here repeated in dotted lines with the inscription ‘dore under’, which indicates the intention of opening two passages in lieu of old windows. On the opposite side there was to be added only one projecting window on the left of the main oriel, keeping flat those on the right-hand side. The addition here is inscribed as ‘trussed’, which may suggest that these elaborate windows, at least in one case, had a wooden structure.

Generally, this projecting window has a convex plan which may combine triangular and semicircular shapes projecting out of the main wall in a quite sophisticated way. Such windows appear in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century and would seem to be of Perpendicular Gothic origin: Henry VII’s Tower at Windsor Castle, begun in the 1490s, reveals oriel windows of complex shape,105 echoed in Henry VII’s Chapel at Westminster Abbey, begun in 1503,106 of which both Thorpe and John Smythson drew a plan, and repeated on the garden side of the great Thornbury Castle, Gloucestershire, of c 1511.107 As a hint of medievalism manifesting self-conscious continuity with the native

105. See Hope 1913, i, 246–55; ii, 448–50.
107. Hengrave Hall, Suffolk, has a similar trefoiled bay window above its main doorway, which may have been the work of William Ponyard and is dated 1538; it includes some Renaissance details,
past, as well as a clear adaptation to the shortage of light in a northern climate, this elaborate type of window virtually never went out of fashion until at least the early 1600s, from the otherwise revolutionary Strand front of Somerset House (1547–52), to such lesser buildings as Paul Pindar's house in London (c 1600), now preserved at the Victoria and Albert Museum. Triangular and canted bays also occur in a considerable number of Thorpe drawings of the early seventeenth century.

Thorpe's plan of the second floor of Northampton House (fig 13), that is the third level from the ground, shows the principal rooms of the house with their functions, and is the earliest source in our possession depicting this part of the building. The great staircase, even if half drafted and problematic, as discussed earlier, should logically lead to the state rooms on the north side of the house via a space connected to the Great Chamber by a screen, of which Thorpe designed a second version. Here he repeats what he had drafted on the plan of the ground floor where the inscription 'gr[eat] cham[b]r above' clearly refers to the top floor. The Great Chamber has an elaborate convex window projecting on to the Strand, while two others open on to the courtyard. It is followed by a large Dining Chamber with projecting windows on both street and court sides, while the Withdrawing Chamber, also on the street front, leads to a Long Gallery which runs the entire length of the east wing, 160ft long, with bay and flat windows on three sides. It should be noticed that all projecting windows along this floor followed the symmetrical arrangement and shape as outlined in Smythson's plan (fig 11), suggesting that this elaborate feature was already in place by 1609 and was probably part of the original design.

To appreciate the predominance of the 160ft Long Gallery, it is useful to compare it with that of the contemporary Salisbury House, where, despite Cecil's leading position, the gallery was only 84ft long. This offers another clue for our evaluation of the Cecil–Howard architectural competition, and is perhaps one of the reasons why, shortly after he had built his gallery at Salisbury House, Robert Cecil decided to add a second and longer gallery, more or less at the same time as Northampton House was being built. At Hardwick Hall the gallery is such as the multiformal mouldings at the foot of the bay, and the little cherubs below, who hold the shields with coats of arms (see Pevsner 2000, 262–4). The inner gatehouse of the palace of Nonsuch, begun by Henry VIII in 1538, had three richly carved oriel windows above the entrance arch, arranged similarly to those at Hengrave Hall. This is shown in John Speed's engraving of the south front of the palace published in 1610 (see Mowl 2001, 77). At Nonsuch, however, the carvings below the windows bore the insignia of two later owners of the palace, Lords Arundel and Lumley, and may have been added after Henry VIII's time (see Colvin 1963–82, II, 198).

108. Other examples include Kenilworth (oriel dated 1570s), Holdenby (1570s), Toddington (by 1581), Burgheley (inner courtyard 1570s–80s), Montacute, Sherborne and Berry Pomeroy castles (of the 1590s), Audley End and Bramshill (1605–12), Charlton Park (begun 1607), Charlton House (1607–12), Chillham Castle (begun 1616) and one of the 'more-window-than-wall' houses such as The Hall at Bradford-on-Avon (c 1610), Wiltshire. I am grateful to Mark Girouard for providing me with a list of the above examples and for a discussion on the matter.

109. See Drury 1980, 36, no. 152. The drawings are the following, all of c 1610 or later: a design for Camden House (T96), c 1612 or shortly before; what may be a scheme for alterations to Copped Hall (T48), c 1610–28; a design for a timber-framed town house inscribed 'heather end of Holborne' (T52), no date; a drawing of Aston Hall (T201, 205), 1618–35; another late one, which may be a design study after Little Charlton (T171–172); and in his adaptation of the plan of the Luxembourg Palace (T123–124 and T127–128), 1618. This excludes the more frequent triangular projection in the centre of a canted bay, which, as Drury suggests, may be the source of the use of the triangular bay alone. For this, Thorpe himself illustrates a suitable precedent, at St George's Chapel, Windsor, of 1502 (T69).

167ft long, only 7ft longer than that at Northampton House, while suburban examples, such as Brooke House, Hackney, built for Lord Hudson in c. 1578–83, had a gallery of 150ft. Long galleries of remarkable length include that at Worksop (1580s), of 212ft, Copped Hall (1580s), of 174ft, and Syon House (c. 1604–5), of 130ft.

Thorpe’s plan of the second floor indicates that the roof of the south wing served as a leaded terrace where the view over the garden towards the river could be appreciated. This feature is reminiscent of various country houses from the second half of the sixteenth century, which can thus be seen as anticipating aspects of the riverside palaces of the Strand. The south front of Northampton House was one storey lower than the other ranges. Unlike Salisbury House, the Hall had maintained its traditional and lavish double height and occupied the ground and first floors of the house, while the other wings had three different levels. This is confirmed by later bills for the alterations to this side of the house carried out in the 1640s, around which time Hollar depicted the river front (fig 8) showing the elevational dominance of the second-floor windows at the south ends of the east and west ranges. The presence of a double-height Hall also determined the position of the piano nobile, which could only have featured on the top floor.

That this plan indicates the second floor of Northampton House there can be no further doubt: both Smythson and Thorpe’s ground plans show three staircases within the lodgings occupying the west range. If Thorpe’s plan represented the first floor, or middle floor, as it appears to be, these staircases would emerge in the Long Gallery, which they do not. Moreover, the shape of the canted window in the centre of the north range could only have featured on the second floor of the house, as we deduce from a drawing of the frontispiece by George Vertue (fig 27), and from the elevation of the original street front which is analysed below (fig 14).

