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"...and Hector drew back to the company of his own companions/ and
sprang to his chariot, but handed over the beautiful armor/ to the Trojans, to
take back to the city and be his great glory."

Homer, *The Iliad*
Introduction

Few relics of Western culture have acquired the symbolic significance of a suit of armor, conjuring notions of chivalry and nobility. With its massive, sculpted forms armor calls to modern minds an era which hovers precariously between historical reality and mythologizing legend. The evolving lore of the fully-armored knight is one that has been consciously crafted throughout the centuries, further blurring the line between fact and fiction. The noble knight was meant to be seen not merely as a figure of authority but as a symbol of righteousness. The romantic idea of the "white knight," for example, distinguished by the color of his armor, is understood as synonym for moral courage. Above all the armored legends which have evolved stands King Arthur, the paradigmatic example of an historical figure enveloped in an heroicizing veil of folklore. At once knight and king, he embodies the essence of noble rulership.

The majesterial conception of King Arthur provides an apt preamble for this study of the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I (r.1493-1519) and the English King Henry VIII (r.1509-1547).¹ For these two warrior-kings of the

¹Throughout the text Maximilian I will be referred to as Maximilian and Henry VIII will be referred to as Henry except in instances where this may cause ambiguity.
Renaissance, King Arthur served as a touchstone of righteous, martial behavior: the fount of chivalry. Arthur's glories were those of piety and warfare. The questionable extent to which his epic feats actually transpired are fittingly paralleled by the aggrandizing accounts which Maximilian and Henry sought to leave behind for posterity through pageantry, images, and literature. The idea of the king as an armored hero leading a knightly court to triumph served as one of the dominant themes of the period of their common rule: 1509-1519. Armor, which played an integral role in fashioning this kingly image, will be the focal point of this study, linking the aspirations and accomplishments of the two sovereigns. Both as individuals and as comrades-in-arms, Maximilian and Henry utilized armor to reflect their status and place in a long continuum of military monarchs, both real and imagined.

Maximilian and Henry envisioned themselves, perhaps rightly, as sovereigns bridging the divide between medieval feudal kingship, governed by knightly classes, and the modern Renaissance state, influenced by increasingly diverse factions. At the center of this gradually shifting world was the royal court. Comprised of ambassadors and nobles, the court provided the sovereigns with an international audience. It was a forum through which they could express their prestige and role as leader of the nation (or empire in Maximilian's case).² The spectacles of both Maximilian and Henry's courts

²Maximilian's empire comprised primarily of Austria, Germany, the Low Countries, and Hungary. With the Emperor's decreasing influence in Italy, attention was increasingly directed towards Germany and Austria. In speaking of these two countries, however, it should be understood that
provided a mirror of the Kings’ bellicose ambitions. Warfare had been the
nobility’s primary means of obtaining knightly virtue since as early as the twelfth
century.⁵ Indeed, feats of arms were themselves held to be essential to the
definition of nobility. "The profession of arms," pronounced one sixteenth
century epic, was "in itself noble."⁴

The parallels between Maximilian and Henry are numerous and often not
uncoincidental. The older Maximilian exercised a profound influence over the
young English Monarch who looked restlessly to the courts of Europe for royal
inspiration. Both were men of action and tireless in self-promotion whose
policies and propaganda were often focused towards the battlefield. It was in
full armor that they most hoped to be remembered. Maximilian brandished
himself as "Der Letzter Ritter" (The Last Knight) while Henry was heralded as
"the ayre to Ector in armes and honour."⁵

Sovereigns dictated the national agenda and, correspondingly, their
behavior set the tone for courtiers as well as commoners. The warrior images
forged by Maximilian and Henry had an impact which extended well beyond the
boundaries of their realms. Their prolonged military campaigns, chivalric

---

they were not nations in the modern sense (as France and Britain were at this time). For the history
of the development of the German state, see Michael Hughes, Early Modern Germany

⁵For the evolution of the knight see Aldo Scaglione, Knights at Court (Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1991).


pageantry, and belligerent politics formed the groundwork for future allegiances, enmities, marriages, and patronage, which would tremendously influence the course of European history. The greatest artists, armorers (though the two, it shall be seen, are far from mutually exclusive), writers, architects, and more, were put in the service of the king to create a royal persona larger than life and, above all, shining in fine armor.

The second decade of the sixteenth century represents a period of transition for both the history of kingship and armor. This paper aims to look at the socio-political roles of the two sovereigns as they are manifest in their employment of armor. Its function as a political tool, martial vestment, and religious icon mark it as one of the most enduring symbols of the age. During the reigns of Maximilian and Henry, the art of the armorer arguably reached its apogee while simultaneously beginning its decline. Through studying the policies and patronage of Maximilian and Henry, the history of armor emerges with a greater clarity and - as this paper undertakes to show - the study of armor will, in turn, illuminate the relationship and goals of the two leaders.
I. The Politics of an Imperial Gift-Armor

In 1514, Maximilian presented the young King Henry with a splendid gift of armor. On the basis of correspondence between Maximilian and his court armorer at Innsbruck, Konrad Seusenhofer, it can be deduced that the armor was decorated with gold and pierced silver work and surmounted by a fantastical closed helmet with ram's horns fashioned in metal.\textsuperscript{1} The correspondence concerning the armor's commission detail the expense and labor involved in crafting the costly, ornate suit. Work on the gift-armor seems to have began around 1511, but a chronic lack of funds, coupled by the need for a diverse number of craftsmen required for its manufacture, delayed its completion well beyond the date anticipated by the Emperor.

Only the helmet remains (figure 1). Its strangeness is at once fascinating and repelling; as a symbol of royal camaraderie it seems, however, to make a

\textsuperscript{1}The question of which armor may have been presented to Henry by the Emperor and what it may have looked like has been well documented by Claude Blair in "The Emperor Maximilian's Gift of Armour to King Henry VIII and the Silvered and Engraved Armour at the Tower of London", \textit{Archeologia}, vol. XCIX, (1965): 1-53. It is not my intention to reiterate the stylistic considerations or questions of attribution. Blair's observations are used as the basis for my examination of the cultural significance of the gift. Dissenting opinions on the Blair attributions can be found in Alan Borg, "The Ram's Horn Helmet", \textit{Journal of the Arms and Armour Society}, vol. VIII, no.2, (1974): 138-85, and Ortwin Gamber, "A Funeral Effigy, Grotesque Helmets and the Seusenhofer Workshop", \textit{Apollo}, vol. CXXVII, No.312 (New Series), (1988): 105-7. I have attempted to incorporate various viewpoints on iconological meaning where relevant but will, otherwise, limit issues of "authenticity" to the footnotes.
mockery of the divine rulership of the king who wears it. Certainly, whatever its intentions were - and many hypotheses have been forwarded, from the portrayal of a fool to a portrait of Maximilian (figures 2 and 3)² - it stands as a testament both to the skill and ingenuity of the armorer and to the importance allotted to his product. Despite its confounding nature, the helmet gives insights into the concerns and values of a court culture emerging slowly from the Middle Ages into the Renaissance and allows us to view how these sovereigns imaged themselves within this changing world. As art and artifact, the gift-armor exemplifies perhaps more than any other object, the symbolic and real role which Maximilian and Henry sought to uphold as sovereigns during their decade of common rule: 1509-1519. The role of armor as a royal gift and the larger significance of its presentation for these "warrior-kings" shall be the focus of this chapter.

The helmet, which appears in a 1547 inventory as "A hedde pece with A Rammes horne siluer parcell guilte,"³ was part of a harness probably similar in appearance to that presented by Maximilian to his grandson, the Archduke Charles (later Emperor Charles V) in 1513 (figure 4). Both armors were commissioned at the same time (ca. 1511) and seem to have followed similar

³Blair and Robinson have suggested the possibility of a caricature; Blair, (1965): 17. Borg offers a slightly less flattering comparison to a portrait of Maximilian's jester. It is, in either case, not possible to determine whether Henry would have made the connection (he certainly would not have been aware of a reference to Maximilian's jester) but the protruding lower lip and large curvilinear nose may have provided suggestive Hapsburg traits.

³The Honorable Harold Dillon, "Arms and Armour at Westminster, the Tower, and Greenwich, 1547", *Archeologia*, vol. LI, pl.1, (1888): 248. (Hereinafter cited as Dillon, "Westminster").
procedures in their construction and decoration. Unfortunately, Charles' helmet now lacks the visor, but the rest of the armor provides a good idea, if not a direct copy, of the workmanship which went into the production of Henry's suit. The distinctive shape of both helmets, for example, reinforces the probable formalistic connections between the two harnesses. Charles' armor reproduces in steel the civilian court fashion of the day, typified by the simulated cloth skirt (base) and the puffed and slashed sleeves and thighs. Assuming Henry's gift was compatible in appearance (see footnote 1), its function, like Charles', would be less military than decorative, with its delicate steel base, ornamented visor, and detailed pierced metalwork distinguishing it from combat or tournament armors of the period. The gift and the gift's purpose must thus be viewed in the light of its decorative significance rather than its functional utility. For what occasions would Henry utilize what was surely seen as, first and foremost, a work of art? Henry's visor, with its stubbled beard, leering eyes, prominent teeth, and hooked nose with dripping mucous, calls upon the long tradition of apotropaic grotesque imagery. The ram's horns further emphasize this canon of grotesque iconography which seeks perhaps to ward off the very

\[ ^4 \text{Blair, (1965): 14-15.} \]

\[ ^5 \text{The spectacles have been the subject of much speculation as no reference is made to them until the 1660 inventory which has led some scholars to argue them as being a later addition. Borg has deduced that their placement would impede the wearer's already limited vision. Evidence for the authenticity of the spectacles has been proffered by Blair who points out that the early inventories were hardly all-inclusive in their descriptions and that, in addition, the shape of the spectacles were of a design that had started to become obsolete by the early sixteenth century. Claude Blair, "Notes on Dr. Borg's 'Homed Helmet', Journal of the Arms and Armour Society, vol. VIII, no.2, (1974).} \]
thing it represents. Such ritualistic devices - which are found in all cultures - do not, however, provide sufficient explanation for their appearance on what, after all, remains a non-combat armor which did not actually need to protect the wearer from any real enemy. Furthermore, it is only the visor and horns which can aptly be categorized as elements of the "grotesque"; the rest of the armor is modelled after contemporary fashion.

Stylistically, the visor is unique but not without comparable examples. Several grotesque visors remain today, at least two of which can be attributed to the Seusenhofer workshop. Although not all grotesque visors were produced for kings, the surviving Seusenhofer examples are of an exceptional quality which seems to have been the reserve of royal personages. One is believed to have belonged to an armor of Ferdinand I and has a distinctive hooked nose and squinting eyes which mark it as a close contemporary of the Henry visor, although it is slightly later in date (ca. 1529). Henry's helmet probably had at least one other alternate visor which may also have been

---

6For discussion on classical and grotesque armors see Carolyn Springer, "Dall'Oggetto Al Segno: Armor and Epic in Early Modern Italy", diss., Stanford University (1989). The connection of horns with cuckoldry had been established by the time of the presentaion and, in hindsight, provides some amusement given Henry's infamous relations with his many wives. In the context of the ambassadorial gift, however, such an insult would certainly not have been insinuated by the Emperor (nor would it have been pertinent in 1514). Rather, the horns can be seen (as Borg suggests) to reference the wearer's strength and were often associated with courage and power. As Blair notes, at least three other sixteenth century helmets survive which have ram's horns although none are as elaborate. This would seem to confirm the currency of the horns as a symbol meriting respect. Blair, 1974.


8It has been attributed to Hans Seusenhofer, brother of Konrad. Norman, 1986, 74. Ferdinand's is notably different from Henry's in so far as it is more of a visor than a full face-mask.
grotesque in design. As such, the visors could be changed to suit various functions.\textsuperscript{9} It has been suggested that Henry’s armor may have originally included a second helmet to render its appearance less grotesque, depending on the circumstances of its setting.\textsuperscript{10} Not all grotesque visors, it should be noted, were intended strictly for ornamental purposes. Surviving helmets of German craftsmanship,\textsuperscript{11} with visors decorated with hooked noses and curled moustaches, functioned as parts of tournament armors. The anthropomorphic design in these helmets, however, is kept subservient to the overall functional utility of the helmet whereas the workmanship on the Henry visage renders the steel too delicate to withstand any substantial force. The limited vision provided by the Henry “horned helmet” would further suggest that the visor was not intended to be used for combat.\textsuperscript{12}

The viewer is left with the question of why such an unsightly visage would grace such an elegant court costume. Or more importantly, why it would grace a king at all. Humor is perhaps the most viable explanation. This is not to impute that Maximilian and Henry were on joking terms. As Dr. Borg has pointed out, at the time of the armor’s commission in 1511, Maximilian and

\textsuperscript{9}Ian Eaves cites this possibility in correspondence adding that grotesque visors were viewed as entertaining and, thus, to have several would provide still greater amusement. To this can be added the King’s insistence on ever appearing in a new and spectacular costume.

\textsuperscript{10}Blair, 1974.

\textsuperscript{11}Such as (IV.29) at the Royal Armories, HM Tower of London; (2877) at the Higgins Armory Museum, Worcester, Mass.; and (LRK 11441) at the Royal Armories, Stockholm.

\textsuperscript{12}Borg argues that the distance between the eyes is abnormally wide which may, he feels, indicate that the visor was not even intended to be worn. Borg, 1974.
Henry had not so much as met. Nevertheless, the humor can be read as understandable within the cultural context of the age and not as an inside joke. Evidence for such fanciful tastes can be found in the courtly penchant for disguising, rooted in the traditional celebrations of Shrovetide carnivals. Henry was himself particularly fond of such entertainment as he demonstrated when he burst into the queen's chamber at Westminster one morning in the guise of Robin Hood or again (to choose from among many examples), when he entered the Parliament Chamber dressed "in Turkey fashion" replete with scimitars and gold decoration.\textsuperscript{13}

As to the origins of such willfull concealement, we find reference to Henry's disguising himself for the Epiphany revels in 1513 "after the manner of the Italians called a mask, a thing not seen afore in England."\textsuperscript{14} The "mask" referred to here is not the visor itself but a form of theatrical courtly entertainment usually based on an allegorical or mythological theme. Although the mask (or masque) originated on the Continent, it was adopted with great enthusiasm by Henry and maintained its popularity throughout the Tudor era, becoming increasingly complex in character. "King Henrie the Eight," wrote one seventeenth century biographer, "spent most part of the first two yeares of his reigne in masques and revells."\textsuperscript{15} There developed with the evolution of the


\textsuperscript{14} ibid., 19.

mask, an "anti-mask" as well, typified by mock assaults and struggles against "wild men...with Ugly weapons and terrible visages." Looking at the Henry visor, one could envision its inspiration evolving from such a festivity.

While the mask cannot be linked directly with the employment of armor, it finds parallels in the masquerading which preceded and concluded most sixteenth century tournament events for which such a fantastical armor may well have been utilized. Elements of disguising in tournament fêtes can be found as early as the thirteenth century and became increasingly grandiose, blossoming most notably in the mid-fifteenth century under the patronage of the Burgundian court of René d'Anjou, whence both Maximilian and Henry received their models of chivalric pageantry. Grotesque elements were often incorporated into armor, notably the crest of the helmet, for spring tournaments which took on often outrageous proportions in a light-hearted yet nonetheless earnest attempt to outdo fellow knights of the court. So extreme were some of the displays that by the fifteenth century, rules were established by the German court to limit the degrees of ostentation allowed in festivities following tournaments. Money spent on costume, be it armor or civilian, was equated

---


(much as it is today) with power and prestige. Commenting on the marriage ceremony for Henry's sister Mary, one observer noted that "some of the noblemen...to do themselves honour had spent as much as 200,000 crowns each [on costumes]." Costly elaboration and honor being thus equated, Maximilian's gift can be seen not merely as a display of humor, but of the greatest honor.

Another tradition out of which the grotesque visor may have emerged is the Schembart festivals popular in Nuremberg from 1449 to 1539 for which the wearing of masks, often demonic or theriomorphic in nature, was considered a special privilege. The term Schembart translates, in fact, to a bearded or, in its original sense, hideous mask. Henry's visor, with its now faded gilded stubble, can be said to fulfill both of these attributes. While the masks used for the festival were of cloth and not steel, armor did feature in the carnivalesque activities. Armors with grotesque masks were often used for the tournaments which sometimes accompanied the celebrations. It was also employed as a stage costume for the elaborate mise-en-scènes, such as the humorous wearing of rusty armors by old men in the 1524 festival. Maximilian, himself, engaged in such "grotesque" disguising. In 1491, for example, it is recorded

\footnote{Lorenzo Pasqualigo, "to his brothers," September 23, 1514, in Frank A. Mumby, The Youth of Henry VIII: A Narrative in Contemporary Letters (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913) 283.}

\footnote{For an explanation of the Schembart Festival and its history, see Samuel S. Sumberg, The Nuremberg Schembart Festival (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941).}

\footnote{Ibid., p.187}
that:

his royal majesty [Maximilian]...had a dance performed at the town hall and had many a dance performed in the Italian and Netherlandish fashion and had them perform games in which the king, too, appeared personally in a bearded mask (Schempert).\textsuperscript{22}

Clearly, Maximilian would not take part in an event, let alone organize one, which he felt would give offense to his dignity. To present a gift, furthermore, which could be even remotely construed as less than appropriate, would render disgrace just as much to the giver as to the receiver. For this reason alone, the gift-helmet - odd as its appearance may be - can understood as referring to an aspect of courtly society in which both sovereigns enthusiastically participated.