It has been remarked that both of Thorpe’s plans are confusing, since they might contain information about more than one floor on each plan. My research has proved that they clearly do so, and that it is now evident that Thorpe used the plan of the ground floor to depict altered spaces on the top of the house, such as the new great staircase and adjacent rooms. On the other hand, the wall with three windows on the courtyard side of the leaded terrace, half drafted on the plan of the top floor, must have indicated the arrangement of the Little Gallery on the middle floor, above the loggia. The plan of the latter level probably appeared superfluous for, as its reconstructed plan shows (fig 21), it could not be much different from that of the ground floor. The claim that the proposed alterations by John Thorpe ‘evidently included adding a second floor over the hall’

112. I owe this information to Mark Girouard.
113. See Guerci 2007, i, pt 2, 137–61.
114. With the Hall as well as the Strand entrance porch occupying the first two levels of the house, the only way to have an uninterrupted sequence of state rooms was to place them on the top of the house, whence there would also be access to the terrace. Such a position, inevitably, presented some problems — such as that of climbing two floors — though the public side of the house (that is, the Strand front) must have looked very grand, with its high windows on the top.
115. As previously observed by Drury 1980, 36, no. 149.
117. Drury 1980, 36, no. 149. The two rooms are ‘the Great Withdrawing Chamber’ and the ‘Bigg[e]r Great Chamber’. The 1614 inventory lists a ‘large paire of Norenburgh Androns’ in the first room, and simply a ‘chimney piece of wainscott, not sett upp’ in the other (Shirley 1869, 358). The inventory is discussed more fully later in this paper.
based on the assumption that other rooms on the top floor seem to have been unfinished at Northampton’s death in 1614, appears therefore unlikely. This would have compromised the leaded terrace providing views of the garden and the river, a characteristic feature of two Northampton-related houses.

Apart from the river-front views, which are of limited use at this stage, for they were made after the alterations of the 1640s, and the south-west elevation of 1717, we do not possess contemporary elevations of Northampton House. However, analysis of the Strand front can rely on an elevational drawing which pre-dates the first changes to this side of the building carried out in 1749 (fig 14). As such, it is a precious survey of the street front almost as first built, though some minor inconsistencies occur. The large elevational drawing by an unknown hand is made of two sheets pasted together in a slightly erroneous way. The distance between canted and flat windows on the left-hand side of the elevation does not fit with the information provided by Thorpe and is clearly exaggerated. In fact it does not correspond to its counterpart on the left of the drawing which, on the contrary, appears to be correct. The other discrepancy between Thorpe’s plans and the elevational drawing is the indication in the latter of a gentle projection from the main wall of the flat windows, just enough for the corners to be rusticated. This is likely to have been an original feature of the front, while the purpose of Thorpe’s plans as rough surveys with sketched suggestions for alterations would account for the omission of such a detail. In general, however, the elevational drawing matches well with Vertue’s earlier representation of the frontispiece (fig 27), in itself consistent with subsequent depictions, and with the three plans of the house (figs 11–13), which thus prove to be reliable sources. It also appears to have been made on site or with first-hand information, for it correctly depicts, at ground level, the gentle slope of Charing Cross. A reconstructed version of this elevational drawing, where the above errors are corrected, is shown here (fig 24).

118. According to Gater and Wheeler 1937 (p. 37): ‘In the views by Maurer (dated 1740) and Scott (circa 1747), the front [of Northampton House] appears to be somewhat dilapidated, but there is no reason to think that it had undergone any substantial alteration since the time of its erection’. The view by John Maurer (1713–63), an English draughtsman and engraver known for his various depictions of London, does indicate 1740 as the date of the Act of Parliament that authorized its publication (see A Perspective View of Charing Cross: BL, K.Top.22.10a). This kind of information, however, is not always reliable, while in the case of Northampton House external evidence suggests that the view by Maurer could not have been made before 1749. The front, in fact, reveals the alterations begun in that year. The other view, by Samuel Scott (c 1702–72), dated c 1747, has not been found, though it would seem that the statement in the Survey of London (Gater and Wheeler 1937, 37), and its link to the above images, referred to the frontispiece of Northampton House, which survived almost unaltered until its demolition, rather than to the front as a whole. Remembering that Hollar only depicted the garden front of Northampton House, the first available view of the main facade is recorded in the Catalogue of Maps, Prints, Copy-Books, &c, printed by John Bowles in 1753 (BL, 823.a.37). Amongst the Perspective views in and about London listed in that catalogue is featured a view of ‘Charing-cross and Northumberland-house’, which most likely corresponds to the one by Maurer. Other prints from that artist, including, possibly, the one of Northampton House, were added to a volume titled Views of all the Cathedrall Churches of England and Wales, now in the Royal Library at Windsor: see Adams 1983, 455–8 and 504. According to Adams, the first topographical book showing the front of Northampton House (after Canaletto) was published by Dodsley in 1761, so that none of the available images would pre-date the first alterations of 1749.

The elevational drawing (fig 14) was first used by Thomas Williams, Steward of the Northumberlands' Middlesex estates from approximately 1820 to 1876, in his unpublished manuscript history of the house which bears the date of 1875.\textsuperscript{120} It shows the Strand front with two storeys over the ground floor characterized by a central composition of superimposed terms crowned by a pediment with the Howards' lion. 'Its architecture', wrote Williams, 'may be most fitly described as neither Gothic nor Classical, but Jacobean. Of this somewhat anomalous style it is a very fair and even a handsome specimen.'\textsuperscript{121} The frontispiece of Northampton House was an adapted and simplified version of the Tower of the Orders, in the mould of Wendel Dietterlin, the sixteenth-century German architect who popularized Flemish Mannerist ornaments through his \textit{Architectura}, published in Nuremberg in 1598.\textsuperscript{122} Little more than a century after it was built, Nicholas Hawksmoor thus recalled the Dietterlin style in a letter to the Dean of Westminster in 1734–5 about his remodelling of Westminster Abbey:

> There is yet another manner of Building which was of the invention of John Ditterlyn, at Strasbourg (a fantastical painter) about the year 1500, where he put the whole disposition of Ancient building into Masquarade ... see some of this Taste in the West [effectively North] front of Northumberland house. This Burlesque Style of Building, is still called Ditterlyn, but not imitated.\textsuperscript{123}

The frontispiece of Northampton House was visually connected with a number of highly wrought, tall, narrow frontispieces built in southern England around 1607, such as those

\textsuperscript{120} ‘Northumberland House – Historical and Descriptive Notes. Part II: A Description of Northumberland House’, Alnwick Castle Library (the first reference to this is in Fontblanque, 1887, ii, 447, no. 3). The document, produced in two copies and bound together with a Percy family history, is a very detailed account of the house, which it describes as still standing, though the manuscript bears the date 1875, one year after its demolition. It is unclear whether Williams wrote this account over several years, while a letter at Alnwick proves that it was commissioned by the then duke of Northumberland to whom the work is dedicated, perhaps as a kind of memento of the past glory of Northumberland House. For its internal description, Williams mainly drew on an 1851 guide to the house (\textit{Northumberland House: its Saloons and Picture Gallery}), while the elevational drawing is referred to as ‘the front facing Charing Cross as designed by these architects’ (Jansen and Christmas, whom he mentions in the text). Williams’s involvement in the drawing, reproduced on a single sheet, can be excluded. This drawing was photographed by \textit{Country Life} and a copy deposited at the Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London (Secular 1530–1830). Thomas Williams also produced a similar account for Syon House. I am grateful to Lisa Little at Alnwick Castle archives for information on these documents.

\textsuperscript{121} ‘Northumberland House – Historical and Descriptive Notes’; see note 120 above.

\textsuperscript{122} This was the first complete edition. A part of it appeared in Stuttgart in 1593, while a second volume was published in Strasbourg in 1594 (see Dietterlin 1968). Some terms of the frontispiece of Northumberland House were saved from dispersal and remounted as gateway piers at Syon House. Photographs of this are preserved at the Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London (Secular 1530–1830).

\textsuperscript{123} See Downes 1979, 257, and Wells-Cole, 1997, 28. Wells-Cole, referring to the view of the house by Canaletto (see Guerci 2007, ii, 286, cat no. xxxvi) and to the photographs taken before its demolition (see ibid, 291, cat no. xlv and 294–95, cat nos l and li), remarks that none of the above ‘show the detail quite clearly enough to be sure that Dietterlin was actually copied for the architectural ornament, but Hawksmoor’s description confirms that it was indeed Dietterlin whom this façade most suggested’. Our analysis, relying on new iconographic material, as well as on the photographs of those terms saved from destruction, has confirmed that Dietterlin is undoubtedly the source of the design.
at Charlton Park, Wiltshire, built by the Countess of Suffolk, and at Charlton House, Greenwich, built for Sir Adam Newton, the tutor of Henry, Prince of Wales. Above all, Bramshill House, Hampshire, built by Lord Edward Zouche between 1605 and 1612, has an elaborately carved frontispiece which seems to owe a great deal to the counterpart at Northampton House. As Helen Hills has pointed out, 'the connections are too close to be coincidental, and it is likely that Zouche was deliberately making reference to the new and prestigious London house of a distinguished peer', thus providing an example of the influence of Northampton’s architectural patronage.

The frontispiece of Northampton House is flanked by three mullioned windows on each level which appear to project very little from the main wall. On either side of the frontispiece, close to the turrets, we recognize the peculiar projecting windows as represented in the survey plans, in vogue in the early 1600s and typical, as we have seen, of a number of Thorpe designs for country houses, including Audley End, built between c 1605 and 1614. The facade, with its rusticated stone corners, is completed at each end by turrets with convex roofs of scaly tiles, one storey higher than the rest of the building.

The elevational drawing (fig 14) depicts a brick house with stone-mullioned windows, string courses and dressings, all in the manner of J A du Cerceau’s Les Plus Excellents Bastiments de France (1576), a connection which can also be found at Audley End (fig 2a). The drawing shows better than its later successors that the piano nobile is placed at the top of the house. It also confirms that the survey by Thorpe of the second floor of Northampton House is unquestionably the plan of its top floor. Such a position for the piano nobile, determined, as we have seen, by the peculiarity of the interiors, was noticed in the first proper account of the history of the house published in 1761. It is reminiscent of such great country houses as Chatsworth, Derbyshire, the arrangement of which derives from its Tudor bones, and Holdenby, Northamptonshire, begun in 1574 by Christopher Hatton on the model of William Cecil’s Theobalds. The same is to be found at Hardwick Hall (1590–6), where the state rooms are placed over the lodgings of the first floor, which acts like a mezzanine, while a similar arrangement is repeated at Charlton House (c 1607–12), Greenwich, already mentioned in regard to its similarities with Northampton House.

As mentioned above, the design and construction of Northampton House were supposed to be the collaboration of Bernard Janssen and Gerard Christmas. John Thorpe, and Henry Howard himself, may have had a role too. The first two names were first associated with the house by George Vertue, who conjectured that the enigmatic letters ‘C AE’ on the frontispiece of Northampton House stood for ‘Christmas Aedificavit’ (fig 27). It can now be stated on documentary evidence that these letters were part of a larger inscription, most likely referring to the ownership and titles of the earl of Northampton. The building accounts for the alterations of Algernon Percy up to 1649 include masons’ work for ‘takeing downe the

124. On Charlton Park see Pevsner 2002, 163; on Charlton House see Strong 1986, 28.
126. The projection is minimal; just enough for the corners to be rusticated. This is probably why it does not appear in the plans of John Thorpe, which nonetheless registered the slight projection of the turrets.
127. See du Cerceau 1576, fols 3r, 6r and 6v and related tables of drawings, and du Cerceau 1579, fols 3r, 5r and related tables of drawings.
128. Dodsley and Dodsley 1761, v, 50.
130. On Hardwick Hall see Girouard 2004; on Charlton House see Cooper 2006, 52–7.
131. Walpole 1879, 131.
letters round the house and at the waterside', clearly suggesting the presence of pierced letters along the top of the house. This is confirmed by John Evelyn who, on a visit at Audley End in September 1654, remarked that ‘instead of railes and balusters, there is a bordure of Capital letters, as was lately also on Suffolck house neere Charing Crosse’. Pierced or embossed initials also featured on the top of Hardwick Hall and Salisbury House, while Audley End, Temple Newsam (parapet dated 1624) and, more spectacularly, Castle Ashby (from 1622) all had full openwork inscriptions on their roofline parapets.

The tradition of including inscriptions on the frieze of a building goes back to the Ancients, especially the Romans. However, the display of letters as balustrades of a parapet would seem to be a Renaissance device found in French architecture to conceal the base of dormer windows as well as high-pitched roofs. For instance, the wing added by François I to the Château de Blois in the Loir-et-Cher region from 1515 shows an elaborate parapet at roof level where the balusters are given the shape of his initial. Parapets of this kind are comparatively rare in England, while those buildings with full inscriptions on their roofline all date to the first decades of the seventeenth century. Here the balusters were conceived for leaded terraces on flat roofs, rather than to conceal garret floors. The original source, however, may have been du Cerceau, whose influential volumes, published from 1576, included the designs of some of the castles such as Blois with its openwork letters on the parapet.

It was Horace Walpole who first supported the presence of a larger inscription on the top of Northampton House containing the earl’s titles in Latin, as well as the builder’s name. His argument was based on William Camden’s Annalium Apparatus of James I, published in 1691, where it is said that at the funeral of Queen Anne of Denmark in 1619 a young man among the spectators was killed by the fall of the letter S from the top of Northampton House. This theory was then further elaborated by scholars who stressed the unlikelihood that a great Jacobean nobleman would have allowed an artisan to put his initials in so prominent a place. The two letters should therefore be integrated in a