Unfortunately, no record has been found describing Henry wearing the 1514 presentation armor. Hall, a diligent recorder of much Tudor pageantry, mentions Henry in armor on numerous occasions but seldom with any telling detail.\textsuperscript{23} Records do exist, at least, which demonstrate Henry's participation in tournament disguising. Though not necessarily grotesque in nature, Henry's costume for the 1524/25 Christmas tournament, exemplify some of the extremes taken for such affairs. Entering the field with a like-disguised knight,

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 40 footnote. I am grateful to Professor Wensinger, Wesleyan University, for his help in translating the German text.

\textsuperscript{23}Edward Hall, Chronicles (1548; New York: Amstel Press, 1965) and Edward Hall, The union of the two noble and illustre familie of Lancastre and Yorke, etc. (1550; London, 1904) give the most illuminating account of Henry's use of armor but do not allow for any certain identifications. Hall's description, for example, of Henry appearing at a joust "in a newe harness made of his [Henry's] own devise and fashion, suche as no armour before that tyme had seen" (1904, 319) give a sense of Henry's enthusiasm for armor but no stylistic evidence.
the king and his companion appeared as:

ancient knightes, with beardes of siluer [in great robes of purple damaske...who then] threw awaile their robes, and then it was knowen that it was the Kyng, and the Duke of Suffolk, whose bardes and bases were golde, embrauded with purple, siluer, and Blacke, very curiously.\textsuperscript{24}

To view the function of Maximilian's gift-armor, however, as providing mere tittilation for an evening's entertainment would be to underestimate both the political connotations of Maximilian giving such a gift and the King's own cultural sense of himself in receiving it.

Although the circumstances surrounding the presentation of this particular gift-armor merit closer study, the ancient tradition of armor presentations should first be understood and be seen, in turn, within the still larger context of royal gift-giving in general. King's have long been expected to display their power through the generous dispensation of their wealth and possessions. We find evidence for associating royalty with gift-giving in \textit{Beowulf} and later medieval writings in which the term "ring-giver" is synonymous with sovereign.\textsuperscript{25} Displays of magnificence, advised St. Thomas, brought with it prestige to both king and court. Castiglione, the paragon of court etiquette for the period, reinforced such notions of lavishness, asserting that it was requisite for a good king to be "of great splendor and generosity, giving freely to

\textsuperscript{24}Hall, quoted in Anglo, 1969, 115-116.

\textsuperscript{25}On this count it is interesting to note that when the two sovereigns met near Thérouanne in 1513, King Henry offered Maximilian a precious jeweled ring which, after some protestation, Maximilian thankfully accepted.
everyone."\textsuperscript{26} Conspicuous consumption was thus seen not as frivolous expenditure, but rather, as a vital means of reaffirming the divinity of the monarch and was interpreted as a "celebration of order and virtue."\textsuperscript{27} Henry's accession serves as a prime example of this public expectation. The young king was heralded in by the people not only because his coronation brought with it the maintenance of order and a secure Tudor dynasty, but also because it brought with it the promise of pageantry and magnificence which had been so neglected under the more parsimonious Henry VII, whose court had been deemed "wealthy...but almost depressingly unspectacular."\textsuperscript{28}

Of all the gifts which a sovereign could bestow upon a subject, arms and armor were among the most coveted. Part of their allure can be attributed to their connection with the image of the king as a warrior which dates back to antiquity.\textsuperscript{29} The marble image of Augustus Caesar (known as the \textit{Prima Porta}) nobly grasping his spear and costumed in an elaborately sculpted cuirass is but one celebrated example of the ancient union of fine armor and the ruler. Arms used for purely ceremonial purposes are found in most cultures throughout history. Bearing swords, for example, were presented as honorific gifts from


\textsuperscript{27}Strong, 1973, 40.

\textsuperscript{28}Anglo, \textit{Rule}, 2.

popes or emperors.³⁰ Maximilian had thus contributed to a long tradition, often sacred in character, of military bestowals. He himself had received an armor in his youth from his uncle, the Duke Siegmund in 1465.³¹ Fine arms and armor with their encrusted jewels and gold inlay had long been the domain of kings and a symbol of the kingdom's strength. In an age when warfare was ubiquitous, the military attributes of its leaders appeared as all the more significant. Armor, particularly of high quality, was furthermore, one of the costliest of possessions. Froissart's Chronicles remark, for example, that the King of Castile wore a helmet enriched with gold at the Battle of Aljubertota (1385) valued at 20,000 francs.³² Only as a gift or as a spoil of war could most soldiers aspire to procure a fine armor,³³ it became, as a result, the reserve of the higher classes. In England, for example, a royal warrant was required to purchase an armor from the royal workshops (see chapter 2), further limiting their availability to only those in the good graces of the king. Armor was, as Beaufort-Spontin points out, a metallic "manifestation of social

³⁰Peter Krenn and Walter J. Karcheski, Jr., Imperial Austria (Munich: Prestel, 1992) 32. Donald LaRocca has added that popes, by the fourteenth century, often distributed one bearing sword a year to a worthy personage. Henry VII, for example, thrice received an honorary papal cap and sword during his reign.


³³In the fifteenth century, for example, it could take up to three months wages for a soldier to provide himself with a complete armor. Vale, 125.
standing"²⁴ and to receive such a gift from a king could be seen as nothing short as the affirmation of an exclusive camaraderie with the giver of the gift.

The gift-armor was, in fact, not the first such presentation from Maximilian to Henry. In 1505, shortly prior to his accession, Henry married Katherine of Aragon, the widow of Arthur, his recently deceased brother and the intended heir to Henry VII. To celebrate the marriage, the Emperor is believed to have given Henry an elaborately decorated bard (horse armor) known as the "Burgundian Bard" because of the Burgundian crosses which adorn its surface (figure 5).³⁵ A 1519 inventory describes it as being of steel partially "gilte wt pomegrannetes and Burgonyons [Burgundian] Crosses...wt a fringe of gold and blak silk given by the Emperour."³⁶ The bard, given ca. 1511, would have been an early display of congeniality by Maximilian. Decorated with pomegranates (the badge of Katherine)³⁷ and the Burgundian Order of the Golden Fleece, the bard demonstrated not only an implied acceptance of the new marriage, but also an acceptance of Henry into the new ruling class of Europe. Furthermore, the Order of the Golden Fleece, a chivalric order reserved for Catholics of the highest nobility and closely associated with


³⁷The pomegranate was also the badge of Maximilian. Its appearance was thus not only a tribute to Henry's marriage but to the Emperor as well.
Maximilian through his marriage to Mary of Burgundy, would have been an honorific inclusion for the young, glory-seeking King. The inclusion of the Order was also a means for Maximilian to connect himself visually with the presentation, serving to parade his prestige to all at the English court. Like the vines embossed upon it, the bard artfully interwove the political tendrils of the sovereigns in a social context. As armor, the bard was a particularly royal gift in that only the wealthiest nobles could afford the luxury of such elaborate decoration for their horse, particularly in England where heavy horses were themselves a rare commodity.

Maximilian’s were perhaps the greatest, but far from the only gifts of arms and armor which Henry received from sovereigns throughout his reign. It would seem fitting that a monarch described as “the most conspicuous...most assiduous, and the most interested in combats [at the tournament]” should be given gifts in the area of his greatest interest. Henry received swords from the English nobility as New Year’s gifts and was often presented with like objects from ambassadors. In 1514, the same year he received the imperial gift-armor, he also was sent an eastern scimitar from the Marquis of Mantua, a sword from the pope and, one year later, a sword from the Marquis of Brandenbourg. While they can be viewed as a mere formality, such gifts served as a gesture of good will. Furthermore, they bespeak an attempt to find

---

38Luis Caroz, "To Ferdinand II," May 29, 1510; in Mumby, 1913, 142.
39Dillon, "Westminster", 244-5 footnote a.
a common ground of interest between the leaders of Europe in a time of tenuous alliances and volatile enmities. That arms and armor should be so prized by Henry and other nobles and that it was deemed an appropriate gift from a pope and emperor is testimony to the pervasive militancy which governed the politics of the period. Implements of war were gifts which brandished none too subtle messages. Implicit in a papal presentation sword, for example, is the understanding that the recipient would serve as a spiritual and military protector of the Church. It was "an age of warfare concerned with religion and morality." At the fulcrum of this triumvirate was armor, offering defense for the body in battle and symbolic force for the moral Christian knight in his pursuit of chivalry.

The intentions behind Maximilian's 1514 gift-armor were not all in the name of the lofty ideals of knighthood. The Emperor had some overtly practical political motives for such a display of beneficence. As a royal gift, armor reinforced the political foundations upon which the relationship between Maximilian and Henry had been founded. When Henry succeeded his father to the throne, it became clear that he had little intention of following his predecessor's prudent, non-aggressive foreign policies; he quickly began fomenting disputes with England's long-standing adversary, France. For the equally bellicose Maximilian, this was a promising prospect, allowing him

---

potentially to gain access to a share of the plentiful Tudor treasury for his own wars with Louis XII and later Francis I. What he had to offer Henry was an equally vital military asset which England all too obviously lacked: a strong continental ally (the endangered Venice being its only close political tie). England's heroic feats had become memories on the field of Agincourt (1415), and it was clear that if Henry had any intention of reasserting English claim to northern France or elsewhere, he was going to need to learn a few lessons from his more modernized military contemporaries. Maximilian, a leader who had forged his reputation in ceaseless battle and had maintained a reasonably amicable relationship with Henry VII, proved not only a willing ally, but a rôle-model for the ambitious new king. What better way of consummating this militaristic coalition than by presenting the hopeful and impressionable ally with a magnificent manifestation of the newly formed protective allegiance? Decorative as it may be, a suit of armor connotes, above all else, a preparedness for war, and Maximilian's gift is little less than an acknowledgement of Henry's involvement in the new power structures emerging in the early sixteenth century. The humorous nature of the visor would not undermine the solemnity of such a gesture, but, rather, might serve to reinforce the amiable undertones which would have accompanied such magnanimity. This personal connection between sovereigns would have been all the more poignant if Henry were to have recognized in the mask a smiling caricature of the Emperor himself.
The exorbitant cost of producing such a fine quality armor coupled with Maximilian’s chronic lack of sufficient capital is a testimony to the return value he must have anticipated from giving such an object. Its presentation in 1514 and the preceding correspondence with the armorers urging its completion because “the King may need such an armor at this time” reference Maximilian’s consciousness of the circumstances under which such a gift was to be presented. The circumstances referred to are those of Henry’s invasion of France in 1513 (discussed in chapter 3). Two years earlier, Henry had sent over a small force of archers to help support Maximilian’s troops in the Low Countries against the Duke of Gelders. Henry himself accompanied his troops across the channel in June of 1513, where he was joined by Maximilian in his victory at Thérouanne, England’s first victory over France in seventy-five years. As a gesture of his good will (and probably from a desire to alleviate the expenses of mounting an independent force), Maximilian consolidated his smaller forces with those of Henry’s and served under the English banner, later even following Henry into the city during the triumphal entry and acquiescing the place of honor in the church to his junior. The commissioning of the gift predated the actual involvement, but its successful outcome must have made the reception of the present all the more poignant as a solidification of the friendship and as a trophy for the early fruits of the bipartisan labor. For Henry, the gift must have been a welcome sign of the much desired recognition of

England's significance in continental affairs. For Maximilian, it was in many ways a strategic investment in future wars, particularly for an emperor whose ability to borrow up to five times his income for his military pursuits necessitated the continuous pursuit of possible support-systems. In Henry, he had a wealthy ally who posed little potential threat to his security in terms of military might and strategic objectives. Thus, while displaying his appreciation and commitment to the young King through the gift-armor and deferring to him the command in France, Maximilian really served his own best interests by winning over the favor of Tudor support.

Alliances during this period were usually precarious ententes which often lasted only until one member felt secure enough to turn on his ally for his own gains. The history of Anglo-German relations for the ten years during Maximilian and Henry's common reign alone reads as a complex series of covert agreements and double-crossings. The armor served as a small filament in this web of intrigue. Looking back at the relationship between the two sovereigns, one could muse today that the two (or more) grotesque visors which probably accompanied the armor were, like Janus, reflective of the two-headedness of the imperial rapport. This, of course, was not the spirit in which the gift was given, but it touches upon the aggressive realpolitik which characterized the age. It will be remembered, as an example of this point, that

---

42 For the financial difficulties of Maximilian's reign see Gerhard Benecke, Maximilian I: 1459-1519 (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1982).
Maximilian and his step-mother-in-law, Mary of Burgundy, had originally supported the Yorkists against Henry's father, Henry VII, and had only changed sides when France's progress in Italy necessitated a less confrontational stand in their support for England. During Henry VIII's reign there was never a serious rattling of sabres with the Hapsburgs but there were frequent disputes over allegiances as Henry's political savior-faire increased with experience. Even before receiving the gift, Henry had become enlightened as to the slippery nature of alliances with the elder statesman when in 1513, Maximilian entered into negotiations with Ferdinand and Henry's enemy, Louis XII, to conclude a peace treaty in direct opposition with the Emperor's previously arranged attack on France in support of Henry. Reflecting on the Emperor's fleeting alliances, Henry's chief-advisor, Cardinal Wolsey remarked on "what promtitude he is to sudden mutations." The gift-armor could be seen as an attempt at appeasement but it would have been a short-term rapprochement, for in 1515 and again in 1517, Maximilian backed out of his treaties with England in favor of more profitable ventures elsewhere. The armor was probably not intended as a kind of reparation, particularly in view of the fact that it was commissioned before any such incident had occurred. Surely, however, by the time Henry received it, he was becoming increasingly aware of the fickleness of favor which accompanied such a diplomatic gesture.

The gift-armor can further be seen in light of a larger schema of self-

---

promotion undertaken at this time by the Emperor. Maximilian was, throughout his life, and particularly in his later years, greatly concerned with the image he would leave behind for posterity and saw to it that every aspect of his reign was woven into the greater fabric of cultural history. 44 A keen propagandist, Maximilian himself noted:

Whoever prepares no memorial for himself during his lifetime has none after his death and is forgotten with the sound of the bell that tolls his passing. Thus, the money spent on the perpetuation of my memory is not lost; in fact, in such a matter to be sparing of money is to suppress my future memory. 45

By proclaiming himself as “the Last Knight,“ Maximilian made clear the nature of the niche he sought to carve for himself. His would be an armored image forged in warfare and he would be the immortal folk hero of mythic proportions. Through his propagandizing biographies like Der Weisskunig (examined towards the end of this study), he could portray himself to future generations as the eternal crusader, balancing his military prowess with patronage of the arts. Like Caesar had in his time, Maximilian could present himself as both poet and general. How better could he have reinforced such an image in his own day than by merging war and the arts in a decorative armor and presenting it to the most esteemed princes and courtiers of Europe? For once suited in the

44 For discussion on Maximilian’s pursuit of lasting fame, see Jan-Dirk Müller, Gedechtus (Munich: 1982).

sumptuous gift, the noble recipient was literally enveloped in the military spirit of Maximilian and served to perpetuate his myth by parading the physical manifestation of the Emperor's omnipresence. That this was Maximilian's intention can be evidenced in the text of Der Weiskunig, a thinly veiled biography organized by the Emperor, in which his gifts of magnificent armor are said to have "[outdone] the gifts of all other kings...for what is greater to a king than a harness with which his body is provided in battle?"\footnote{The related text from this passage has been fully translated in the appendix.}

The commission for the Henry armor was, as previously mentioned, coupled with the commission of a similar suit for the Archduke Charles in Spain. One year prior to the request for these two harnesses was an order by Maximilian for two other fine armors to be presented to his grandsons the Archduke Ferdinand and King Ludwig of Hungary. In 1515, Sir Robert Wingfield, the English ambassador to Maximilian, wrote to Henry detailing yet another royal presentation from the Emperor, this time, of a bard to the young King of Poland.\footnote{Sir James Mann, "Notes on Armour of the Maximilian Period and the Italian Wars", Archeologia, vol. LXXIX, (1929): 243.} Such an expansive and expensive project of armor bestowals in the later years of Maximilian's life references not only his desire for self-aggrandizement, but the concern for dynastic security which consumed much of his political agenda. Maximilian was wardrobing an entire kingly entourage according to his knightly model. As Benecke notes in his biography of the Emperor, "Maximilian had turned the Hapsburgs from a grubby little
central European dynasty...into a supranational great power." Through strategically arranged marriages and continuous military action, Maximilian had turned the "House of Austria" into a European fortress with influence extending from the Netherlands to Northern Italy to Spain and its overseas colonies. The idea of maintaining power in these diverse regions and passing it on to an able, like-minded successor required the development of a complex network of connections with the future generation of sovereigns. Maximilian, by appearing as the great patriarch of patriarchs through impressive displays of wealth and power, hoped to win over the good graces and gain further influence in shaping the future of the dynasty he had already done so much to create.