133. Quoted in Anon 1866, i, note a; see Beer 1955, iii, 141.
135. See Babelon 1989, 110–11. In relation to the 16th-century facade at Blois, the author writes thus: ‘La balustrade ajourée qui la surmonte est au contraire un legs de la tradition ancienne qui dissimule fâcheusement le départ des grandes lucarnes de pierre’. The French also made an extensive use of wrought initials. Examples include the late 15th-century wings of the Château de Blois, which feature the initials of Louis XII and Anne, his queen, embossed in the pediments of the dormer windows; the Château de Chaumont in the Loir-et-Cher region, rebuilt by the Amboise family in the early 16th century, which has a frieze of embossed letters running halfway through the walls; the old Louvre, rebuilt by Pierre Lescot for François I and his successors from the 1540s, with embossed initials throughout the facades; and the Château d’Anet, in Eure-et-Loir, rebuilt in the mid-1550s by Philibert de l’Orme for Diane de Poitiers, mistress of Henry II. Here, the letters HD, devised as a single and rather charming symbol pointing to the intimate relation between the two, figure prominently on the main front. See Babelon 1989, 41–7, 55–6, 410–17 and 419–27.
136. See du Cerceau 1579, fol 3r and related tables of drawings.
137. Walpole 1879, 131–2; interestingly, the 1849 edition includes the following information which does not appear in other editions: ‘The front of Northampton-house ... was profusely ornamented with rich scrols of architectural carvings, and with an open parapet, worked into letters and other devices’ (I, 249, no. 2).
139. Colvin (unpublished paper, 1993), and Girouard in a discussion with the present writer.
larger inscription standing on the Strand front, which, considering the layout of the rooftop, was likely to be self-contained. 140 A possibility that has been worked out in the available space would imply the presence of some abbreviated words and reads thus: ‘H [HENRICUS] HOWARDIUS NORTHAMPTONIÆ – C [COMES] AE – DIF [AEDIFICAVIT] AD MDCCV II REGIS IACOBI’ (fig 24). 141 The names of the builders, if mentioned at all, might have featured on the other, less prominent sides of the house. The absence of a parapet with pierced letters in the elevational drawing pre-1749 represents another difference from the original state of the main front. It is accounted for by the masons’ bill up to 1649, when this decorative feature, probably in decay and certainly unrelated to the new owners, was removed. The separation of the letters C AE, which alone appeared in the frontispiece, could nonetheless be interpreted as a deliberate attempt on the part of the carver to point indirectly to his role, thus explaining the information provided by Vertue.

The involvement of Miles or Moses Glover, described as ‘painter and architect’ who drew ‘the survey of Sion and the neighbouring villages’, 142 is suggested by some literature on, or related to, Northampton House, 143 even if his name may also be associated with the internal decorations of Syon House in the 1640s. 144 To what extent Janssen, Thorpe or Henry Howard were responsible for the design or alterations of Northampton House is not altogether clear. However, comparison with Audley End, the other contemporary great fabric related to the earl of Northampton, offers important clues for our understanding of the matter.

It was Margaret Audley (d 1563), by her marriage to the 4th duke of Norfolk, in 1558, who brought Audley End to the Howard family. She was the daughter of Thomas, 1st Baron Audley of Walden (1488–1544), who had passed the Acts of Suppression of the Monasteries which caused the secularization of so many abbeys. Consistent with this,

140. It is not clear whether all sides of the rooftop featured inscriptions. The one overlooking the Strand was self-contained between the corner turrets, while those sides on the wings facing east and west had too many chimney stacks for a full inscription. The three sides of the rooftop overlooking the courtyard are the ones most likely to have contained inscriptions, considering the availability of uninterrupted space, whilst the south wing, being one storey lower, must have featured a brief self-contained inscription on both sides, as shown in the reconstructed elevations (fig 26).

141. I am grateful to Mark Girouard who suggested to me a more elaborate version of this reconstruction – Henricus Comes Northamptoni Domum Han[c Ae]dificavit Anno – Regis Iacobi – which proved to be too long for the actual front line. The orthography of the earl of Northampton’s name is based on that of his epitaph composed by William Camden (see note 10 above). As Andersson (2006, 16–17 and no. 8) has shown, the orthography of Northampton’s name varied: examples include ‘Henrye Howarde, Henricus Howardus, H Howarde, Henry Howard and H Howarde’ (the Greek omega, in place of a long o, is not infrequent in 17th-century printed books).

142. Walpole 1879, 131, no. 4, writes thus: ‘In the New Description of London, vol. 5 [sic] it is said, that from some letters in the fronts, when it was last rebuilt [1749], it was inferred that one Moses Glover was the architect; which is not improbable, as that great curiosity at Sion House, the survey of Sion and the Neighbouring villages, was performed by Moses Glover, painter and architect’. An identical footnote appears in earlier editions of the Anecdotes (see editions of 1762–71 and 1782), while none of them provides a fuller bibliography for the identification of the source.

143. Walpole 1879, 131–2; Dodsley and Dodsley 1761, v, 50; Chancellor 1908, 51.

144. An entry in the household accounts of the 10th earl of Northumberland records: ‘Building & Reparacons at Syon: viz.t … Gilding a greate picture frame xxx s Money paid to Moses Glover the painter in part for work done & to be done at Syon xv li; see Alnwick Castle, Sy:U.I.5 (‘The Accounts Thomas Cartwright for reparations at Syon and his Lordship’s house in Queen Street for the year ending 12 January 1640–1641’), mentioned in Wood 1994, 309 and App IV, 16.
Henry VIII granted him the Benedictine abbey of Walden, on which site a Tudor house was built. After Suffolk's execution in 1572, his brother, Henry Howard, lived there and supervised the education of his nephews, Philip, later earl of Arundel, and Thomas, who was to become the 1st earl of Suffolk and Howard's closest relative.

Audley End was probably rebuilt in its Jacobean form in two stages after c 1605, and its palatial transformation was achieved by no later than 1616. The house was then composed of a principal courtyard pile with wings projecting eastward, preceded by an enclosed outer court of considerable size. The earliest plan of the house in John Thorpe’s hand (fig 2c) varies significantly from Henry Winstanley’s survey of the exterior executed in the 1670s (fig 2a), at which time it seems to have been substantially as the 1st earl of Suffolk left it. By comparing these two sources, Drury concludes that Thorpe’s drawing as a whole seemed to be a proposal for adding an outer court to an existing house, represented by the inner court and its subsidiary wings – hence his suggestion that the Jacobean Audley End was built, or at least conceived, in two stages, with the contrasting styles between the two courts pointing to the employment of different designers.

In addition to John Thorpe, associated with the design of the outer court, and Bernard Janssen, claimed by Vertue to be the surveyor of the two Northampton-related houses, the name of Henry Howard was also suggested in connection with Audley End by a source of 1650. There is at least one source, though not a contemporary one, which equally pointed to the earl of Northampton’s involvement in his London house. In these circumstances the similarities between the two houses appear hardly coincidental. The south range at Northampton House was dominated by a large hall, which carried above it, as at Audley End, a leaded terrace flanked on the courtyard side by a loggia with a gallery above it. The entrance from the Strand was in the same position relative to the hall as the entrance from the park at Audley End, and along the east and west ranges, as also in the street front, were canted bay windows reflecting analogous features in the country seat. Nor can it be accidental, we should add, that the top of Northampton House, as we now know for certain, was characterized by a balustrade with pierced letters, a feature repeated at Audley End (fig 2b) and likely to reflect Howard’s aristocratic pride. With the addition of the outer court in around 1608, Audley End reached the ‘nearest approach to a royal palace to be built in the first half of the seventeenth century’, representing the Jacobean stage of development along the line of the courtyard plan. This achievement seems to be perfectly consistent with Henry Howard’s attempt at grandeur, so clearly manifested in his London residence which, in both scale and treatment, was more like a country house.