Maximilian viewed Henry not only as a vital key to the future of Hapsburg security but as its potential leader as well. In Henry he saw an ambitious and wealthy young king who delighted in the pursuit of war. Upon his accession, Henry had quickly earned himself a reputation for action which Maximilian so highly valued. Like the elder ruler, Henry proclaimed himself "the very perfect" valorous knight. Even Machiavelli saw in him, a prince "rich, ferocious, and desirous of glory." Perhaps Maximilian viewed Henry as the possible surrogate for his only son, Philip, who died in 1509. Maximilian, ever calculating and opportunistic, attempted to bring the young prince closer to the

---

48 Benecke, 181.
49 Scarisbrick, 20.
50 Loades, 27.
Hapsburg fold by pushing for the annulment of Henry's marriage to Katherine in favor of Margaret, the sister of the Emperor's grandson, Charles. This plan having fallen through, Maximilian sought different methods to incorporate Henry into his network of political progenies. In 1513, having witnessed the English king's earnestness in creating an English presence on the Continent, Maximilian offered to adopt Henry as a son and more surprisingly still, even to give to Henry his title of Emperorship. Henry refused the offer, but it was again proposed by Maximilian with even greater detailing in 1516 only to be, for a second time, declined.\textsuperscript{51} Letters from Maximilian to Henry during this period felicitously salute the Tudor monarch as son and brother. Even in writing to Margaret of Savoy, the Emperor addresses Henry as "our brother, the King of England."\textsuperscript{52} Maximilian, in a rather shrewd attempt to endear himself to the young British monarch even offered himself as "the servant of the King [Henry] and St. George" during Henry's war against France in 1513.

The gift armor, presented shortly after the first offer of the imperial crown, can thus be seen as one of a series of undertakings intended to enlighten Henry as to the potential treasures which awaited him as a member of the Hapsburg "clan". More a symbolic gesture than a material gift, the armor

\textsuperscript{51} The offer was probably made by Maximilian in an attempt to usurp money from Henry and to ingratiate himself after the recent withdrawal of imperial support in Lombardy. Henry probably saw the far-flung plan as both impractical and not in his best interests. For details of the Emperor's envisioned scheme, see Scarisbrick, 98.

\textsuperscript{52} Letter from March 16, 1513; cited in Mumby 164-5. It should be noted that this amicable tone was not unique to Henry and Maximilian. Louis XII, writing to Henry in 1514, for example, closes his letter: "Your loyal Brother, Cousin, and Good Comrade, Louis"; Mumby, 306.
joined Henry in a fraternal bond with the other recipients of Maximilian's
grandfatherly benifice. It is perhaps less than ironic that two of the main
contenders for the imperial crown, Henry and Charles, were presented with
armors very similar, if not identical, in appearance.53

The aforementioned letter from Sir Wingfield to Henry concerning the
gift-bard presented to the king of Poland is of interest in that it indicates the
attention paid to the particulars of such royal gestures. Maximilian's
presentations were not isolated events privately exchanged between two
sovereigns but part of a subtle foreign policy acknowledged by the larger
community of nobles. The specific nature of Wingfield's report describing the
"two courser all covered in steel"54 underscores the significance of the actual
gift as well. There is in the description an obvious enthusiasm in conveying to
the King how exactly the bard functioned. Armor was both significant on a level
of revealing implicit political relationships and as an object in and of itself.

Writing later in the century, Gabriel Kalte Markte emphasized this point when
advising Christian I on the formation of a Kunstkammer: "The best adornment
and treasure of a prince and sovereign includes...his possession of magnificent
munitions and military equipment."55 For all the self-serving ends the gift-

53 The two main contenders for the imperial crown after Maximilian's death were Charles and
Francis I. During Maximilian's lifetime, however, his two preferred successors appear to have been
Henry and Charles. Henry considered pursuing the title after the Emperor's death but put his
energies, instead, behind Charles who emerged victorious.

54 Mann, 243.

55 Walter J. Karchesi, Jr. in Age of the Marvelous, ed. Joy Kenseth (Hanover, N.H.: University
armor may have promoted, it remained an exquisite gift for a sovereign as militaristically inclined as Henry. In analyzing the symbolic significance of armor, the evidently impressive nature of such workmanship and the aesthetic appreciation it brought to the recipient should not be overlooked.\footnote{Responding to Dr. Borg’s criticism, Blair does not rule out the possibility that the helmet, with its abnormally wide ocular range, may have been intended primarily for show. This is not to suggest that the armor could not be worn. The accompaniment of an armorer with the presentation intimates that the armor was fitted to the King and intended to be worn.}

There is, of course, tied to this aesthetic appreciation a certain power dynamic that Henry must have been painfully aware of. Maximilian had presented Henry with a gift that Henry, for all his wealth, could not equal. As Cripps-Day surmised, when Henry came to the throne in 1509, he alone “of all the great princes of Europe was in the humiliating position of being unable to offer a princely gift of harness made by armories of his own country.”\footnote{F.H. Cripps-Day, Fragmenta Armamentaria, (Frome: 1985), i., pt. ii, 8; quoted in Blair, (1965): 32.} While the London Armourer’s Company had been chartered in 1453 by Henry VI and continued to supply native armors on a small scale, its quality seldom met up to continental standards and the steel utilized was often rejected as inferior.\footnote{Prior to the formation of the Armourer’s Company of London, there existed the guild of Taylor’s and Linen Armourers as well as the Heaumers (helmet-makers) guild since the beginning of the fourteenth century. For the evolution of the Armourer’s Company see Charles fouldes, “The Armourer’s Company of London and the Greenwich School of Armourers”, Archeologia, vol. LXXVI, (1928): 41-58.} The English armorers simply did not have the training or ready access to the same quality of materials which made the workshops in Germany, Austria, and Italy renowned throughout Europe. For a monarch so concerned with military
and tournament accomplishments, this was a deficiency of the highest order.

During the early years of his reign, Henry had purchased all his armors from abroad. At about the same time that Maximilian commissioned the Henry gift-armor (1511), Henry had privately ordered two armors from the same workshop at Innsbruck. A year earlier, he had purchased one armor from Milan and another from Flanders. Even large-scale, munition-quality orders had to be sought abroad as is evidenced by the purchase of 2000 harnesses from a Florentine merchant in 1512 by Cardinal Wolsey. In 1513, Henry's ambassador, Jerringham, reported having made an “advantageous bargain at Milan for 5000 foot-soldiers’ suits.” While the London Armorer's Company could surely produce some number of adequate munition-quality armors, Henry still looked to the security of the Continent's reputation for the bulk of it. There are a few surviving records from this period of the importation of Austrian steel into England for the making of armor, such as the 1516 payment to John Hurdy "for four bundles of Isebroke [Innsbruck] stuff for making parts of armour" noted by Lord Dillon. In 1516, four bundles of steel (1 bundle equals aprox. 264 lbs.) cost £8.6s.8d. The additional cost of importing steel from the Continent
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62 Ibid., 168.
63 Pfafflenbichler, 51.
may have made large scale native orders prohibitive, but understandably, the English armorers - like many other native craftsmen of the time - were displeased by the favoring of foreign merchants; petitions can be found as late as the Elizabethan period pressing for the curtailing of foreign armorers entering England.\textsuperscript{64} The popular resentment against foreigners in England was very much a reflection of the favor which the continental craftsmen received from the nobility of the court. Maximilian's gift, with its extraordinary level of virtuosity, surely reinforced the rift between native and foreign workmanship on the score of armorer's skills and may, furthermore, have been a subtle reminder to Henry that English prestige not only depended on powerful continental models but still had a long way to go to equal them.\textsuperscript{65}

A reliance on foreign suppliers for defensive needs could be in times of necessity not merely a cause for embarrassment, but a serious military inconvenience. Such short-comings were not unique to the patronage of armor and Henry's handling of the situation is in many ways exemplary of the broader policies of patronage carried out under his reign: If he lacked the native talent to rival his continental contemporaries, he simply imported the most capable artisans available to him, established a royal workshop, and set them to work so that England could boast of a comparable product. This he did not only with

\textsuperscript{64}Houlkes, 1912, appendix G.

\textsuperscript{65}In a 1590 trial of English and German armors by Master of the Armory Sir Henry Lee, the English product still proved inferior to German craftsmanship. Even as late as 1634, in a report on the manufacture of armor we find that German armorers had been brought over to teach English workmen the craft. Dillon, "Sir Henry Lee", 170-171.
armor, but with horse-breeding, paintings, music, and architecture as well, to name but a few.\textsuperscript{66} When, for example, a Spanish ambassador visiting the English court presented Henry with portraits of Philip the Fair and Juana of Castile, Henry acquired the services of one "Meynnart" as "King's painter" so as not to be outdone or embarrassed by such royal gestures in the future.\textsuperscript{67} He employed musicians from Germany, architects from Italy, manuscript illuminators from Austria, and so forth. In so doing, he was expanding on a cultural importation which his father had begun - albeit more sparingly - with the acquiring of a tapestry-maker from Flanders and a plasterer from France. This catalog of continental influence indicates that armor cannot be viewed as an isolated interest in Henrician politics or patronage, but functioned as part of a larger, extremely self-conscious program of development of the arts through royal workshops. It was the Tudor vision that England, "which hath been but the suburbs of the old world, [would] become the bridge to the new."\textsuperscript{68} Prominence in the arts and in the military were, to Henry, the pillars upon which to build the bridge. The development of native armor workshops served, on a personal level, as a prime venue for pursuing both his own fondness of the military arts and toward fulfilling his humanist "obligations" of princely

\textsuperscript{66}Henry's cultural "borrowings" were not considered against the norm of expected princely patronage. The employing of foreign artisans was a common practice in most European courts of the period. Nonetheless, the breadth of Henry's use of foreign craftsmen was proportionally far greater than that of his contemporaries.

\textsuperscript{67}Loades, Tudor Court, 127.

\textsuperscript{68}Cited in Crowson, 5.
patronage. The zeal that Henry demonstrated in the establishment of the armor workshops is evident in the exceptional quality of the armors produced there only a short time after the workshops' inception.
II. Harnessing Prestige: The Royal Armor Workshops

Maximilian's imperial gift-armor was the result of a network of craftsmen interconnected through royal contracts which enabled Maximilian to retain some of the finest artisans for his exclusive employment. The importance attributed to armor by both Maximilian and Henry, as well as the influence which the Emperor exercised over Henry, can be seen through the emphasis they placed on the creation of royal armor workshops. The study of the genesis and product of the workshops provides a clearer picture of what each sovereign hoped to obtain from armor both for his own use and as a royal gift. Maximilian and Henry were the only sovereigns of this period to have organized royal workshops.¹ The workshops functioned, like the armors themselves, as a means of improving personal defense and prestige. The rôle of the royal armorers thus emerges as a crucial factor in determining the overall expectations of armor as a kingly possession.

Of all the workshops which the seemingly tireless Emperor established, those related to the military received the heaviest emphasis and funding. The

¹Other noblemen had armorers employed in connection with their court but there are no records of a workshop organized by and for the sovereign on the scale of either Maximilian or Henry. See Claude Blair, European Armour (London: Batsford, 1958); and Pfaffenhüchter.
reasons behind his devotion to the development of the military arts were those of enthusiasm and necessity. Attention was delegated not only to the manufacture of armor, but to improving the development of artillery and firearms as well. His personal military involvement fostered his technical interests in the objects while the defense of his often beleaguered Empire necessitated the urgency of their production. By providing a receptive liaison between himself and a collective of skilled armorers and weaponsmiths, the Emperor realized he could more efficiently facilitate his personal and national military agenda. When, for example, the threat of a Turkish invasion in Styria grew imminent, he could transfer craftsmen trained at his home base in Innsbruck to Graz in order to help modernize the production of supplies there.²

Maximilian’s patronage of and interest in armor was so great that the large majority of German armors produced during the period have been termed in the "Maximilian" style in deference to his supposed influence in the armorer’s craft (figure 5). The most salient hallmarks of the style are the bands of radial fluting which generally (but not always) cover the surface of the armor in imitation of the folds of a civilian blouse.³ The fluted design, with its corrugated surface, gave the steel an added degree of strength without causing a

²As he did with Hans Maystatter in 1510. Krenn and Karcheski, Jr., 7.
³Although the feature is brought to prominence in "Maximilian" style armors, Laking notes that the fashion of parallel fluting on armor is Milanese in origin. Few fluted armors, however, appear outside Germany. Other distinguishing features of "Maximilian" style armors are the convex breastplate, broad-toed sollerets (foot defenses) and rectangular mitten gauntlets. Sir Guy F. Laking, A Record of European Armour and Arms through Seven Centuries, 5 vols. (London, 1920-22) 3: 247.
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substantial increase in weight. Visually, it produced an impression of increased massiveness which, when combined with the borrowing of rounder Italianate armor forms, considerably altered the knight's appearance from the slimness of "Gothic" style armors previously popular in Germany. Maximilian's armor workshops at Innsbruck, conveniently situated between Augsburg and Milan, the two main centers of armor production, proved a fertile testing-ground for amalgamating the two regional styles.  

In attempting to discern the degree of influence exerted by Maximilian in creating the style which bears his name, we can turn to a woodcut from Der Weisskunig (figure 7) by Hans Burgkmair executed ca. 1515. Much employed by armor scholars, the image depicts Maximilian overlooking the production of armor with his court armorer, Konrad Seusenhofer. The accompanying text (translated in the appendix) describes how Maximilian discovered a new technique for mass-producing as many as thirty cuirasses at a time. Although the text of Der Weisskunig is rather extreme in its praise of the feats of the "White/Wise king", the Emperor undoubtedly took great interest in the workshops and their production. It is difficult to assess the extent of his influence but considering his fondness for war and the tournament, it seems safe to assume that the propagandizing image is at least based in truth.

---

4The German style of the late fifteenth century can be characterized as attenuated and angular in appearance compared with Italian armors which were generally more massive with rounder forms. For a concise description of the development of the two styles see Blair, 1958, 77-107. For the armors produced at Innsbruck, see Bruno Thomas and Ortwin Gamber, Die Innsbrucker Plattnerkunst (Innsbruck: Tiroler Landesmuseum, 1954).
Whatever the reality, his workshops produced an innovative style of armor with which he was clearly proud to be associated. It was his model and example that was to set the standard that Henry and, later, King Gustav of Sweden would look to in establishing their own workshops.⁵

In 1495 Maximilian established for himself a small workshop at Arbois in Burgundy, procuring two armorers from a Milanese duke, Lodovico il Moro.⁶ When he took over the government of Tyrol from his uncle in 1504, Maximilian moved the small operation to Innsbruck. Located on the Inn river (running water being necessary for powering the armor mills) and being in close proximity to the rich iron supplies of Tyrolia, Innsbruck was an ideal choice for the royal workshops. Austria was, as Hughes notes, "the only German state with large enough dynastic resources [both financial and natural] to shoulder the burdens of the imperial title"⁷ and Innsbruck, one of the largest centers within Austria, became - in addition to the home of the workshops - the seat of the imperial court. The workshops thus occupied a central position in the social network of the realm, distinguishing them from the arsenals situated in various strategical points of the empire which were predominantly military in function. There already existed an armorer's "colony" near the outskirts of Innsbruck at Mühlau but Maximilian was intent on creating his own distinct workshop. A

---

⁵King Gustav established his royal workshop in 1551.
⁶Pfaffenbichler, 54.
⁷Hughes, 23.
personal workshop would allow him more control and could serve as a corporate entity within his court, limiting the armors to working only for him. Furthermore, from the point of view of convenience, their location at Innsbruck saved the need to travel across the river to Mühlaun. The result was a competition between salaried court armors and independent local armors which lead to a crisis in 1514 when armors at Innsbruck accused their bretheren across the river of stamping inferior quality armor with the Innsbruck stamp. The court workshops produced both high quality armors for the Emperor and priveledged clients as well as larger orders of unadorned harnesses for the Emperor's foot-soldiers. Unlike Henry's, the imperial workshops catered their production to a wide spectrum of the soldiering society and were not restricted to the highest nobles. If necessary, Maximilian could also draw on the well-established centers of arms and armor production in Landshut, Augsburg, Brunswick, and Nuremberg. Of all Europe, only Italy could boast of a comparable diversity of sources for acquiring fine armor.

The 1514 imperial gift-armor for Henry and comparable armors were not the product of one workshop and certainly not of one craftsman. Writing in 1512 on Maximilian's gift-armor, the Raitkammer (payment office) at Innsbruck

---

Because of German guild regulations limiting the number of apprentices permitted, the court armorer had, in fact, elicited the help of the Mühlaun armors to fulfill a large order of armors. The crisis arose as a result of the Innsbruck armors' complaint about the damage to their reputation on account of the inferior quality of the work made in Mühlaun; See Pfaffenbichler, p.34. Arms and armor of inferior quality were often falsely marked with the name of a famous maker or location to increase their desirability much to the consternation of those whose reputations were thereby tarnished.
elucidated that the armor had been sent to a goldsmith in Augsburg for gilding and silvering. Some armors seem to have been capable of gilding; Erasmus Kyrkenar (see below), for example, made book-clasps and other ornaments as well as armor. Normally goldwork was sub-contracted, as was the case with a headpiece and sallet (helmet) sent to goldsmith Robert Amadas in 1513 to be gilt and decorated with precious stones for Henry. Processional armors sometimes required the additional help of an artist who would provide the design for the etched design. It has been speculated, for example, that a Florentine sculptor working in England may have helped design the etching for at least one celebrated Greenwich armor. The helmet of the 1514 gilt-armor has only a small amount of etching at the sides. The related suit presented to the Archduke Charles does have etching throughout but, as there seems to be no surviving record in the correspondence detailing the work, it is not possible to determine if it was executed by an outside artist or an armorer in the workshop. After the armor was completed it still had to be sent to polishers

---

5Blair, (1965): 18 footnote.
6foulkes, 1912, 60-61.
7Pfaffenbichler, 37.