145. See Drury 1980, 3.
146. The source, Anderson and Heylin (1650, 66), claimed that Henry Howard ‘assisted his Nephew the Earl of Suffolk by his designing and large contribution, to that excellent Fabrick Awdley-End’.
147. The guidebook produced in connection with the opening of the house to the public for the Great Exhibition of 1851 (Northumberland House: its Saloons and Picture Gallery) reported thus: ‘Its architects were several; Jansen being the principal, assisted by Gerard Christmas and the Earl of Northampton, a distinguished amateur’. Chancellor (1908, 51) later recalled this by saying that the architect of Northampton House was ‘a little uncertain, some supposing the Earl himself to have designed the house’.
149. As shown in Winstanley 1688, pl 25, the inscription on the north elevation of the south range of the outer court at Audley End (fig 2b) recites thus: ‘Prudent est in concilio fortunam semper habere’. This motto, the origin of which I have not been able to trace, would nonetheless describe well the attitude and policy of Henry Howard. I am grateful to Jonathan Harrison for his advice.
Against this background, it is now possible to re-evaluate Northampton’s role at both houses, and to re-affirm their postulated attribution to a Northampton/Janssen partnership and to John Thorpe respectively: as far as a division is possible, the first may have provided or selected the ideas for a design, while Thorpe could be associated with some of its features. Janssen probably acted as the surveyor of the fabric, while in the case of Gerard Christmas we can only rely on Vertue’s conclusion. As often with the scarcity of primary sources, it is nonetheless important to emphasize that much of the gathered evidence is largely circumstantial. Our knowledge of Janssen and Christmas is still very limited, while Thorpe’s alterations, though they would seem to suggest some involvement at the house, do not always make sense and it is doubtful whether they were ever carried out. In fact, to relate the interiors of Northampton House to its inventory of 1614, we have to assume that some of them were not executed. Instead, my reconstructed plans rely on some of the information recorded by Smythson.

The inventory of Northampton House, taken on the death of Henry Howard on 15 June 1614, provides a unique insight into the building, as well as further elements for its evaluation. According to Evelyn Shirley, who made a transcript of the original manuscript (published in 1869), it was discovered amongst miscellaneous papers belonging to the Baroness North at Wroxton Abbey in Oxfordshire. It is described as a thin folio of twenty-five leaves ‘in somewhat dilapidated condition … evidently coeval with the period [1614], if it is not the original Inventory itself’. The current location of this document has not been identified, so that our understanding of it must rely on Shirley’s transcript.

The inventory covers both the residences in London and in Greenwich and is arranged by room. In the case of Greenwich Lodge, the rooms of the first building are arranged by floor, from top to bottom, while in London the itinerary is more difficult to grasp. At Northampton House there appears to be a double version of each of the rooms of state: Little and Long Gallery, Great and Bigger Great Chamber, Withdrawing and Great Withdrawing Chamber, and so forth. Remembering that this house had its piano

151. Cowie 1977, 117, in an article which only recently came to my attention, states that Henry Howard, in addition to Northampton House, ‘was the creator also of Audley End in Essex and employed the same master-mason, Bernard Jansen, for both houses’. The official guidebook of Audley End by the Department of the Environment published in 1974 thus reported (on p 7): ‘The design of the house is important in the development of English architecture, for Audley End was one of the first great buildings in England to display the Anglo-Flemish style which marks the first years of the 17th century. It was the work of Bernard Johnson [sic], who also designed Northampton House in the Strand for Henry Howard … The older man [Henry Howard] was a considerable scholar and may be regarded as a patron of architecture, and at Audley End we may well see an example of his influence both in the overall design of his nephew’s house and in the choice of Johnson as architect.’ Despite the absence of documentary sources, our analysis supports this theory.

152. While the relationship between the two Northampton-related houses is undeniable, the figures associated with them both rely on secondary and not entirely reliable sources – that is, Vertue and Stoakes.


154. The bulk of the North Family Papers were included in the 1932 purchase by the Pilgrim Trust and are now preserved at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, together with an unpublished catalogue, which does not list such an inventory. Although the introduction to the ‘Calendar of North Family Papers from Wroxton Abbey’ (Borough 1960, 7) suggests that the North papers ‘do not appear to have been broken up’, some items have been removed to other institutions. Howard’s inventory may have been one of those. I am grateful to Creg Colley in the Department of Special Collections and Western Manuscripts at the Bodleian Library for his help with this.
nobile on the second floor, it is reasonable to conclude that here would be located the more elaborate version of the state apartments, while the simpler and more private one would feature in the middle floor, that is ‘the one pair of stairs floor’.  

A list of all rooms with a summary of their contents is provided in the Appendix, where they have been entered as they appear in the transcript of 1869, and accordingly numbered from 1 to 19. The itinerary of the appraiser can thus be followed in my reconstructed plans of the house (figs 19–22), where, together with my identification of each room, I have indicated that provided by John Smythson as (S) and that by John Thorpe as (T). When inconsistencies occur, both identifications are indicated. Assuming that room 1 was the first to be appraised and that each room would lead into the next, and remembering that the simpler version of rooms featured on the middle floor, the inventory may have started at this level (fig 21) with the Great Chamber (1) in the south-west corner of the house, adjoined by the Dining and Withdrawing Chambers (2, 3), northwards to the more private set of Northampton’s rooms (4–7) on the opposite side of the east wing. From the Pallet Chamber (7), the appraiser would then go back to the Little Gallery (8) on the courtyard side of the south wing, and climb up to the Long Gallery (9) on the top floor (fig 22) by way of the stair in the south-west turret. Moving eastward to the great staircase, he would cross the Great Withdrawing Chamber (10), the Bigger Great Chamber (11) and, apparently, a Parlour (12), though it is hard to believe that such a room would be located on the top floor, unless it was the grander version of two, like a Great Parlour. The appraiser would also find a Long Wardrobe (13), which oddly would feature before the great staircase, and the Higher Library (14), in the south-east corner of the house. He would then descend to the Lower Wardrobe (15) in the room immediately below (fig 21), and to the Lower Library (16) in the corresponding space of the ground floor (fig 20). From here the appraiser would further descend to the basement (fig 19) where the Kitchen (17) is recorded, and eventually record sixteen chambers of household members, entered all together under no. 18, to be found on the basement, ground and middle floors (figs 19–21). The last room on the list was a Wardrobe of clothes (19), which may have occupied a little chamber on the Strand front.

In general, the sequence of rooms as listed in the inventory finds its way in the reconstructed plans, where my conjectures mainly relate to the middle floor, for which we do not have contemporary evidence. Our identification also appears to be consistent with most of the information in Thorpe’s plans (figs 12 and 13), with the exception of the Dining Chamber on the top floor, rather than on the middle one, followed by a Great Chamber, presumably its bigger version, in lieu of the Parlour. Thorpe placed this last room where we would expect it to be, adjacent to the Hall on the ground floor. The presence of a Parlour on the top floor, and the peculiar location of the Long Wardrobe, question the reliability of the transcript of 1869, for it is possible that some of the twenty-five leaves of the original document had got mixed. It should also be noticed that neither the Hall nor a proper Chapel is listed in the inventory, while none of the two libraries

155. Referred to as such in the first available survey of the entire house, produced in c 1750 (see Guerci 2007, ii, 283–4, cat no. xxxiii).  
156. In this case it may have been part of the sequence of rooms of the piano nobile, considering that it was not uncommon for large houses to have two parlours (see Cooper 2006, 13).  
157. A wardrobe would normally be placed on the top floor, though its apparent location between the Parlour and the Great Staircase would seem peculiar. That this room was located on this floor is confirmed by both the Percy accounts and the inventory of 1670, discussed in Guerci 2007, i, pt 2, 137–61.
apparently contained books, looking, instead, like bed chambers of state. This, however, finds an explanation in the fact that Northampton House, being the house of a bachelor, had a single bed chamber proper, while other important rooms, such as the library, could be set up as guest bedrooms. At the same time, the fact that the inventory does not list books should not necessarily imply their absence, as was clearly not the case with Henry Howard. The various inventories of Salisbury House, for instance, do not itemize books, while that of Bess at Hardwick Hall only listed four. In effect, inventories of great households would not normally list books since their financial value was comparatively negligible; on the contrary, they would regularly be valued as part of the process of probate of the lesser gentry and clergy. As for the Hall of Northampton House, its absence from the inventory could either be due to its undergoing alterations, and thus being empty, or to the lack of items of particular value, considering that such rooms, once paintings and hangings were removed, would be furnished merely with wainscot and plain tables. The apparent lack of a proper chapel is more surprising in Northampton’s case, though there were enough religious paintings in his private rooms to compensate for this.

The inventory, however problematic it may be, depicts a remarkably elaborate arrangement where the top floor of the house was almost exclusively devoted to public rooms. The same set of rooms was then repeated in the middle floor for a more private and personal use. On both floors, almost every room was richly furnished with contemporary European and Asian luxury objects, including Turkish carpets and wares from China, while the walls were covered with Brussels tapestries, which mainly depicted biblical themes. Northampton’s bedroom contained a lavishly decorated bed of state and was hung with four of Cardinal Wolsey’s tapestries, originally part of an outstanding collection of 600 pieces acquired and commissioned by Wolsey for York House and Hampton Court from 1515. A large part of these hangings had been manufactured in the Netherlands and were on a religious, judicious or moral theme, which no doubt attracted Northampton. The earl owned maps of Rome, Amsterdam and Antwerp, John Speed’s large map of England, Scotland and Ireland, and a pair of Molineaux globes of the world, one celestial, the other terrestrial. He also had a rich wardrobe of clothes, including a ‘gowne of russet velvet … buttoned and laced with russet silk & silver’, another ‘gowne of black velvet in slippes and flowers’, and fancy waistcoats embroidered with silver thread and spangles, normally worn by women. Northampton’s gowns were

158. I am grateful to Linda Levy Peck for a discussion on this matter.
159. The books of Robert Cecil were listed in the library catalogue of 1615, compiled by Captain Thomas Brett of All Souls College, Oxford. Consistently, the 1670 inventory of the then Northumberland House (see Guerci 2007, 212–25, app xvii) does not list books, apart from a ‘Chest of Bookes’ valued at £20. At the time, the library seems to have been moved to Petworth House, where the 10th earl of Northumberland had retired. Two libraries with shelves are listed there in 1670, while non-specified books were appraised all together at £600.
160. I am grateful to Robin Harcourt Williams and Mark Nichols for their advice. See Dils 2006.
161. The Hall was also the room where the lower servants would generally take their daily meals, so while it had to do justice to its owner, it was generally less decorated than the grandest rooms. See Cooper 2006, 12–13.
164. Ribeiro 2005, 75. It may be wondered whether a woman’s waistcoat in Northampton’s wardrobe had anything to do with his rumoured homosexual orientation (see Peck 1982, 214 and no. 3, and Andersson 2006, 19 and no. 15).
‘signifiers of status and aristocratic idleness’, a distinction of which Shakespeare was aware in *Twelfth Night* (II. v. 45–6) when Malvolio fantasizes about his dress if he were to be married to Olivia.165

There were seventy-seven paintings at Northampton House, principally portraits of family members and courtiers hung in the two galleries, though there were also several royal portraits, with a telling predominance of five of the Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots, against one of Elizabeth. Howard’s religious outlook also determined the choice of the non-familial or political pictures, which concentrated on a number of sacred subjects, mainly related to the Virgin and the Passion of Christ. These included ‘five waxe imported pictures of the five sences, being Italian worke under glasses’,166 while at Greenwich he kept ‘14 Venetian pictures of one bignes’, five pictures of familial and religious subjects, and ‘a picture at large of Prince Henry on horsebacke in armes’,167 which Peck associated, rightly in my view, with Robert Peake’s portrait of the Prince armed, mounted on horseback and leading Opportunity by the forelock.168 After Northampton’s death, the Countess of Suffolk bought the household stuff from his trustees, ‘the like whereof then could not elsewhere be gotten’.169

Unfortunately, we only have scant information on Northampton’s collection of books and manuscripts, though it is clear from the surviving fragments that it must have been of considerable quality. The entire library was acquired by the earl of Arundel in 1615 for £529, which may account for a separate appraisal and its consequent absence in the general inventory. In 1667 it was donated to the Royal Society by the 6th duke of Norfolk of the Arundel line.170 By then, what is known as the ‘Bibliotheca Norfolciana’ featured numerous books on art and architecture, including most of the work of such Renaissance authors as Alberti, Serlio, Vignola and Palladio, as well as a manuscript of Vitruvius and three editions with commentaries.171 The provenance of most of these books was nonetheless Arundel, though the successive dispersal of the ‘non-scientific’ body of the Bibliotheca Norfolciana, sold by the Royal Society at different stages from 1830, makes it impossible to know with certitude whether or not Henry Howard owned books on the visual arts.172 Linda Peck has since traced part of his library which included continental books, but none of the titles is relevant to our study of architectural history.173

165. Ribeiro 2005, 47.
166. Shirley 1869, 357.
171. See Perry 1681; *Arundel Manuscripts* 1834.
172. I am grateful to Joanna Corden, archivist at the Royal Society, to David Paisey, who has established which of the Arundel books still at the Royal Society originally belonged to Pirc-kheimer, and to Katherine Spears, of Richard Quaritch, London, for advice. Quaritch took over the sale on behalf of the Royal Society.
173. Peck 2005, 149–52, and 1998. David Paisey has recently discovered that the College of Arms in London, known to have received some heraldic and genealogical manuscripts from the Arundel Library, also has about 40 printed books on related subjects from the same source, received at the same time as the manuscripts in 1678. Three amongst these books are recorded in an old MS catalogue of the books in the College of Arms as having belonged to Northampton: *Catalogue of the Books in the Heralds’ Office*, FT2, sequence HDN, nos 68, 84 and 85. I am grateful to David Paisey for this information.
This article has illustrated the building history of what was arguably the most important Strand palace after Somerset House.\textsuperscript{174} Among the questions it raised, those related to typology and style are of great relevance to our understanding of Lord Henry Howard and of the period more generally.