12The Genuilhac armor, now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and perhaps the large Henry armor at Windsor Castle. Blair forwards, based on the morphology of the decoration, that the etching is the work of one Giovanni di Maiano. He additionally points out that one of the extra pieces for the Genuilhac armor betrays the influence of a design by Hans Holbein with whom Giovanni worked on the triumphal arch at Greenwich for Henry. Claude Blair, “New Light on Four Almain Armourers: 2”, The Connoisseur, vol. CXLIV, (1959): 240-244.

13The ornamental etched pattern could well have come from an artist affiliated with the armor workshop. Daniel Hopfer and Hans Burgkmair are two examples of artists working Augsburg who provided designs for the celebrated Helmschmied family of armurers. See Stephen V. Grancey, “Armour with Etching attributed to Daniel Hopfer”, in Arms and Armor: Essays by Stephen V.
who would remove the blackened hammer marks of the armorer and then to an upholsterer who would line the interior. Most German armorers were qualified, indeed restricted by strict guild sanctions, to produce only certain elements of an armor. A master like Konrad Seusenhofer was able to produce a complete harness but he still received the assistance of six journeymen, four polishers, and two apprentices.\textsuperscript{14} In 1512, annoyed at the lack of progress on armors "for his own person, various princes, ambassadors, and others," Maximilian ordered for the retainment of additional armorers (\textit{extraordinariplattner}) to complete the various tasks at hand.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, even the highest quality armors like that given to Henry underwent something akin to a factory production. A gift-armor can thus be seen not only as a costly undertaking, but as the result of a complex organization of craftsmen whose work was as political as it was artistic.

It was some of the \textit{extraordinariplattner}, like those mentioned above, that were to become the foundation of the English court workshops. The reputation of the master armorers of the Holy Roman Empire was international while, as previously mentioned, the estimation of English armorers was notably inferior. In 1511, Henry had brought over armorers from Brussels and Milan, but it was the gift-armor presentation that seems to have provided the impetus for the


\textsuperscript{14}Pfaffenbichler, 51.

\textsuperscript{15}Blair, (1965): 10.
major workshop development. In 1515, one year after the presentation, Henry brought over eleven Almains (Germans) and set them up in Greenwich and Southwark with Martin van Royne, a Fleming or German, appointed as master armorer. The selection of van Royne is noteworthy in that he may have been the armorer responsible for the "Burgundian Bard" given to Henry in 1509. As such, the influence of Maximilian's gift (if it was, in fact, by van Royne) can be seen to have extended beyond the confines of the presentation itself; nearly four years after receiving the bard, Henry seems to have still regarded it and its maker in high esteem. Greenwich, a residence of the King conveniently located near London and on the Thames, proved the better location for the court workshop and replaced Southwark by 1525.

The importation of armurers previously employed by Maximilian indicates that Henry was particularly impressed with the armours sent to him from Innsbruck in 1514. In an early armour probably made for Henry by Italian armurers working in England, the influence of the imperial gift can be seen by the inclusion of a metal base, such as the ones which decorated the armours fashioned by Konrad Seusenhofer for Henry and Charles. Henry also acquired the services of the Flemish harness-gilder Paul van Vrelant around

---

16 The crupper (rear defense) is marked with an "M" surmounted by a crescent, which is believed to be van Royne's mark. Karen Watts, "Henry VIII and the Founding of the Greenwich Armouries", in Henry VIII: A European Court in England, ed. David Starkey (New York: Cross River Press, 1991) 42.

17 The silver and engraved suit (II.5 at the Royal Armouries, HM Tower of London); see Blair, (1965): 32-33.
the year 1514. Van Vrelant, like van Royne, is interesting in so far as it was he who engraved and gilded the "Burgundian Bard." His arrival in England ca. 1514 coincided roughly with the imperial gift-armor and can be interpreted as another example of the Hapsburg-Tudor exchange intended on alluring Henry into the schema of Maximilian's dynastic designs; this seems all the more significant if one considers that van Vrelant was previously in the employ of Maximilian's late son, Philip the Handsome. The early direction of the English workshops were thus closely aligned with the political situation on the Continent vis-à-vis Henry's alliance with Maximilian. Armors were regarded as politically valuable assets who were circulated (and in some cases retained) as valuable commodities. The transference of several prestigious Almain armorers to England is thus, in itself, a kind of inferred imperial gift.

The gift-armor presentation in 1514 was not the only catalyst to inspire the founding of an English royal workshop. In 1503, the year before even Maximilian's court workshop had begun, Henry's brother-in-law, James IV of Scotland, brought over thirteen armorers from France and set up a mill at Linlithgow, largely, it appears, for the production of munition armors since he still sent to France for special orders. Henry would have had good reason to ruminate on such a development for in 1513, while he was in France, James sided with the French and invaded England with his army "to relieve [his]

---

18Watts, 1991, 43.
19Anglo, Roll, 11.
people of unjust oppressions. Fortunately for the absent Henry, James, along with much of the Scottish nobility, was killed at the Battle of Flodden thereby ending the feud. The importing of armorers from the Continent by James must have planted the seed of a like model in Henry's head but the fact that nothing along similar lines was done for over a decade seems to indicate that not the threat of invasion but the need for prestige, exemplified by Maximilian's offering, was the driving force behind Henry's workshops.²¹

That the royal armor workshops were not created strictly for reasons of national defense can be observed in the diverse nature of the armors they produced. Maximilian's gift armor to Henry, for example, represents the non-military function of the workshops at its most extreme. Although both workshops provided their kings with armors for their defense in war, both also produced harnesses for the tournament which, important as they may have been, cannot be considered as truly military events for this period (see chapter 3). Maximilian, it has been noted, had many existing armor communities to supply his army adequately. The burden of national defense was, therefore, not incumbent entirely upon the armorers at Innsbruck. The Greenwich workshops

²⁰From James IV's "Proclamation of War"; Mumby, 209.

²¹There is evidence that, perhaps following the model of James, mills were set up at Deptford, as described by a later 1624 account recalling: "King Henry VIII being resolved to have his armory always strong and richly furnished with thirty or forty thousand arms to be in readiness to serve all the necessities of the times"; quoted in Charles floukes, "Some Aspects of the Craft of the Armourer", Archeologia, vol. LXXIX, (1929): 14. It is difficult to assess from such a later account whether or not this would have coincided with Henry's bringing over of armorer's from Brussels and Milan in 1511. It does not appear, at any rate, to have been conceived as a royal workshop along the lines as those at Greenwich and Southwark as no reference can be found to Deptford following the arrival of the Almains in 1514.
were not even concerned with the production of munition armors, focusing rather on fine armors for the King and a very select few nobles. Thus, even after the English workshops had been created, Henry continued to seek munition armors abroad. He may even have purchased a fine armor from France for the occasion of the tournaments celebrating his sister Mary's marriage to Louis XII in 1515. This is telling in that it reiterates the political significance of armor patronage during the period. Clearly, Henry could have procured a fine quality suit from his newly inaugurated native workshop for the event. Instead, he requested to have one from the armorer of his long-time nemesis-cum-ally Louis XII. The small gesture can be interpreted as an expression of faith in the new alignment, an investment in France of sorts. His arrival in a suit of French craftsmanship would certainly have made a different statement than the "Almaine ryvet" crested...[and] chapeau...with ye image of Saint George" that Henry appareled himself in for his siege on France in 1513. The symbolic significance of the French armor is all the more compelling if one considers that less than two years earlier, Henry had been sent "certen odde peces...from Bulloigne at divers tymes the whiche the Frenchemen were slayne in." Another example of armor "courtesy" can be

---


23An "Almaine ryvet" consisted of a sallet (helmet), gorget, breast and backplate, and a pair of short faces.


25Ibid., 252.
seen when the Dukes of Norfolk and Cromwell, along with three others, ordered the well-reputed cuirasses of Brescia in Italy. The Doge and the Senate, who voted on a case by case basis as to whether or not arms and armor should be exported, decided that the armors should be given as gifts.\footnote{ibid., 252 footnote a.}

Such an interaction indicates something of the nature of Anglo-Brescian relations and that armor was deemed an appropriate means of expressing the latter's political gratitude for England's allegiance.

Only a small number of Greenwich armors produced during Henry's reign have survived to the present day. Extant armors seem to suggest that much of the workshops' production was devoted to supplying armors for Henry himself. Even one armor given as a gift to a French ambassador is believed to have been originally made for the King's use.\footnote{The provenance of the Genouilhac armor was the subject of a talk given by Claude Blair to the New York Arms and Armor Club in October, 1992. For a detailed study of the armor, see Helmut Nickel, "a harnes all gilté: A Study of the Armor of Galiot de Genouilhac and the Iconography of its Decoration", Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin (1972): 75-124.} Given the diverse references to spectacular armors of the King mentioned in Hall's \textit{Chronicles}, it can be concluded that furnishing Henry with consistently impressive defense, worthy of public attention, would be a time-consuming undertaking.\footnote{Such extravagance was not unique to Henry; one finds a similar passion for vast armor "wardrobes" in Charles V who reportedly had a new armor fashioned for every major event he attended.} The royal workshops were, in large part, a means of guaranteeing armors crafted to suit Henry's taste. The armors themselves were highly innovative, reflecting the
interest taken in producing a distinctive type and not merely copying from the German model (figure 8). The establishment of the workshops was, at least in part, motivated by a genuine desire on the part of Henry to develop armor which rivalled, if not surpassed, those produced on the Continent. The Greenwich armorer's product during Henry's reign is stylistically characterized by its rounded pauldrons (shoulder-defenses) constructed with internal leathers to connect upwardly overlapping plates (rather than the usual means of sliding rivets). 29 Both elegant and superbly functional, the Greenwich armors were one of the many opportunities in which Henry could attempt, as Loades has described, to prove that the Tudor court was "capable of challenging the highest standards of taste and refinement." 30

By 1527 Henry's armor workshops could function as the political tool he had so lacked upon his accession. At last, he could reciprocate with a gift-armor of his own, this time for a visiting French ambassador, Turenne, to whom he gave a Greenwich suit "said to be," reported one French narrator, "[among] the safest and easiest that are made." 31 It was not long until Henry, like Maximilian, embarked upon a series of royal presentations designed to enhance his magnificence in the eyes of Europe.

---

29 It is difficult to generalize the stylistic hallmarks of early Greenwich armors since most of the armors made for Henry were unique. Greenwich armors of the later sixteenth century can often be identified by the distinctive outward curve of the visor. I am grateful to Karen Watts for clarifying the evolution of the style. See Blair, 1958; and Laking, vol. III, chapter 24.

30 Loades, 6.

31 From the Narrative of Claude Dodieu, quoted in Anglo, Roll, 15.
Henry's gift of armor most germane to this study exists, unfortunately, only on record. An Augsburg inventory from 1519 mentions a roundel (shield) decorated with black and white bone, partly gilt, with a border of black samite, given as a gift from Henry to Maximilian.\textsuperscript{32} Such a record is exceptionally meaningful in that it confirms the idea of reciprocity which underlies the giving of gifts and royal favors. No such shield has been identified and it is not possible to establish the date or circumstances of the presentation. Whether the shield was the product of the newly created Greenwich workshops must thus remain conjectural. English bucklers (small shields) seem to have enjoyed a good reputation in Europe throughout the sixteenth century and so it seems that the gift to Maximilian would have been representative of Henry's finest military product. Like the gift-armor from Maximilian, the shield was richly decorated and intended as more of a symbol of friendship than as an implement of war. As a symbol, the shield was a particularly apt one; as an extension of the body's defense, it would have been a fitting response to the Emperor's 1514 gift of armor and to the military security which Maximilian had provided for Henry in France. The shield is not the only example of Tudor reciprocity; records exist for the presentation of an armor from Henry to a German prince, Laurence Stayber, in 1535. Thus, approximately twenty years after Maximilian's gift arrived in England, an armor had at last crossed the Channel en route to the country whence so many had previously emanated.

\textsuperscript{32}Dillon, "Westminster", 247.
In assessing the products of the Greenwich workshops it is interesting to observe that, decorative as many of the Greenwich armors may be, there seems to have been significantly less emphasis on armors which were strictly processional in nature. In this regard, Henry's patronage of armor seems to have differed from those of Maximilian and many sixteenth century French, Italian, and Spanish patrons who often had elaborately decorative armors designed for their parades and processions. Of the five surviving Greenwich armors which can be safely said to have been made for Henry, only one is processional in nature and even this seems to have been equipped with pieces to convert it into a combat armor.\textsuperscript{33} The English preference for the less ostentatious has been suggested as one way of accounting for this dearth\textsuperscript{34} but Hall's descriptions of Henry's public appearances in armor suggest otherwise. For his entry into Tournay (discussed in chapter three), for example, Henry is reported to have worn an armor encrusted with jewels. Although it is not possible to identify the craftsmen of the long-lost processional suit, it is conceivable that it was an armor of English provenance. Perhaps Henry's desire to use the armors in tournament rather than as showpieces explains the Greenwich predilection for armors of a more practical design. The

\textsuperscript{33}The silver and engraved armor (II.5 at the Royal Armouries, London). Blair notes that "the armour could have been used perfectly well in the field" were it not for the steel base (which could be removed) and the elaborate decoration. Blair, (1965): 1 footnote no.2.

\textsuperscript{34}See, for example, ffoulkes, 1912, 16.
aforementioned Henry armor\textsuperscript{25} fashioned with a steel base after the model of the imperial gift attests to Henry's interest in strictly decorative elements of armor. Other than this, however, the armors which Henry had made for himself and gave as gifts generally appear to have been decorated (in the case of the previously mentioned Genouilhac armor, even gilt) but essentially utilitarian in design.

Extant Innsbruck armors produced for Maximilian's own use indicate a similar penchant for armors which could be utilized in combat. Maximilian was a true soldier and his practical armors reflect this. Decoration, while sometimes present, is kept on the whole, subservient to functional utility. A decorated leg defense for the joust executed for Maximilian by Konrad Seusenhofer is one such example.\textsuperscript{36} Its surface is embellished with the "puffed and slashed" costume design which decorated the imperial gift-armor discussed in chapter 1. The patterning, however, is more restrained than that on the gift-armor and does not interfere with the overall defensibility of the piece for its use in the tournament.

One notable exception which has survived is the Emperor's processional bard decorated with the Labors of Hercules.\textsuperscript{37} The visual narrative it presents is obviously intended to associate the feats of the mythic hero with that of its

\textsuperscript{25}(II.5) at the Royal Armories, HM Tower of London.

\textsuperscript{36}(A163-s.116) at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.

\textsuperscript{37}(Inv. A 149) at the Real Armeria, Madrid. It is attributed to Kolman Helmschmied of Augsburg, ca. 1517-1518. For illustration and discussion of the bard see Resplendence, 130-137.
imperial rider. The tradition of classizing armors, which was most prevalent in Italy during the sixteenth century, did not win much favor in Germany and seems to have held very little currency in England.\textsuperscript{38} As Holy Roman Emperor, however, Maximilian obviously found the bard to be an ennobling work of art befitting his imperial status. Nevertheless, for his triumphal processions, such as his entry into Luxembourg in 1480, Maximilian opted for the austerity of a contemporary field armor rather than an armor of a more fantastical design as those found in many Italian spectacles.

The most extravagant example of the Emperor's self-aggrandizing use of armor for his own person exists, unfortunately, only on paper. A group of drawings by Albrecht Dürer executed in 1517 outline a design for an elaborate decorative armor for man and horse to be made in silver\textsuperscript{39} The drawings coincide with the Emperor's commissioning of the silver suit (steel plated with silver) in 1516 from the Augsburg armorer Koloman Colman. No elements of such a work survive and it seems probable that the costly project never progressed beyond the early stages of development. The drawings, nonetheless, reveal Maximilian's personal interest in processional armors and,

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{38}See John F. Hayward, "The Revival of Roman Armour in the Renaissance", in Art, Arms, and Armour, ed. Robert Held (Chiasso, Switz.: Aquafresca Editrice, 1979) 144-163.

\textsuperscript{39}Dürer's three drawings of the silver armor depict designs for the haute piece (Albertina, Winkler no. 678), the visor (Albertina, Winkler no.679), and what appears to be the cantle of the saddle (Pierpont Library, Winkler no.680). Two other armor drawings by Dürer are in the Print Cabinet at the Berlin Museum (Winkler no.'s 681 and 682) but they do not appear to be designs for the silver armor. I am grateful to Donald LaRocca for helping identify these pieces and their locations.}
in addition, demonstrate the use of prominent artists for the modelling of arms and armor.

The elaborate decoration of the silver suit and the Hercules bard were certainly not in keeping with the Emperor's motto of moderation: "Halt Mass" (Be moderate in all things). Maximilian understood that one could not afford to be frugal when one's royal reputation was at stake. It was for this reason that his gift-armors were almost exclusively ornate in character. The gift-armors which he bestowed to Henry and other sovereigns were intended as displays of prestige and were therefore often gilt in parts and artfully decorated. They served more as a _tour de force_ for the armorer (and by extension the patron) than as a reflection of what the Emperor was having produced for himself by his workshops.

Whereas the product of the armor workshops allows insight into the taste and image desired by the king, the means of distribution of the armor helps create a sense of the politics of the king's court. Through the royal armor workshops Henry had availed himself an additional courtly influence which Maximilian could not, given the nature of the various powerful princedoms within the Empire. Henry prohibited the purchase of armor from his workshops to all nobles. The only manner in which a Greenwich armor could be obtained was through a royal warrant from the King. What this did, in essence, was help secure his hegemonic control over all other English lords, both symbolically and materially. By controlling the production of armor Henry could hold the reins
over the distribution of what was considered the most salient visual attribute of chivalry; by deigning who was worthy to receive such a desirable honor, the king became a fount of knightly virtue whose example had to be followed if others wished to receive their due reward. Armor became synonymous with allegiance. Through this allegiance, most notably expressed in war, one could gain the greatest potential rewards, such as the Dukedom of Norfolk, granted to Thomas Howard for his victory at Flodden. An example of this system of royal leverage is the granting of a hosting harness (field armor) to Lord Lisle in 1534 in exchange for the possibility of his going to war for the King. Henry would, in so doing, be helping to protect Lisle’s life through the armor in return for Lisle’s helping to protect the interests of the realm.⁴⁰

A gift of armor represented a substantial monetary investment. The greater the recipient, the greater the armor was expected to be and, necessarily, the costlier. The total cost of the imperial gift-armor is difficult to assess because of the prolonged period involved in its production and the fact that several armors were being worked on simultaneously. The work of the extra armorers employed on the project alone cost 300 florins. The gold and silver for Henry’s cost at least 400 florins. The armor required approximately 17 silver marks and 50 ducats worth of material with an additional goldsmith’s fee of 5 guilders for every mark of silver. The armorer had to be paid, in addition,

⁴⁰A fine suit of armor could save a man’s life not only by physically protecting his person, but by signalling the monetary value which could be gained through his ransom should he be taken prisoner.
for the cost of tin, copper, and lead. In May of 1513, Seusenhofer received payment in the amount of 45 guilders 23 kreuzers and 11 marks for the completion of both the Charles and the Henry armor. He received a final payment in August of 1514 in the amount of 169 guilders 53 kreuzers 2 hellers for "expenses and work" on the Henry and Charles armors.\textsuperscript{41} Above this cost must be taken into account the annual salary Seusenhofer received as the master court armorer as well as those of his regular assistants (see below). Furthermore, payment had to be allotted for the transport of the armor from Austria to Augsburg and back and, finally, to England. It cost 80 guilders, for example, to send Hans Seusenhofer (brother of the armorer) to England with the armor to assure its safe passage and that the gift fit the king. Part of the reason Henry's armor took so long to complete, in fact, was because work could not continue until various craftsmen received their proper payment for labor and materials. To put this expenditure in better perspective, it can be compared with Maximilian's total expenditure of "pocket money" for 1512: 6,619 florins. The 300 florins spent on the gilding of the armors can itself be seen as a great expense when one compares it to the cost of an imperial feast for 140 persons in 1510, for which the Emperor paid under 20 florins total.\textsuperscript{42}

Processional armors were, like the Maximilian gift-armor, intended to be

\textsuperscript{41}All prices taken from Blair, (1965). Blair additionally points out that the Henry suit would have been the costlier of the two considering the larger size of his armor compared with the armor for Charles who was but thirteen at the time of its commission.

\textsuperscript{42}Banecke, 128.
showpieces and money was lavished on them with the intent of revealing their costliness. In the extreme, they could cost the equivalent of twelve years salary for a high-ranking courtier, as was the case with the harness given by Emperor Ferdinand I to his son, the Archduke Ferdinand, in 1547 which cost a princely 1256 guilders.

The standard of living of the master armorers of the period bears testimony to the great value which the kings placed upon them and their product. The armorer was at once a craftsman, a military supplyman, a businessman, and an artist. Each commission required the exercise of different degrees of each skill. For the gift-armors, the artistic rôle clearly dominated over the military demands which were negligible for a non-combat armor (although, first and foremost, an armor - be it for battle or dress - had to meet the practical demands of comfort and mobility). The gift-armor displays the versatility of the armorer as artist and craftsman. The "horned helmet" discussed in chapter 1 alone exhibits a mastery of several techniques in

\[43\] The cost of a presentation armor can be compared with the prices paid for less elaborate armors. It should be noted, however, that prices for both presentation and munition quality armors varied considerably. Much depended on the material cost and the reputation of the armorer. The price for the more common munition armors was, predicatably, more stable. Buying from the Continent, English ambassadors paid about 8 shillings per harness in 1509, 11 shillings in 1512, and 16 shillings in 1513. Compare this with the diverse range spent on higher quality armors. For personal orders, even for royal clients, the range was enormous. The French armorer producing the previously mentioned harness for Henry on the occasion of Mary's marriage was paid £66.4s.2d. in 1514. One year later, the king's armorer was paid only £19.16s.2d. for a harness, presumably, less intended for display. Jacob de Wat, an armorer working in England, was paid £24 for a harness in 1516 and received later the same year only £30 for three harnesses. Dillon, "Sir Henry Lee"; idem., "Westminster", 256 footnote a.

metalwork: embossing in the horns, etching around the eyes and at the sides of the helmet, gilding in the details of the mask, and pierced plates (now missing) above the visor. As businessmen, court armorers, particularly those affiliated with the forever-indebted Maximilian, had to be careful to collect their payments before the patron's debts ran too high. Often, nobles accrued bills so large with their contracted armorers that they granted them exemption from taxes as a means of appeasement. In trying to establish a workshop at Arbois, Maximilian offered two brothers 1000 francs, 1000 florins and exemption from taxes to set up a forge for three years. One brother agreed and by 1506 was owed 2000 florins by the Emperor.\footnote{Pfaffenbichler, 34.}

The positions in the royal workshops were salaried, unlike the private and arsenal armorers who generally worked on commission. The salaries of the master craftsmen working for the kings help guage the level of income earned by those considered among the most skilled in their field. These were individuals with whom the kings had very close contact and relied on for the defence of their lives. It was probably among the most important positions in the realm for, as Charles fioulkes has pointed out, the death of a king in battle could lead to the fall of a kingdom. Writing in 1513 on King Henry's decision to journey with his army to France, the Bishop of Durham noted that:
in the conserving of his noble person dependeth the weal and surety of his realm and all the nobles and others of his array, wheras of the contrary (which God defend!) the loss and destruction of all may follow.\textsuperscript{46}

Even in tournament scenarios an armor had to sustain considerable force for which confidence in the armorer was paramount. For parade and presentation armors, not their lives perhaps, but their pride was at stake, and for a king, this is arguably equally important. The great and trusted armorers of nobles rose to positions of great power during the sixteenth century, becoming a member of the city council in one case, and owning as many as six houses in another.\textsuperscript{47}

In Maximilian’s workshops the armorers received, in addition to their salary, a fee for completed work. In 1509, Konrad Seusenhofer accepted a contract for 2000 florin a year with the proviso that he work solely for the Emperor. This stipulation can be compared with master armorer Lorenz Helmschmied who worked for the Hapsburgs in Augsburg and was, in addition to this important clientele, patronized by the courts of Mantua and Urbino as well. Seusenhofer’s committing to such an exclusive agreement illuminates the lucrative potential of the position, both in finances and prestige. The relationship was evidently satisfactory for the Emperor who appointed Seusenhofer Court Armorer for life and in 1515, appointed him Keeper of the


\textsuperscript{47}As was the case with Maximilian’s armorer Hans Grünwalt. For discussion on the wealth of the armourer, see Pfaffenbichler, 48-55.
Imperial Armoury. Between 1511 and 1514, he delivered over an estimated 1000 pieces of armor from the royal workshop which, considering the commission on completed work, would have made Seusenhofer a very wealthy man. An armorer working at the armory at Graz, for example, was paid a mere 15 florins a year. The largess of the court salary is reflected even in the annual wages of Seusenhofer’s six journeymen who received 50 florin each, over three times more than the Graz armorer! Assuming 50 florins, which included lodging, could sustain a hard-working laborer, 2000 florin would appear as generous indeed. It is especially generous if compared to master craftsmen in other fields, like a master carpenter who received, at times, as little as one kreutzer a day more than his journeymen.\textsuperscript{46} In addition to this sum, Maximilian provided 1000 florin per year for the maintenance of the workshops and salaries of the assistants, which proved, nevertheless, insufficient for covering the cost of materials.\textsuperscript{49}

Early payment records for Greenwich, though less exacting in their detail, indicate that armorer working for the English court were also well respected. Unlike Maximilian, Henry was not impeded by frequent shortages of funds, particularly in the early phases of his reign when he could access the surplus left to him by his less spendthrift father. In 1511, the two armurers brought over from Milan, accompanied by three craftsmen, were paid a

\textsuperscript{46}Benecke, 61.

\textsuperscript{49}Pfaffenbichler, 34.
combined salary of £80 for two years.\textsuperscript{50} These pre-workshop armorers, along with those coming from Brussels, differed from the later court armorers in that they were not liveried and thus not restricted to working for the royal household.\textsuperscript{51} A court workshop required higher wages to compensate the craftsmen for the exclusiveness of the contract as well as for the cost of materials which had previously been invoiced to the King. Henry allotted £5500 per year to the Almain armorers, the King’s Watermen, Gentlemen ushers, Servers, Yoemen, and Grooms of the Privy Chamber.\textsuperscript{52} Monthly payments of £16.12s.6d. were issued to the armorers at Greenwich for July through September in 1515.\textsuperscript{53} Erasmus Kyrkenar, a master armorer working after Martin van Royne (c.1540’s), received the gentlemanly wages of £17 a year while assistant millmen received £15 and apprentices £9 plus cloth for clothing.\textsuperscript{54} This can be compared with the £20/year given in 1525 to members of the illustrious Austrian family of illuminators, the Horenbout, employed by Henry for the Tudor court.\textsuperscript{55} While the salary of the armorer was lower, the figure must be taken as a base salary which would have been supplemented by substantial prices received for individual commissions.

\textsuperscript{50}Watts, 1991, 42.
\textsuperscript{51}Ibid., 45.
\textsuperscript{52}Loades, 80.
\textsuperscript{53}Dillon, "Westminster", 250 footnote a.
\textsuperscript{54}Pfaffenbichler, 51.
\textsuperscript{55}Loades, 128.
Both Maximilian and Henry were tireless devotees of military sports and involved themselves in related events until age or injury forced them to desist. The royal armor workshops were requisite appendages to such passions and presumably sources of pleasure in their own right. A personal princely production of an identifiable style of armor would understandably be a source of pride and patriotism for both the wearer and the court society. The possible criticism that Henry had to seek out German, Italian, and Flemish armorers is diluted by the resulting creation of an English school of armor.\textsuperscript{56} Royal workshops also provided convenience in an age when shipping an armor from Innsbruck to London could be treacherous if relations with France were unsettled. The capture and seizure of an armorer and his harness en route to their client, the king of Sweden, in the mid-sixteenth century attests to the reality of this potential hazard.\textsuperscript{57} On a more practical level, as Karen Watts has pointed out, a suit of armor is best made to measure and the creation of a workshop alleviated the stress of long-distance tailoring alterations.

As Maximilian's gift suggests, the workshops also served as a kind of tilt-yard for princely competition. Unfortunately, Henry does not seem to have directly responded with a gift-armor of his own, but perhaps Maximilian's age

\textsuperscript{56} Greenwich armors, while distinct from continental works, are not without their indebtedness. Many features, particularly in the earlier suits, betray either strong Italian or German influence, as might be expected from the employment of foreign armorers. As has been mentioned, the imperial gift-armor and bard discussed in chapter 1 exercised a strong influence on the direction of early Greenwich production, even determining where foreign armorers were recruited.

precluded such an undertaking: the first recorded gift-armor presented from the
Greenwich workshop was well over a decade after Maximilian's death in 1519.
The now-missing shield from Henry suggests that there was, in fact, an
exchange of workshop products between the sovereigns. The very
establishment of the workshop by Henry, however, suffices as a reflection of
this royal reciprocity. The workshop challenge can be seen most readily in
Henry's preparation for the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520 which, although
slightly beyond the historical confines of this study, will be addressed toward
the conclusion of this paper.
III. The King's Uses of Armor

The possible reasons for the presentation of a fine suit of armor and its means of production (discussed in chapters 1 and 2) do not, in themselves, fully explain the significance of armor for both Maximilian and Henry. That armor was highly valued has been established. Why it was so esteemed and to what extent it was used by the kings still needs to be understood. Maximilian and Henry's gifts served as one passage in this visual dialogue of kings. Gift-armors underscore the relevance of armor as an esteemed possession. What was the relevance? Did a king, in fact, equip himself for battle and enter the fray or was he simply expected to parade his militancy and to let others decide the nation's fate on the battlefield? How, in essence, does armor relate to the expected roles of Maximilian and Henry as early sixteenth century sovereigns and military leaders?

This chapter undertakes to isolate the circumstances in which the kings utilized armor for practical purposes and, in so far as is possible, to untangle the symbolic ramifications of such appareling. The line between real and symbolic usage inevitably blurs as most activities of the sovereign take on symbolic overtones by virtue of his exalted status. There was, however, clearly
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an initial utilitarian purpose for armor out of which the symbolic significance evolved. It would perhaps be easier to view the underlying impetus for the employment of armor by subdividing the activities of the sovereigns into the categories of war and tournament, followed in the final chapter by an analysis of their depictions in royal portraiture and other artistic medium. In so doing, we can procure a clearer sense of the myriad of connotations and references which armor and the king were expected to fulfill.

From the beginning of Maximilian's reign as King of Rome in 1486 to the end of Henry's in 1547, armor underwent significant changes in design and utility. The battle-hardened example of Maximilian featured prominently in the formative years of Henry's reign. It is therefore instructive to preface their mutual affiliations and views on armor with a preliminary overview of Maximilian's evolution in military matters.

Maximilian's military sensibilities were formulated at the height of what has been dubbed the "Great Period" of the armorer's art (c.1410-c.1500).¹ It was during this phase, with the development of full plate (or "white") armor, that the steadfast image of the "knight in shining armor" emerged. Maximilian, born in 1459, entered in the midst of these technical innovations and was immersed in the strategic implications of the increasingly invulnerable knight. The "White King" received his first "white" armor at the impressionable age of six from his uncle, Duke Siegmund in 1465. Maximilian remained, throughout his life, both

¹Blair, 1958, 77-107.
a preeminent product and producer of the developments in the field of armor. Indeed, the "Maximilian" style of armor, which emerged during the latter half of his reign, outlasted his life by about fifteen years; though the label may be post-facto, it stands as a testament to his promotion of and devotion to the armorer's craft.

While Maximilian may have had his roots in the eclipse of medieval knightly traditions, he revealed himself to be a quintessential Renaissance ruler and is often cited as one of the leading figures in the development of the modern German nation.² He was, as Benecke notes, Machaivelli's Prince and Castiglione's Courtier rolled into one. His keen interest in armor and in fashioning himself as "the Last Knight" did not preclude his involvement with the latest military innovations and the modernization of his forces. One of his most notable contributions toward the improved efficiency of the armed forces was his formation around 1486 of the landsknecht, a highly proficient group of mercenaries organized in the service of the empire. Modelled on the Swiss units whose disciplined pike phalanxes proved so devastating to cavalry charges, the landsknecht served as a precursor to the idea of a standing army which Machiavelli would so extoll at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Maximilian was also a dedicated enthusiast of the development of firearms, an art in many ways threatening to those of the armorer and the ideals of chivalric combat. The desire for victory on the battlefield, however, relegated any

²See, for example, Hughes, 1-29.
qualms about the effects of modernization to the rear ranks. The armorer and
the chivalric ideal would have to rise to the occasion and defend themselves
against the advances in firepower. Maximilian, for his part, pursued an
expansive program of native gun-founding, filling his arsenals with a variety of
artillery and firearms. As is inscribed upon his *Triumphal Arch* (discussed in
chapter 4): "For strong cannons, he [Maximilian] declared,/ No expense should
now be spared."\(^3\)

The potential for a mounted nobleman to be killed by a random shot
from a common foot-soldier posed challenges to the armorer and the nobility
on both a strategical and psychological level.\(^4\) The image of the knight errant
of the Middle Ages was, while perhaps always more mythic than real, an ideal
entrenched in the collective psyche of the warrior class which was becoming
increasingly overshadowed by the impersonality of modern warfare.\(^5\)
Maximilian's ability to render the venerable figure of the noble knight adaptable
to the changing nature of warfare which threatened to render it obsolete proved
both politically and socially central to his reign. The weapons with which he


\(^5\) As Donald LaRocca has pointed out in conversation, the conception of the knight as a
relatively self-sufficient unit had begun to dwindle by as early as the thirteenth century, long before
the time of Maximilian. By Maximilian's reign, the status of free imperial knights had been greatly
diminished. The steadily increasing loss of independence of the knightly class in Germany
culminated in the organized knightly rebellion of 1522 which was put down in 1523. Had it not been
for their incorporation into the imperial court following their defeat, the knights would probably have
disappeared as a distinct class and power. See Hughes, 15.
carried forth the crusade of the knightly ideal were not only the sword and warhammer but the pen and the medium of the woodcut as well. With the former two instruments he could legitimate his claim to princely valor while with the latter two he could assure its widespread dissemination.