Whether a model for the town house of the ruling elite actually existed independently from that of the country house, it is difficult to say. Clearly adapted to a limited site, the first plans of Salisbury House, a contemporary of Northampton House, may offer some clues for, as Summerson argued, they originated from the multiplication of a ‘unit house’, a flourishing urban type since early Tudor times.\textsuperscript{175} However, that of Northampton House (the courtyard of which could contain the whole of the original Salisbury House) was an altogether different case, for it reflected both the size and the arrangement of a country house, as did other Strand palaces, such as Somerset House and Burghley House. Apart from the latter, which, together with Bedford House, lay on the north side of the Strand, these houses had large gardens serving as the main approach from the river, whence they were accessed through elaborate water gates.

While it is undeniable that some of the Strand palaces clearly echoed their rural equivalents, it does not necessarily follow that a country-house typology existed independently from urban models. In effect, especially at the highest level of the ruling elite, such a distinction can hardly be made. Stylistically, they were deeply intermingled, while typologically the only differences would seem to have been determined by the availability of space.

The Strand palaces, and their counterparts in the country, were the product of a culture of conspicuous consumption that reached its height during the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods. They were created in a competitive way and often as an alternative to Whitehall, thereby providing a new political elite with authority at a time of great social mobility. As a consequence, ‘private palaces of monarchical intents’\textsuperscript{176} flourished as never before, by contrast with major royal building, which had virtually stopped after Henry VIII. It is no wonder that Northampton House nearly became a Crown property in the early 1620s, after it had passed to Thomas Howard, Northampton’s impeached nephew (the English Fouquet), who would also lose Audley End. But the case of Henry Howard is more complex. Being a bachelor in the last stage of his life, he had no direct family to care for, nor is there any evidence of his house ever being visited by the king or used as a political centre. Neither would he need authority in the same way that someone like Robert Cecil did. Instead, the reason for such grandeur would seem to refer to the way he wished himself to be distinguished from others, rooted in an older vision of aristocracy, hence the parallel between his London house and some fairly unusual country houses such as Hardwick Hall. This must also be the key to our understanding of the ‘traditional’ style of Northumberland House as a deliberate, controlled and self-conscious attempt at stressing continuity with a very exclusive native past, where any foreign influence was limited to decorative elements, duly applied to a scheme of medieval origin.\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{174} On this house, see Thurley 2009.
\textsuperscript{175} Summerson 1970, 97–102. See also Guerci 2009, 40–7.
\textsuperscript{176} Thus named in Bold 1989, 74.
\textsuperscript{177} This may have been due to a general understanding in contemporary patronage of the difference between ‘solid’ architecture – that is, traditional – and frivolous, or new – that is, classical, hence the practice of limiting the latter style to ornaments. I am grateful to Maurice Howard for a discussion on this matter.
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APPENDIX

Northampton House: sequence of rooms with their contents as listed in the first inventory of 1614 (the list of contents is summarized and names are spelled in modern English)

1 Great Chamber

4 pieces of green tapestry; 10 green velvet stools; 1 back chair; 1 green velvet chair; 1 long cushion; 1 foot carpet [floor carpet]; 1 cupboard; 1 Turkish carpet; a great pair of Nuremberg andirons [ornamental iron or brasses on either side of the hearth].

2 Dining Chamber

5 pieces of tapestry with busk of hunting work; 1 long Turkish carpet with the arms of the earl of Northampton; 1 high chair; 1 low chair; a long and a short cushion; 8 high stools; 1 low stool; 1 long table and 1 cupboard of walnut tree; 1 Turkish carpet [table or cupboard cloth]; 1 Turkish foot carpet; two small creepers [small low irons used for the support of the blocks of wood between the andirons: see above].

3 Withdrawing Chamber

4 pieces of hangings of the story of Sawle and David; 1 high chair with a long cushion; 2 scrolled chairs; 8 high stools; 1 large Turkish foot carpet; 1 walnut-tree cupboard with a Turkish cloth.

4 Study Chamber

3 pieces of hangings, two of which of the former story of Sawle and David, the third of men in arms; 1 large chair; 3 high stools; 2 low stools; 1 China gilt cabinet; 1 Danish inlaid cabinet; 2 long window curtains; 1 Turkish carpet; 2 andirons.

5 Little Study

1 table of wainscot

6 Bed Chamber

4 pieces of Brussels hangings garnished with the arms of Cardinal Wolsey; 1 field bedstead of China work with the arms of the earl of Northampton on the head piece; 1 high chair; 1 low chair; 1 long cushion; 5 high stools; 3 low stools; 2 Turkish foot carpets; 2 small tables with 2 Turkish carpets; 1 ebony cabinet inlaid with bone; 1 cabinet of crimson velvet inlaid with silver and golden lace; 1 desk with a cabinet therein; 3 pictures, one the Passion, the other of James I, and the third of Mary of Scots, all with taffeta curtains; 1 silk screen; 2 window curtains; 1 walnut-tree cupboard; 1 fire shovel, tongs, and creepers.

7 Pallet Chamber

1 wainscot standing table; 4 Turkish cushions; 1 feather bed.

8 Little Gallery

7 pieces of leather hangings; 1 wainscot table; 1 old Turkish carpet; 8 curtians of Bruges satin red and yellow; 33 pictures, including 28 secular portraits with one at length of James I, one of Mary Queen of Scots and one of the French king, and 5 wax imported pictures of the five senses, being 'Italian work under glasses'.

9 Long Gallery

7 large and deep pieces of tapestries of the story of Christ; 1 large China table; 1 large pair of Nuremberg andirons; 1 pair of Molineaux globes; 1 wainscot table with a Turkish
carpet; 20 pictures, including 6 of religious subjects; 6 secular portraits with one of Queen Mary, and 8 pictures of the Sibels.

10 Great Withdrawing Chamber

1 large pair of Nuremberg andirons.

11 Bigger Great Chamber

1 chimney piece of wainscot, not set up.

12 Parlour

1 large piece of tapestry of the story of Joseph; 1 high chair, 2 low stools; 2 small Turkish carpets 'whereof one is upon the ground'; 1 wainscot drawing table; 1 table covered with leather, 'belonging to a couch in the wardrobe'; 2 deep curtains; 1 fire shovel; 1 pair of tongs; 1 pair of creepers.

13 Long Wardrobe

Various pieces of tapestry, including one of Brussels work with Wolsey's arms, and other kinds of hangings totalling 63 samples; 2 large Persian carpets; 4 short carpets; 2 small Turkish carpets; 6 chairs of various kinds and size; 1 high stool; 1 low stool; 1 footstool; 1 highly decorated bed; 1 new long cushion; 1 old field bed; 3 other richly manufactured cushions; 1 couch of crimson leather 'printed border wise with silver and gold' with 3 cushions 'suitable to the same'; 2 canvas wool beds; 1 sumpter clothe with Northampton's arms; 1 fustian bolster; 2 down beds; 3 livery beds and bolsters; 1 large feather bed; 1 old bolster; various pillows and blankets; 16 paintings: 7 religious pictures, 8 secular portraits, including one of Mary of Scots at large and one of Lord Burghley, and 1 picture of 'divers praiers'; 1 map of Rome; 1 map of Antwerp and another of Amsterdam; 2 tables, one of China work; 1 couch; 2 curtains.

14 Higher Library

1 Tester [bed] with seven curtains of China taffeta; 1 field bed of velvet with tester, five curtains, two velvet carpets suitable for a square table and a cupboard, furniture for a large chair, two high stools and two low stools; 'flowers slippes and borders of an imbredered clocke with silver cutt for the into pieces to imbroder some furniture for the howe withall'; 10 yards of deep gold fringe; 42 yards of black satin; 1 black velvet foot clothe; 1 watch and Alarum of copper and gilt in a case; 1 embroidered cabinet; 1 inlaid ebony cabinet; 1 velvet cabinet; 1 little cabinet of needle work; 1 long cushion with Northampton's arms 'given by my old ladie of Arundell [Anne, wife of Philip Howard, earl of Arundel]; 2 more long cushions; 5 embroidered waistcoats; numerous sweet bags [bags filled with potpourri to sweeten the air] and various other bags of precious media.
15 Lower Wardrobe

1 bunch of a chained lace in Esses of black silk and silver of 100 yards; 15 ounces of silver lace; another bunch of broad lace of silk of 50 yards; 1 new robe of St Georges; 1 old crimson robe; 1 mantel; 1 embroidered carpet; 6 night caps; 13 1/2 yards of gold velvet China with flowers de luces and diamond work; 1 canopy; 7 bags; various other yards of velvet; 1 velvet square carpet; 3 China quilts; 1 scarlet clocke [cloak?]; 1 long cushion; 1 carpet and cupboard cloth of velvet ‘belonginge to the bed where my Lord died’; 1 skirt of a gown of silver cloth ‘in which my ladie of Hertford was married’; 1 China carpet; various other cloths; 2 curtains; 2 pillows; 1 table of oriental inlaid stone; 3 paintings: 1 picture of Louis XIII at large, 2 pictures at large of the French Queen and of an Italian; 1 pair of great old andirons; 1 pair of new andirons; 2 fire shovels; 2 pairs of tongs; 1 empty cabinet; 2 little tables.

16 Lower Library

3 great velvet chairs; 3 velvet stools; 1 bedstead; 1 large frame for a chair; 4 high stools; 4 low stools; 1 footstool; 1 table; 2 court cupboards; frames of a high chair; 2 scrowle chairs; 1 very large bedstead with ‘wreathed pillars ballasters for head side and feet’.

17 Kitchen

‘3ooli quart. Di. wth weight of pewter vessel’; 1 great brass pan; 2 lesser brass pans, 2 skillets; a frying pan; 2 brooches; 2 dripping pans; 2 spits; 6 pairs of racks; a scammer [skimmer?]; 1 old brass pot.

18 Gentlemen’s Chambers

16 chambers of household members: 12 of those addressed as Mr; 4 of lesser staff (William Fox, the footmen, the Gardener and Sam: Fishe).

Mr Ashburnham’s chamber: 1 half-headed bedstead; 1 livery featherbed; bed accessories and 1 small table
Mr Edward Gent’s chamber: 1 half-headed livery bedstead; 1 featherbed; bed accessories and 1 small table; 1 stool
Mr Andrew Jud and Mr [Thomas] Jermynes’s chamber [the latter also present at Greenwich]: ‘the like as in the rest, with one stool and wantinge a bed stead’
Mr Robert Cole’s chamber [Northampton’s executor]: 1 livery bedstead; 2 featherbeds; bed accessories; 1 table; 1 stool
Mr Robert Lewes’s chamber: 1 livery bedstead; 1 featherbed; bed accessories; 1 table; 2 stools
William Fox’s chamber: 1 livery bedstead; 1 featherbed; bed accessories
Footmen’s chamber: ‘as in William Fox his chamber’
Mr John Griffith’s chamber [Northampton’s secretary and executor]: 2 featherbeds; 2 bolsters
Mr Giles Savage’s chamber: 1 livery bedstead; 1 featherbed; bed accessories; 1 table; 1 stool
Mr John Heydon’s chamber [also present at Greenwich]: 1 featherbed; bed accessories; 1 table; 1 stool
Mr William Hodder’s chamber: 1 livery bedstead; 1 featherbed; bed accessories; 1 table; 2 stools
Mr Willowes’s chamber [also present at Greenwich]: 1 bedstead; 1 featherbed; bed accessories; 1 table; 1 stool
Mr Christopher Harrys’s chamber [also present at Greenwich]: 1 livery bedstead; 1 featherbed; bed accessories; 1 table
Gardener’s chamber: 1 bed; bed accessories
Samuel Fishe’s chamber: 1 bed; bed accessories
Mr John Jaggard’s chamber [custodian of linens, also present at Greenwich]: 2 beds; 1 featherbed; bed accessories

19 Wardrobe

2 gowns; 15 cloths of various media; 1 jerkin; 7 doublets; 13 pairs of breeches; 12 table cloths; 6 cupboard cloths; 11 towels; 10 linens; 14½ dozen of napkins; 76 pairs of sheets; 16 bands; 14 shirts; 10 pairs of pillow cases; 2 further cloths ‘for a covering basquett’.

Household members

In his will, Northampton apologizes to his ‘loving friends’ for not showing them his affection through legacies, considering that his ‘debtes are greate’, while his ‘servaunts [are too] many to be remembered’. Those servants included some twenty-three gentlemen, thirteen of whom resided permanently at Northampton House with lodgings at Greenwich too. Northampton’s ‘meniall’ servants remembered in his will or mentioned in the inventory counted a tailor, cooks, a kitchen boy and a gardener.
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Cet article offre une analyse complète de la construction de l'Hôtel de Northampton (par la suite Hôtel de Salisbury) situé dans le Strand (et démolie en 1874), qui n'a jamais fait l'objet d'une enquête approfondie. Il commence par un examen du patrimoine architectural très peu connu de son bâtisseur, lord Henry Howard, premier comte de Northampton à partir de 1603, et l'un des personnages les plus intéressants du début de l'ère Stuart. Faisant référence à la construction de l'Hôtel de Salisbury, qui est contemporaine, et qui est le seul autre palais dans le Strand construit au début du dix-septième siècle par Sir Robert Cecil, premier comte de Salisbury, les indices visuels et textuels sont étudiés de près. Un dessin de l'élevation de la façade d'origine de l'Hôtel de Northampton est analysé pour la première fois. En l'associant à d'autres sources, comme le premier inventaire du palais transcrit dans l'annexe, l'intérieur et l'extérieur de l'Hôtel de Northampton, telle qu'il a été laissé par Henry Howard en 1614, sont reconfigurés pour la première fois.
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