Maximilian armed himself with the attributes of knighthood in part because it was accepted as an honorable code of life and in part as a means of self-promoting propaganda. In both cases, armor was an essential component of such a code. Its role fluctuated between catering to the need for new improved defensibility and mobility on the battlefield and fulfilling the desire for chivalric associations at the court. Between the destructiveness of the field and the spectacle of the court lay the tournament. Here, behind the relative safety of his armor, the king could prove his mettle, glorify his dynasty, and reinforce the centrality of his sovereignty all under the auspices of chivalric tradition.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the attempt to discern the underlying motives for a king’s appearance in armor is a complex undertaking. Reasons for wearing a particular costume at a particular time range from the obvious to the most subtle of cultural mores. The soldier’s uniform - analogous in many respects to an armor for this period - bears with it a cavalcade of semiotic relationships well beyond the confines of this study. Political leaders have long engaged (and continue to still) in the usurpation of military pageantry as a means towards their own greater empowerment.
The suit of armor, with its roots paralleling the rise of the knight of the Middle Ages, had developed by the sixteenth century into a potent symbol of the glorious past of the nobility, a nobility which was coming to feel increasingly threatened by the rise of the middle class and their resulting decrease of autonomy. Long unchallenged as feudal lords, the nobility sensed the encroachment of commoners' blood on all fronts. Just as their economic domination was beginning to erode with increased urbanization, so too was their military autonomy diminishing with the rise of the mercenary class. For the nobility, armor served as a vestige of their continued élite status. Armor reaffirmed their own sense of their heritage and military authority. It seems fitting, given its true function, that armor should have emerged as a symbol of the nobility's quest for self-preservation. Maximilian and Henry utilized armor and the pageantry of the knight to harness the nobility's need for solidarity to the service of the state. By consciously imaging themselves as the very personification of the chivalric ideal the sovereigns set a precedent upon which a court hierarchy - based on these ideals - could be established with the king at its head. Let us first turn our attention to the manner in which the kings reified these ideals on the field of battle.

The Kings' Participation in War

The idea of the king as warrior-chief resonates through time immemorial.
Indeed, the esteem imparted to a sovereign has often hinged upon his success or failure in the field. The "greatness" of Alexander the Great, for example, can be attributed first and foremost to his ambitious bellicosity which drove him further and further into enemy territory in pursuit of the laurels of victory. War, it must be understood, was held throughout most of Western history - and notably so during the sixteenth century - to be a glorious venture.\textsuperscript{6} Pacifism was, as Hale illustrates, "stridently anti-establishment."\textsuperscript{7} It was incumbent upon the sovereign not only to protect his own provinces, but to engage in war when peace would be deemed dishonorable. The king’s presence in battle was interpreted as a primary legitimating element in the determination of a "just war."\textsuperscript{8}

Although both Maximilian and Henry indefatiguably engaged their forces in extended military campaigns, their personal involvement in the conflicts differed considerably. We will turn first to Maximilian’s personal involvement in war, then to Henry’s, and thirdly to their mutual endeavors in France, the only occasion where the two sovereigns ever met. By looking at the nature of their participation in warfare we can better assess the differentiation between the royal image which they sought to cultivate and the royal reality which they

\textsuperscript{6}Hale, (1962): 19.

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., 35.

\textsuperscript{8}Hale cites the following traits as components of a just war according to the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century: a war waged with right intention, moderate means, and at the command of legitimate authority; Ibid., 20.
enacted. The employment of armor, it shall be seen, is central to the formulation of both kingly constructs.

If we are to understand the king’s use of armor in war for this period a preliminary note should first be made on the utilization of armor by contemporary soldiers against which the model of the king may be compared. The early sixteenth century was the last time in which full plate armor was worn in battle as a matter of course. It was the reserve of the heavy cavalry: a bastion of nobility which served as the premier shock forces through the strength of their charge and the impact of their lances. Encased in steel, they have been compared, anachronistically, to the modern tank. One can readily imagine that the psychological impact of an oncoming, armored, equestrian regiment would have been almost as devastating as the collision itself.

Below the heavy cavalry in prestige was the light cavalry which rose to prominence in the late fifteenth century. They were equipped in three-quarter armors (that is to say, from the knees up) which allowed for increased mobility but resulted in increased vulnerability as well. As the sixteenth century progressed, they were often armed with increasingly accurate hand-held firearms, which proved an effective threat to the more cumbersomely equipped heavy cavalry.

One significant change in the practice and psychology of warfare during the sixteenth century is the changing status of the common foot-soldier.

---

Combat on foot had long been regarded by the nobility as ignoble. Increased organization and the evolution of firepower, however, brought about a reappraisal of such absoloute heirarchies of prestige. By the period of the Italian Wars (1494-1529) it was no longer deemed inappropriate for a member of the nobility to command a regiment of foot-soldiers. Taken as a total force, a well-disciplined group of foot-soldiers could resist the thunderous impact of the heavy cavalry. Individually, however, they were often minimally protected with an open helmet and munition-quality armor protecting the upper half of their body.

The choice of armor utilized by the king would serve not only to reinforce his wealth and command, but to visually associate himself with a particular socio-military enclave. For the most part, the choice and decoration of armor worn by a nobleman was dictated by circumstance and personal preference. Because of the wide variety of armors and decorations available, a king’s preference for a particular form of defense can be seen to illuminate his inclinations, be them towards combat or procession. By appearing in a full-armor, the sovereigns allied their sympathies and stature with their fellow nobles of the heavy cavalry. It was a politically expedient means of uniting the...

---

10 The attitude of the English nobility towards the foot-soldier was a notable exception. Oman states that during the fifteenth century, the English had in fact ceased to fight on horseback. For Henry’s 1513 invasion of France many English gentlemen enlisted as “spears afoot.” Throughout his reign, Henry went to great lengths to expand the heavy cavalry which consisted largely of foreign mercenaries. The small native English cavalry was comprised largely of “demi-lances” (half- armored men on unbaired horses) although Henry’s “gentlemen pensioners” formed the core of the heavy cavalry. Sir Charles Oman, History of the Art of War in the XVI Century (London: Methuen & Co., 1937) 289-90. I am grateful to Donald LaRocca for bringing this to my attention.
powerful, often quarreling factions of their realm. Such gestures are not insignificant. With the rise of the foot-soldier, particularly in later centuries, the sovereign often chose to win the favor of the common troops by presenting himself in a less ostentatious uniform. Napoleon, with his plain gray overcoat, is a case in point. Maximilian was a sovereign who understood well the need for solidarity across the ranks. He could present himself as alternately majestic and informal. An image which appears in Der Weisskunig (figure 9) portrays Maximilian on foot in an unadorned military outfit conversing with his mercenary troops of diverse origin. By appealing to the mercenary landsknecht through such gestures of camaraderie Maximilian enhanced his chances of maintaining discipline over a very tempermental group of potential brigands.\textsuperscript{11}

For the most part, however, Henry and Maximilian required the allegiance of their fellow nobles for their frequent declarations of war which necessitated regional musters headed by the local nobility. It was thus vital that they present their cause as being in the common interests of the nobility; this was particularly true for Maximilian, who was plagued with occasionally rebellious principalities within his Empire.\textsuperscript{12} Harnessed in the knightly armor of the heavy cavalry, the king asserted his majesty as a warrior and a

\textsuperscript{11}The image is intended to display Maximilian's genius by showing him conversing in seven different languages with the mercenaries. Thus the interaction succeeds in showing Maximilian simultaneously at one with the common soldiers in deed and above them in authority and intellect.

\textsuperscript{12}In 1500, for example, a group of imperial princes at Augsburg withdrew support from the Emperor in favor of a council consisting of twenty-one electors and princes. The small secession failed, however, on account of counter-measures taken by Maximilian.
nobleman. Both Maximilian and Henry were the sons of newly established dynasties, Frederick III and Henry VII, respectively. They may have particularly felt the need to declare their commitment to the interests of the nobility while reaffirming their own place among its ranks.

Warfare is the predominant element of Maximilian's reign. If one could crystallize his foreign policy it would be that of marriage for gain where possible, war when such options were unavailable or thwarted. His energies were devoted to expansionist policies against France and Venice which lead to continuous war in the Low Countries and northern Italy. The scourge of the Turks on his eastern border lead to costly military engagements in Hungary and increasing but futile pleas for financial support for a crusade.

"My true home," declared Maximilian, "is in the stirrup, the overnight rest and the saddle."\textsuperscript{13} Maximilian's personal reflection underscores both his peripatetic nature and his soldiering existence. Armor was clearly more than an authoritative symbol for Maximilian; it was a cornerstone of his existence. A survey of his surviving armors\textsuperscript{14} bears testimony to the military role which he fulfilled throughout his life.

Maximilian was a military commander who led by example. Though certainly not always successful, he was at least present among his troops in

\textsuperscript{13}Quoted in Benecke, 13.

\textsuperscript{14}Several elements of Maximilian's armors for the field and tournament are preserved in the Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum. See Bruno Thomas and Ortwin Gamber, \textit{Katalog der Leibrustkammer}, vol.1, (Vienna: Anton Schrol & Co., 1976).
the heat of the battle. Often, his participation imperilled his safety. In 1504, for example, during a battle outside Regensburg, Maximilian led a cavalry charge against Czech mercenaries who succeeded in pulling him off his charger with their halberds.\textsuperscript{15} Only a cavalry rally by his fellow general spared him from certain death on the field. Even prior to his emperorship, Maximilian pursued his policies through the sword. As co-regent of the Netherlands he channeled his energies into building a mercenary fighting force in order to counter the encroaching claims of the French king, Louis XI. As emperor, Maximilian encouraged his officers to dismount when necessary and fight among their men. Such participation was, as previously mentioned, long frowned upon by the upper classes, but Maximilian set the precedent himself when, as a duke at the age of nineteen, he fought along side his foot-soldiers at the battle of Guinegate in 1479.

Even when incapacitated by old age and hindered by an injured leg, Maximilian continued to exert his presence on the battlefield. Though he ceased to participate in the conflict itself, he presided over his troops and commanded the placement and movement of his forces. The last years of his life were spent attempting to consolidate his vast and volatile empire. In the final year of his life, with death imminent, the Emperor departed from Innsbruck on route to Vienna where he planned to organize a crusade against the Turks. Although he did not live to complete the journey, he successfully fulfilled his

\textsuperscript{15}Benecke, 17.
mission as "the Last Knight," dying while pursuing the chivalrous crusading ideal.

Turning to Henry one finds a rather different scenario in terms of royal participation in combat. Though certainly no less bellicose in his early politics, Henry's actual involvement proved slightly more restrained than that of his Austrian brother-in-arms. Henry's youth was undoubtedly affected by the example of Maximilian. By the time of the English monarch's ascension in 1509, however, the circumstances of military strategy were beginning to alter. Full plate armor continued to be utilized by the heavy cavalry but the increased use of artillery and the growing impersonality of organized warfare necessitated a change in the manner in which the fully-armored knight (or king) conducted himself. Personal feats of arms, so central to the chivalric ethos, were increasingly sacrificed to the efficiency of organized units and the effectiveness of mercenaries unconcerned with issues of knightly honor.

Despite the transition towards a more modern deployment of forces, the presence of the king remained a vital element of battle throughout the sixteenth century. The increased regimentation of armies, in fact, rendered the commander-in-chief an even greater asset by its creation of a clear, centralized chain of command. The large-scale mobilization of troops in an era of slow communications required a leader who could easily transmit commands to his officers. For a king to exercise authority over an often mutinous composite of mercenaries and commoners his presence on (or at least near) the battlefield
was crucial. The results of the commander's absence can be seen in the
debacle of the English army's first invasion of France in 1512 in which Henry
attempted to delegate orders from England. After prolonged waivering and
inactivity, the misguided army returned to England as the laughing-stock of
Europe.

Henry's skills were required more as a tactician than as a soldier. Because his presence as a commander was of such paramount importance, his participation in battle would therefore have to be curtailed to assure his safety. Unlike Maximilian, Henry took "good heed...to avoid all manner of
dangers"\textsuperscript{16} during times of war. When travelling in France in 1513, he was
protected by an entourage of some 16,000 men. To get through to the king the
enemy would have had to penetrate the ranks of the light cavalry escort, walls
of wagons (twelve of which transported the king's wooden house) and cannons,
the renowned English archers, lines of billmen, the king's personal bodyguard,
and the standard-bearer.\textsuperscript{17} He travelled with the comfort of all the amenities
of his court at Greenwich, with over 2000 servants replete with minstrels,
chambermaids, and a wardrobe staff.

On a symbolic level, however, the king still had to be perceived as an
active and valorous warrior whose actions inspired both his troops and his court
poets. Polydore Vergil, an Italian priest in Henry's service, lauded the King's

\textsuperscript{16}Quoted in Cruickshank, 83.
\textsuperscript{17}Cruickshank, 30.
valliant departure for France, expounding upon how "many considered it perilous that the King in the first flush of his youthful maturity in arms should expose himself to the dangers of so great a war."  

The tradition of the warrior-king was invested upon him not only from his Austrian contemporary but by the powerful precedent of the English medieval monarchs as well. Henry rode into France armed with the glorious legacy of Edward I, Edward III, and Henry V who had taken the same path across the Channel to victory. Henry felt the need to equal or surpass the martial achievements of his ancestors and to this he whole-heartedly dedicated the first decade of his reign. For Henry, a king of the Renaissance, glory was still to be earned on the terms of his medieval forerunners. This sense of a noble continuum was clearly addressed by Polydore Vergil when he wrote:

It behoved him [Henry] to enter upon his first military experience in so important and difficult a war in order that he might ...create such a fine opinion about his valour among all men that they would clearly understand that his ambition was not merely to equal but indeed to exceed the glorious deeds of his ancestors.

Henry's first encounter with the enemy demonstrates that even with precautions, there existed the possibility of the king engaging in battle. While

---

18Quoted in Cruickshank, 7.
19That Henry was inspired by the model of Henry V can be evidenced by his commissioning and translating an early life of Henry V at the beginning of his reign. Scarisbrick, 23.
Henry was setting an example for his troops by being the first to wade across a river, English reconnaissance reported the approach of French troops. According to English chroniclers, Henry led his forces to a defensive position and supervised the placement of artillery. The French account alleges that Henry ignobly dismounted and placed himself in the middle of his mercenary forces.\textsuperscript{21} The discrepancy between the reports indicates the perceived significance of the king's behavior in battle. In either case, the French did not attack. There was, however, one telling incident which reflects on the changing nature of warfare for this period. A French knight reportedly approached the English forces and issued a challenge to single combat in the chivalric spirit.\textsuperscript{22} That the challenge went unaccepted casts light on the growing shadow of knightly traditions.

Henry's travelling to France with a wardrobe staff consisting of forty-nine servants indicates the importance of the image of the king at the front. His behavior and appearance were calculated to impress. Henry is described as arriving in 1513 in an "Almaine ryvet crested." As Dillon elucidates, the reference to the armor as being crested probably denotes its fluted surface which further highlights the king's indebtedness to contemporary "Maximilian"

\textsuperscript{21} Cruickshank, 38-39.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
style armors (see chapter 2). Prior to Henry, English nobles had tended to favor Italianate armors. Henry, himself, as previously mentioned, had ordered an armor from Milan prior to receiving the imperial gift-armor. The exceptional quality of German harnesses coupled with Henry’s admiration of Maximilian seems to have provided an incentive for a shift of patronage amongst the nobility towards a more Northern taste. The Emperor thus provided not only the vitally needed alliance for Henry’s arrival, but the equally valued armor for the young monarch’s survival and pagaentry.

Upon his arrival in France in 1513, Henry’s first public spectacle was to enter the church of St. Nicholas in Calais dressed in full armor and offer prayers of devotion to God and war. The intention of the gesture is virtually palpable; Henry succeeded in amalgamating the piety of the church with the heroic pursuit of "righteous" war which together encompass the ideals of chivalry. The imagery of the armored king consecrating his militancy in the church serves as a poignant reminder of the religious pretense which provided

---

23Dillon, "Westminster."

24English monarchs seem to have favored Milanese armors at least as early as the mid-fourteenth century. Probably the most well-known instance of the English nobility’s patronage of Italian armorer occurred during the reign of Richard II (1377-99) when Henry Bolinbroke sent a party to Milan to procure an armor for his combat against the Earl Marshal.

25Henry is described as arriving in France wearing, in addition to his fluted armor, a helmet from Montauban, a region in France. His harness was thus not entirely indebted to Maximilian’s influence. Furthermore, that a king should wear a French helmet during his invasion of France beckons caution in making absolutist claims about the political connotations of wearing certain armors. In some instances, as with the Montauban helmet, the king’s selection may simply be a matter of what was regarded as the finest quality armor, regardless of provenance.

26Scarisbrick, 35.
the blessings for the king's personal mission of glory. It was, after all, Pope Leo X who had called for action against Louis XII, even investing Henry with the French king's title, "Most Christian King of France." The papal confirmation advocating war enabled Henry to convince his less-martially inclined advisors of the necessity for action. Both personal and religious glory could thus be captured on the battlefield. Arriving from the west on the coastline of Calais, with the Red Cross of St. George upon his brooch, the King may well have envisioned the image of the Lord as depicted in Isaiah:

[Wearing] righteousness as a breastplate,/ and 
a helmet of salvation upon his head;/ he put on 
garments of vengeance for clothing,/ and wrapped 
himself in fury as a mantle/...to the coastlands he 
will render requital./ So they shall fear the name 
of the LORD from the west.../ for he will come like 
a rushing stream.... 27

The appropriation of religious allusions by the monarch was not intended to be subtle. Such ecclesiastical arrogations served as the ultimate vindication for the secular sovereign's divine right to declare war. This gradual transference of central authority from the religious to the secular ruler has been cited as one of the hallmarks for the emergence of the modern nation in the Renaissance. 28 Henry, it will be recalled, did not long heed the instruction of the Catholic Church. Early in his reign, however, it served his purposes well and he unsheathed its righteous fervor to reflect his own majesty. Tudor

28See, for example, Strong, 3-19.
pageants, as Anglo has noted, borrowed biblical military images for the aggrandizement of the dynasty. The pageant for the Entry of Katherine in 1501, for example, utilized Pauline language to associate Prince Arthur with divinity through the "spiritual armor of Justice." So too did Henry, empowered by the Pope, seek to dispense justice through the "whole armor of God" (Ephesians 6:13). Armor, through such calculated symbolic associations, became an integral icon of the king's commitment to righteousness. Fighting under the banner of St. George, the patron saint of England, Henry succeeded in serving homage to God while allowing God to serve him in pursuing his less spiritual objectives.

When Maximilian joined Henry at Marquise, fifteen miles west of Calais, in 1513, the Emperor pledged to serve with his troops under the command of Henry and the banner of St. George. Their initial encounter was brief, private, and business-like. They dined together and, according to one observer, "showed such cordiality that one might suppose them father and son rather than brothers." Henry much desired to commence the siege on Thérouanne while Maximilian apparently displayed some reservations. Any doubts which

---

39 Holy Bible, RSV, 2 Corinthians 6:7, Quoted in Anglo, 1969, 84.
30 Paul Armstroff, "To Margaret of Savoy," Aug. 15, 1513; in Mumbley, 204.
31 Maximilian probably desired the siege on Thérouanne just as much if not more than Henry. As one of the gateways to the Low Countries, it would have provided the Emperor with greater security against French aggression. It would appear, as Cruickshank has highlighted, to have been in Henry's greater strategical interest to lead an assault on Boulogne but Maximilian may have had his own designs on Thérouanne and convinced the impressionable young monarch to conform to his will. Cruickshank, 29.
Maximilian entertained must have been alleviated by the £20,000 promised to him by Henry with the additional provision of £20 per day as a living allowance.\textsuperscript{32}

Their second formal meeting provides a better glimpse of the public spectacle so central to their authority and this paper. In the interim, the siege of Thérouanne had begun and both sovereigns had returned to their camps. While the cannons bombarded the French town, Henry entertained (and was entertained by) the court of Margaret of Savoy in Lille. Henry evidently did not consider his obligations to revolve completely around soldiering. The war against France was noble, but the entertainment of the court was, for Henry, equally kingly. The manner in which he accompanied his troops, with his insistence on rich tents for his own person, suggests that he viewed the battlefield essentially as an extension of his courtly life. He does at least seem to have been present for the only significant engagement of the campaign, the Battle of Spurs at Guinegate, in which the English army compelled the French cavalry to retreat. He seems to have commanded his forces from behind but it is not clear as to whether he participated in the cavalry’s pursuit.\textsuperscript{33} As Hall chronicles the encounter, Henry was eager to pursue with the cavalry, but was dissuaded by his council of war who insisted he remain behind. The victory at

\textsuperscript{32}The enormity of this sum can be gauged against the four shilling a day wage earned by an English captain, which was deemed "barely enough to live honestly." Quoted in Cruickshank, 69.

\textsuperscript{33}Cruickshank, 103.
Guinegate was particularly poignant in that it was at that very location in 1479 where Maximilian earned one of his greatest early victories against Louis XI of France. Maximilian, who was encamped at the nearby fortress of Aire when the Battle of Spurs began, arrived with an escort of thirty men-at-arms to witness the King’s first great victory.\(^{34}\) Although Henry did not dismount and fight among his soldiers as Maximilian had done over thirty years earlier, he could now claim to be walking in the Emperor’s martial footsteps.

Approximately one month after the siege on Thérouanne had begun, Henry arrived to survey the progress and ceremoniously fire a few cannons. Maximilian joined him nearly two months later with much needed military advice. Outside a tent of cloth of gold, the sovereigns met in the full panolpy of stately majesty. Henry, bedecked in a jeweled coat and a light armor, had an escort of 2500 men while behind him, nine servants carried his sword and his heavy field-armor. Maximilian, also appareled in robes of state, was accompanied by a train of 1500 men.\(^{35}\) Only the rain dampened the splendor of the courtly interlude. One month later, the town was defeated and, perhaps uncertain as to which sovereign should gain possession, was destroyed.

The two sovereigns turned their attention next to the town of Tournay. Following Maximilian’s tactical counsel, Henry personally directed the artillery bombardment on the town. After much destruction and diplomacy the town

\(^{34}\)Oman, 293.

\(^{35}\)Cruickshank, 85.
surrendered, thereby concluding the campaign. Henry could finally boast of achieving his long-desired victory. It was a triumph which cost him a staggering £900,000.36

Accounts of Henry and Maximilian’s entry into Tournay read - not surprisingly - like a description of a Roman general’s triumphant return from battle. As Hall detailingly recounts the episode37 Henry led the procession in a braid of cloth of silver, edged with cloth of gold, and bordered with red roses; his armor was freshly burnished and set with jewels. Maximilian, perhaps sensing the young king’s enthusiasm and content with the services rendered him, deferred the main honors to England and Henry. Henry received the keys to the city with the Emperor and the “banqueting, plays, comedies, masques, and other pastimes”38 soon followed. The celebrations included the knighting of forty-nine soldiers and, the sovereigns’ preferred activity, jousting. Maximilian, well beyond his prime, observed but did not participate in the youthful festivities. Henry more than made up for the Emperor’s absence, impressing the French and German spectators alike. An ambassador noted that Henry was attired in “the most sumptuous manner imagineable.”39 It was additionally noted, however, that the tunic which he wore over his armor had been previously seen by the public. Clearly, the attention paid by the king to

36 Crowson, 74.
37 Hall, 1542, (1809), 553; Cf. Cruickshank, 127.
38 Ibid.
39 Quoted in Cruickshank, 136.
his appearance did not go unnoticed. Inexhaustible opulence was expected of him and even the slightest deviation was perceived as an impropriety.

Henry's foray into France was not about territory. The gains he made on the Continent were hardly significant and, what's more, were quickly regained by France after his departure. The mission was not financially inspired; his expenditure far exceeded his gain. What Henry sought was personal glory and so, any military and financial service which he bequeathed to Maximilian were repaid in kind. Maximilian had long proved his courage in battle to the princes of Europe. Henry, on the other hand, required the victories at Thérouanne and Tournay, as tactically trivial as they may have been, to compete with the martial accomplishments of his continental contemporaries. Foreign policy on the Continent was based on, and decided by, war. By becoming a warrior, Henry became a political player.

It can be surmised that the organizational skills and martial fervor of both sovereigns far outweighed their tactical acumen. Neither were generals of notable innovation or, for that matter, remarkable success. What is crucial in assessing the contemporary estimation of their military prowess is their presence and perceived bravery on the field of battle. Both sovereigns participated in the bombardments, but as there were no pitched battles, they avoided the hazards of close-quarter combat. Their armors served them as effective decorations, imparting to them the necessary martial status. Concern for image more than safety often prompted the sovereigns to wear their armor
during the campaign. The royal entry into Tournay is a case in point; an armor decorated with jewels would hardly be appropriate for the conditions of battle. Their appearance and costume, it may be reiterated, were as political as the events in which they participated. They were warrior-kings to be remembered by their radiant armors as much as by their victories.

The Kings' Participation in the Tournament

To grapple with the armored image of the sovereigns in all their splendor, one must turn to the pageantry of the tournament. There can one find the spectacle, politics, martial fervor, and artistic ambitions of the king and his courtly culture. This section shall address the manner in which Maximilian and Henry utilized the long-established knightly form of competition as a means of asserting their omnipotence through pomp, costume, and action. Armor was an essential appendant to this chivalric mise-en-scène. It was at the tournament that armor and the king were most frequently united. Facing his oncoming opponent, the king called upon his armor to serve him in its most ancient and practical usage: protection. That is not to say that it did not fulfill a symbolic role as well. On the contrary, the king, armed with a lance and harnessed in steel, was deliberately fashioned through dialogue and images, to invoke the image of the mythic and real kings of medieval lore.
For Maximilian and Henry, the tournament was more than a spirited game; it was the governing ethos which provided center stage for the image and message of the ruler. It was, in essence, an opportunity - albeit one which required proficient training - for the king to impress the courtiers and commoners with his wealth and prowess. Tournaments resonate as nodal points celebrating most significant events and holidays during the sovereign's reign. The manner in which the king presented himself at these grand events drew predominantly upon the glories of his dynasty, the history of the tournament, and the literature of knightly romances. Performing in the company of ambassadors and princes, their actions and appearance earned them an international reputation. The tournament was thus viewed by the kings as a prime source of propaganda as well as personal pride and pleasure. Writing in 1515, an Italian ambassador in London remarked that King Henry:

exerted himself to the utmost [at the tournament], for the sake of the ambassadors and more particularly on account of Pasqualigo (who is returning to France to-day) that he may be able to tell King Francis what he has seen in England and especially in regard to his Majesty's [Henry] own prowess.⁴⁰

Unlike their allied participation in war, the two leaders never met at the tilt-yard. Maximilian's old age coupled by a recurring ailment in his leg prevented him from engaging in any forms of combat towards the later years of his life. Both sovereigns were present for the jousts celebrating the entry into

⁴⁰Nicolo Sagudino, "To Alvise Foscarî," Murnby, 346.
Tournay, but only Henry participated while the elder statesman withdrew once the revelries began. Despite the Emperor's absence for the event Henry had an opportunity to leave a favorable impression on the Prince of Castile and Margaret of Savoy who witnessed his great chivalric skills. It is, nevertheless, Maximilian to whom we shall turn first as it was his passionate enthusiasm in the tournament which brought about many of the innovations which would influence Henry during the period studied here.

To do justice to the origins of the Emperor's tournament inspirations, one would have to credit the glorious spectacle of the Burgundian courts which so greatly influenced the young Maximilian during his visit at the age of eighteen. It was from this rich tradition that much of the visual trappings of Maximilian and, later, Henrician pageantry derived. Of particular importance was the Burgundian precedent of the grand tournament fête with its element of disguising and employment of allegory. These carnivalesque features surrounding the personage of the potentate were a crucial development in the effort to render the nobility and knightly class subservient to the king. As such, they provided the foundation for the formation of laws controlling the ruling classes and, ultimately, the evolvement of nations.

The central element of the spectacle was the joust in which two

---


42See Strong; 11-19, and Jackson, 1990.
mounted, heavily armored opponents charged at each other with wooden lances. The object was either to dismount their adversary or break their lance against a particular element of the other's armor depending on the rules of the particular tournament. Although not intended to inflict serious injuries, there was the frequent risk of accident. For Maximilian and Henry, the joust often posed a greater threat of fatality than their participation in war. King Henry II of France, for example, was killed in a tournament in 1559 when his opponent's lance shattered into his helmet. Henry VIII, himself, was once knocked unconscious for over two hours as the result of a fall from his horse during a jousting encounter. At no time during the siege on Thérouanne or Tournay did either monarch incur such a direct hit. The tournament was, despite its many safety precautions, truly a display of the king's courage. It was a calculated risk which paid handsome returns in terms of the respect showered upon the kings for their frequent success.

A survey of Maximilian's copious propagandistic images (discussed in the final chapter) reveals the overwhelming emphasis placed on the importance of the tournament as well as the vast range of forms which it took. Many of the variations on the joust in the late fifteenth century are attributed to Maximilian. The *Triumph of Maximilian* woodcuts, commissioned in 1512, contain fourteen images devoted to knights armored for different forms of jousting. Each type of joust required a specific armor of varying thickness and design which was determined by the nature of the impact and the overall objective of the contest.
By the sixteenth century, there had emerged three main types of tournament armor. To supply a separate armor for each event, in addition to armors for field combat (of which there were an additional five possibilities), was a luxury that even few nobles could afford. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Augsburg armorer Lorenz Helmschmied ameliorated this dilemma by constructing a single armor for Maximilian which could be adapted through "pieces of exchange" to service either field or tournament engagements.\(^{43}\) These large garnitures, which could consist of as many as sixty separate pieces, became the norm throughout Europe into the seventeenth century.\(^{44}\) The prohibitive cost of such elaborate equipage helped insure that the tournament would remain confined to the nobility.\(^{45}\)

The high cost of armor for the tournament was also one way in which the king could express his good will to his courtiers. By providing funds and encouragement for tournaments, Maximilian and Henry glorified themselves while fostering an éspirit de corps within their courts. For the tournament celebrating his wedding to Bianca Maria Sforza in 1494, Maximilian commissioned a series of armors for the Stechzeug (employing heavier lances)

---

\(^{43}\)For the development of "pieces of exchange", see Blair, 1958, 117.

\(^{44}\)Among the largest of the earlier garnitures were those for Henry produced in the 1540’s. These could be adapted to use for the tournament as well as several forms of combat. Maximilian’s garnitures, as Donald LaRocca indicated in conversation, accommodated various types of tournament but did not include as wide a variety as the Henry garnitures.

\(^{45}\)See Jackson, 1990; for various ways in which the nobility attempted to maintain control over their tournaments. The primary difficulties arose when noblemen married into wealthy bourgeois families. There existed separate tournaments for members of the wealthy bourgeois (Geselleng gestech) for which armors were provided by the local armory.
were used by participants. In 1515, Henry provided financial assistance and weapons for a tilt (joust with barriers) to "encourage all youte to seke dedes of armes."\textsuperscript{46} His reward would be not only self-aggrandizement but the nurturing of a young, competent force of nobles.

The tournament had long been viewed as an essential training ground for knightly combat. During the reigns of Maximilian and Henry, vestiges of the connection between the war and tournament remained, despite the changing realities of warfare. As illustrated at Thèrouanne, the nature of combat had altered considerably to the point where single combat was reduced to brief, orchestrated intervals between artillery-fire.\textsuperscript{47} Nevertheless, Maximilian still viewed the tournament as necessary military preparation and a vital aspect of the heroic ideal of the ruler.\textsuperscript{48} Tournaments were viewed as an integral part of the mental preparation for war and, additionally, as an essential aspect of triumphal pageantry. With the taking of Tournay, for example, there immediately followed a series of jousts organized to honor the victorious and impress the defeated. The sixty-four documented tournaments organized during Maximilian's reign\textsuperscript{49} register their popularity and, calculating their costliness, their perceived importance.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{46} Hall, (1809) 516; quoted in Alan Young, \textit{Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments} (London: Sheridan House, 1987) 101.

\textsuperscript{47} Another example was at the Battle of Ravenna in 1512 where both sides agreed to withhold artillery fire until the cavalry concluded their encounter. Vale, 166.

\textsuperscript{48} Auer, 329.

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 333.
\end{flushright}
The German nobility of the fifteenth century had organized itself into numerous knightly societies (Rittergesellschaften) which served both political as well as social functions.\textsuperscript{50} This expression of aristocratic solidarity coupled with the related resurgence of chivalric romances ushered in a renaissance for the tournament in German courtly politics of the fifteenth and sixteenth century. Maximilian contrived to utilize such events as glorious reaffirmations of his role as princely patron. The bankrupt reality of the Hapsburg emperor could thus veil itself behind the facade of choreographed grand gestures.\textsuperscript{51} By organizing the tournament and the accompanying fête Maximilian could bring together all the various knightly factions at once and channel their aggressions into a codified competition. The giving of prizes by the sovereign at the conclusion of the tournament further magnified the nobility's indebtedness to the munificent monarch.\textsuperscript{52} Finally, Maximilian could immortalize the costly spectacle along with his patronage of it by commissioning a tournament book to commemorate event. His own participation in the knightly activities enabled him to express his camaraderie with his fellow princes. Of course, it should not be forgotten that Maximilian seems to have enjoyed the martial games in their own right and probably needed little political prompting to organize them.

Maximilian's encouragement of and participation in the many forms of

\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Jackson}, 1990, 77.

\textsuperscript{51}\textit{Anglo}, \textit{Roll}, 6.

\textsuperscript{52}The prize, which could range from a ring to a sword to money, was historically one of the major incentives for participation in tournaments.
tournament on foot as well as on horse seem intended on instilling the knightly games with a martial relevance. The emphasis on foot-combat, suggests W.H. Jackson, reflected the growing tactical importance of the foot-soldier and counterbalanced the bifurcation of war and tournament practices which increasingly characterized the joust.\textsuperscript{53} Three consecutive images in \textit{Der Weisskunig} depict the young Maximilian engaging in combat on foot. In them we see the "young White King" (Maximilian) in full armor learning the skills deemed important to him as a sixteenth century sovereign. The latter two, with crowds watching intently, remind the viewer of the public forum which such martial displays commanded. Armor served as a vital safety precaution in such events but also as a steel surface upon which the king (and other tournament participants) could reflect and glorify his noble lineage. Crests and favors worn on the helmet denoted allegiances and rank in addition to providing artistic manifestations of chivalric ideals.\textsuperscript{54} The pomegranate painted on Maximilian's shield and the imperial eagle emblazoned upon his bard served as a means of identification for the public while simultaneously associating the grandeur of the event with the strength of the Hapsburg dynasty.

Maximilian's gift-bard to Henry (discussed in chapter 1) is a visual

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{53}Elements of armor designed specifically for use in the tournament appear as early as the mid-thirteenth century. By the late fourteenth century, armors with increased protection (and decreased mobility) were produced exclusively for use in the tournament.

\textsuperscript{54}This became an increasingly significant aspect of tournament pageantry, expressing itself most fully with the requirement of \textit{impresas} (heraldic devices with an accompanying motto) by knights participating in Elizabethan tournaments.
Hapsburg *tour de force*. With its prominent dynastic references, such as the attributes of the Order of the Golden Fleece, it emphasizes the noble heritage of the bestower. Furthermore, it demonstrates the universality of the tournament as a sixteenth century stage for kingly display. The vocabulary of rulership used in Hapsburg tournaments was similar to that employed by the Medici in Italy, the Tudors in England, and the Valois in France. Every European court entertained a large retinue of foreign ambassadors and the impressions made upon them through the pageantry of the tournament often received substantial attention in their correspondencies to their native courts. As a result, the tournament became a contest not only between knights on opposite sides of the tilt-yard but between kings on opposite sides of the Channel. The more magnificent the tournament, the more magnificent the king.

Henry treated the tilt-yard as the altar from which to orchestrate his courtly deification. He incorporated the precedents of René d’Anjou and Maximilian in an ambitious effort to present himself to the world as the tenth worthy. The joust, at which he was exceptionally proficient, was clearly among his most cherished activities. Forty-five tournaments are recorded as having taken place during his reign, almost three times more than those held

---

55 Young, 23.

56 Tudor tournaments have been studied in great detail by Anglo and Young. Many of their observations have been incorporated into this section and credited accordingly. I have not, however, discussed the elaborate stages or allegories which were integral aspects of the pageantry. See especially Anglo, *Roll, Idem. 1969.*
by his father. In nearly all of the tournaments held through 1527 the King distinguished himself as the chief challenger, impressing princes and commoners alike. Henry, like Maximilian, still aspired to view the tournament as a viable preparation for war but increasingly it came to serve as a ritualized celebration organized to display Henry's wealth and power.

The tournament was among the most serious political components of Henry's court during the first twenty years of his reign. To be competent in the joust was the surest means of winning the good graces of the King. Thomas Grey, the Marquis of Dorset, for example, had nearly been executed as a traitor by Henry VII, but his skill as a jousting proved sufficient to assure him an honored place in young Henry's court. Henry's greatest jousting companion, Charles Brandon, the Duke of Suffolk, earned the praise and respect of the kingdom when dazzled spectators compared the amicable rivalry between the two to that of Hector and Achilles. These events, observed sometimes by as many as 12,000 people, cannot be underestimated when assessing the popularity of the king as seen through the eyes of the populace.

Of particular importance for Tudor monarchs were tournaments

---

57 Young, appendix. This number does not include the countless times Henry entertained members of his court in related martial events like the running of the rings.

58 Cruickshank, 4.

59 Anglo, 1969, 114. As Peter Gunn has remarked, the rise of Brandon in the court can be "charted by his place in tournaments and increasingly similar outfits to the King." Peter Gunn, "The Early Tudor Tournament", in Henry VIII: A European Court in England, 48.

60 One Venetian chronicler purported that as many as 25,000 people were in attendance at one Tudor tournament. Young, however, feels this to be an exaggerated figure.
celebrating their coronation or surrounding issues of their primogeniture. Even Henry VII, noted for his parsimony, lavished money on tournaments marking his coronation and the elaborate wedding of his ill-fated eldest son, Prince Arthur, to Katherine of Aragon. Henry VII, unlike his contemporary, Maximilian, and his son Henry VIII, did not actively participate in the events. Henry VII was not a monarch who cultivated a martial image; his lack of personal involvement with the tournament can be seen to correspond to his unaggressive political inclinations in the realm of foreign policy. Nevertheless, key dynastic events were deemed to merit (if not require) such quasi-military pomp. The coronation of Henry VIII in 1509 witnessed the first of the young monarch’s many tournaments. Although he chose to observe the event from a position of honor, he participated in the following tournament which followed quickly thereafter in January of 1510. The birth of his short-lived son, Henry, was grounds for a sumptuous string of banquets and tournaments recorded for posterity in the \textit{Great Tournament Roll of Westminster}. Like the tournament for the marriage of Arthur to Katherine, the tournament for the birth of a son was a celebration of Tudor legitimacy.

Nothing better displays the richness, care, and skill lavished by and for the king at the tournament than the costumes and armors which were fashioned for Henry and his entourage. The enormous expenditure on one’s appearance at the tournament was expected of all nobles but the King incurred the additional expense of outfitting his vast retinue of squires and servants. The
costliness reflects the diversity of labor entailed in outfitting such royal company; money was required for the armorer’s materials, the construction of the armor, the goldsmith’s gilding of the armor, the feather maker and artist who designed and made the helmet’s crest, the clothier and silkman who supplied material for the king’s horses and entourage, the tailor, and finally the armourer needed at the tournament to tend to any repairs.\footnote{Based on an individual receipt of the Earl of Rutland for an Elizabethan tournament; see Young, 72.} For a 1516 tournament at Greenwich, Henry spent nearly £1000 on the velvet alone.\footnote{Anglo, Roll, 16.} The Office of the Wardrobe seems to have been charged with the responsibility of organizing and funding the costumes and disguising while the royal workshops (after their inception in 1514) tended to the King’s armors.

Henry’s 1517 tournament at Greenwich is one such example of the enormity of the effort taken in fashioning the King’s majesty. The event was held to entertain (or more explicitly, to impress) members of the Flemish embassy residing at the King’s court. All the goldsmiths in London worked exclusively for the King for the preceding four months in preparation for the festivities. The harnesses, reported the Apostolic Nuncio visiting the English court, had cost the King "a mint of money."\footnote{Anglo, 1969, 114.} Accompanying the finely-armored King were fourteen gentlemen in white satin and velvet, fourteen knights dressed likewise, thirty-four trumpeters, stablemen, and armorer...
clothed in white damask, as well as forty-nine others wearing sarennet of various colors. The appearances of the King have been copiously documented by chroniclers, ambassadors, and artists. That such contemporary descriptions abound is hardly surprising when one notes that Henry often attired himself in a different costume for each day of tournament revelries. His glorious costumes were intended to beckon attention and be remarked upon.

Henry's use of costume was designed to do more than display his spending-power. By providing a thematic motif (e.g., through color or heraldry) it functioned as a primary unifying element in the visual cavalcade. When coupled with the allegorical frameworks which surrounded most early Henrician tournaments, the spectacular robes and armors formed part of a cohesive dialogue; a means of effectively comparing the King to mythic figures or ideas of rich cultural significance. The King, through his costume, could embody an abstract concept as he did during the Westminster tournament of 1511 in celebration of Katherine's giving birth to Prince Henry.

The 1511 Westminster tournament was the most costly of Henry's reigns, Field of Cloth of Gold notwithstanding, costing approximately £4,400. For the event Henry presented himself as Ceure loyall (Loyal Heart) along with three other knights who were garbed as "Vailaunt desyre," "Bone voloyr," and "Joyous panser." The four knightly attributes emerged from a masterfully

---

64 Young additionally notes that Henry permitted all gentlemen challengers to retain their costumes, further magnifying the court's sense of the King's wealth; Young, 54.

65 Anglo, Roll, 16.
crafted pageant:

armed at all peces, evry of them a spere in
his hande on horsebacke with great plumes on
their heddes, their basses and trappers of clothe
of gold, evry of them his name embroudered on
his basse and trapper.\(^66\)

All the bards were garnished with golden "K's" in deference to the Queen with
Henry’s bearing, in addition, a prominent Tudor rose. Twice emblazoned in gold
upon the King's bard was written "CEURE LOYALL" for any who might have
missed the less than subtle allegorical challenge issued at the event's
commencement.

This survey of kingly image-making ends with the death of Maximilian
in 1519. It seems impossible, however, to not at least touch upon the Field of
Cloth of Gold which transpired in 1520 between Henry and Francis I.\(^67\) Just
as the precedent of Maximilian's youth was examined to understand Henry’s
early developments, so too should the aftereffects of Maximilian’s example be
presented. The event stands as the paradigmatic example of the importance
invested in the belief of chivalric kingship which Maximilian had so ardently
fostered. The name itself (derived from the gold cloth used for the pavilions
around the tilt-yard) conjures up a sense of the excessive display of kings
aimed at creating political amity through the tournament.

The gala seventeen day event was arranged as an ideal means of

---

\(^{66}\) Hall quoted in Anglo, 1969, 112.

\(^{67}\) For a detailed account of the event's significance see J.G. Russel, Field of Cloth of Gold (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1969).
securing a long-term alliance between Henry and the young French King, Francis I. Henry, travelling to Calais, with an entourage numbering over 6000 dispersed with more than £17,600 to assure that his glorious magnificence was duly reflected. Of that tremendous sum, over £3000 was devoted to the King's clothing and bards. The royal armor workshops at Greenwich were virtually disassembled, forges and all, and transported to Calais in thirty-eight wagons accompanied by twenty-six armورers, two of whom where master armорers. The event demonstrates, among many things, how central the armорer was in forging not only the image but the politics of the king.

The design of armor to be used for the tournament became, itself, an issue of serious political debate. King Francis requested that the English ambassador Wingfield ask Henry for a locking gauntlet which would allow for better control of a foot-combat sword. In exchange, Francis would send Henry one of his unique arming doublets to be ready before the interview. Two surviving armors were made for Henry's participation in the foot-combat at the Field of Cloth of Gold. Ian Eaves has suggested that the second suit (IV.2, Tower of London) with the tonlet (deep steel skirt) was probably hurriedly put together by the royal workshops after the French, at the last minute, changed

---

68Anglo, Roll, 17.

69Young, 65-6.

70Dillon has surmised that the arming doublet, "such as has not been seen before" probably referred to a grand-guard (reinforcing "piece of exchange" for the tournament) or manteau d'armes (fixed shield); Dillon, "Westminster", 260. The results of the correspondence between the monarchs is not known.
the guidelines for the type of armor to be used. The first armor (figure 8), an English masterpiece of unprecedented design, was thus never used, undoubtedly much to Henry's displeasure.

Henry and Francis stressed their relationship as brothers-in-arms as a means of conveying their commonality as warrior-kings. The lists provided the only common ground between the two sovereigns with jousts carefully organized so that the two Kings did not meet as adversaries. That the two Kings were at war with each other within two years following the Field of Cloth of Gold serves as a reminder that such pageantry was more conducive to self-glorification than to political rapprochement. Like Henry's war against France six years earlier the event provided the King not with tangible long-term results but with a brief theatre in which to parade his stature. Perhaps, however, the awe of the audience was all that Henry desired in the long-term; in this he was the greatest success.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{71}}\text{Watts, 1991, 50-51.}\]
IV. Armor and the Image of the King

It is through Maximilian and Henry's artistic programs that we can today view the diverse manner in which the sovereigns most wished to be perceived by posterity. The royal portraits, imperial commissions, and tournament rolls all offer important insights into the nature of the king's cultural sense of himself. We shall concentrate here on a selection of images in which armor and kingship were confederated in art to convey a political message of personal, dynastic, and national strength.

For Maximilian and Henry, monarchs of the greatest ambitions, art provided a means of outlining their desired aspirations and, in many cases, a medium for presenting achievements that they could not in reality obtain. Above all, royal commissions were intended to immortalize the patron's image and, ideally, to lionize their personality and accomplishments. The costumes in which they chose to appear are thus a primary indication of the subjects' inclinations. Even when not appearing in armor, references to kingly knightliness are omnipresent; attributes such as the Order of the Golden Fleece around Maximilian's neck or a richly bejewelled dagger at Henry's side serve as visual reminders of the sovereign's martial prestige and authority.

The abundance of armored, royal images which were commissioned
between 1509 and 1519, particularly in the case of Maximilian, merits an entire study in itself. For practical purposes the examination will here have to be limited to select images from the period which most closely address the implications of the kings' appearances in armor. It will only be able to give a small sense of the magnitude of their patronage and the plethora of images produced on coins, prints, monumental sculptures, and elsewhere. It must furthermore be understood that both Maximilian and Henry had diverse roles to uphold as sovereigns and that their portrayals in armor were only a part of the total production of royal images. By appearing as everything to everyone they could better exert control over the many social and political tendrils of their reigns. Albrecht Dürer's images of the Emperor as well as Hans Holbein's many celebrated portraits of Henry exemplify the genre of royal commissions aimed at presenting the ruler as model courtier in costly vestments.

Maximilian's employment of printed images for his own aggrandizement was revolutionary in the history of political propaganda. He was among the first to understand that in the print-making processes there lay the potential for wide-spread dissemination of the sovereign's image accompanied by textual explanations. Pictures and words together could be spread throughout the empire and function as a network of imperial processions. In so doing, Maximilian could compensate for his inability to finance his fame through costly architectural and sculptural undertakings.¹ The production of printed works

¹Benecke, 16.
organized in the final decade of the Emperor’s life was immense. It can be interpreted as a venture aimed at legitimating his imperial status, but the commissions seem predominantly engendered by Maximilian’s desire for lasting, cult-like fame.

In 1508, Maximilian commemorated his recent election as Holy Roman Emperor of the German Nation by commissioning an equestrian portrait of himself from the Augsburg artist Hans Burgkmair (figure 10). In this woodcut, Maximilian sits upon his armored horse in full field-armor. Across his breastplate hangs the Order of the Golden Fleece while upon his horse’s poytral (breast defense) is a shield decorated with the double-headed imperial eagle. The plume of ostrich feathers above the helmet denotes the archduchy of Austria, further ennobling and identifying the armored personage. Clasped in his right hand, just above his sword, is his martial’s baton. Below the triumphal arch, which fills the background, are prominently displayed the words: IMP.CAES.MAXIMIL.AUG. (Imperator-Caesar-Maximilian-Augustus). The image serves as the triumphant procession from Rome which the Emperor, in reality, never had. All the elements of the image are intended to resonate as integral aspects of Maximilian’s imperial stature. Even the horse’s chanfron (head

---

2 Much to Maximilian’s disgruntlement, his title as emperor was never officially consecrated by the expected papal crowning at Rome. He had been dubbed Emperor-elect at Trent in 1508 but his political enmity with Venice prohibited his peaceful progress through Italy.

defense) is surmounted with an imperial crown. Armor is, of all these ennobling symbols, the most visually dominating aspect of the work. Only the raised visor provides the viewer with a glimpse of the Emperor himself.

Silver has identified the model for Burgkmair's design as Lucas Cranach's 1507 woodcut of St. George. For a sovereign who sought to present himself as the "Dragon slayer for the dynasty" and had adopted St. George as his patron saint, the artistic comparison was an apt one. His devotion to the Saint is commemorated in the Triumphant Arch (discussed below) wherein it is inscribed: "Knightly friendships did he [Maximilian] forge/ by strengthening the Order of St. George." A later etching by Daniel Hopfer even went so far as to depict Maximilian as the Saint. A warrior of noble ancestry, St. George embodied the exemplary ideals of the Christian soldier and had served as the patron saint of knights since the Crusades. Burgkmair's equestrian print thus succeeds in associating Maximilian with both the imperial rulers of classical antiquity (i.e., through the arch and the inscription) and with the righteous Christian image of the warrior-saint. Like the equestrian statue of Constantine in Rome (now known to be of Marcus Aurelius), Maximilian's print served as a public tribute to both the leader's

---

4 Ibid., 10-12.
5 Benecke, 14.
7 Ibid., 21.
Christian and imperial splendor as expressed through his military authority.\(^8\)

Maximilian commissioned and personally supervised several allegorical works dedicated to the documentation and glorification of his life and lineage. Of the three major literary works he outlined only one, *Theuerdank* (The Knight of Adventurous Thoughts), was finished in his lifetime.\(^9\) Completed in 1517, it was among the most sumptuous books of the era. Its manner of distribution sheds light on the anticipated dispersal of the later works as well. Six trunks containing copies of the knightly tale were distributed amongst the nobles and retainers of the vast empire while the Emperor retained one trunk’s worth for his own edification. Hapsburg supremacy would thereby become an addition to the libraries of all the courts of Germany’s princes.\(^10\)

*Der Weisskunig*, which remained unfinished at the Emperor’s death in 1519, was the most far-reaching of Maximilian’s propagandizing literary efforts. In it, the “Young White/Wise King” asserts his presence and *savoir-faire* in every conceivable vocation found in his realm. The more than two-hundred images accompanying the text lavish attention on the King’s martial activitites

\(^8\)The woodcut seems to have provided the impetus, if not the model, for an equestrian statue of Maximilian at Augsburg. The project may have received its initial inspiration from the statue of Marcus Aurelius and similar monuments in Italy dedicated to powerful condotieri. Maximilian’s visit to Lodovico Moro (from whom he obtained two armorers, discussed in chapter 2) would be a potential source for the germination of the idea. Like so many of the Emperor’s undertakings, it never came to fruition.

\(^9\)The third chivalric book, not discussed in this paper for want of space, is *Freydal*, an account of tournaments and masquerades of Maximilian’s youth in Burgundy.

and patronage. In the 1775 facsimile (which is itself abridged)\textsuperscript{11}, more than half of the images relate the King's activities to issues concerning the use and production of arms and armor. The title itself can be interpreted, in fact, as a reference to the King's armored stature, "white" armor being synonymous with full plate armor. The sheer volume of battle scenes (well over sixty) bespeaks the importance imputed to armor and other attributes of war.

Hans Burgkmair was again the artist responsible for the large majority of woodcuts appearing throughout the text. His image of Maximilian with Master Armorer Conrad Seusenhofer has been mentioned in the chapter on royal workshops (figure 7). It represents both the Emperor and Seusenhofer crowned with laurel wreaths, indicative of their esteemed status. No other craftsman appearing in the text receives such an accolade. Hanging on the wall behind them are elements of harnesses for the "joust of war" and the "joust of peace" (the latter employing rebated lances for greater safety). Maximilian's giving of advice to a young armorer impresses upon the viewer the Emperor's knowledge of the subject as well as his devotion to the posterity of armorer's craft through his interest and encouragement. Armorners sacredly guarded the processes of their craft and so Maximilian's involvement appears as all the more impressive.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11}Reproduced by Acta Humaniora (Dresden: VCH Verlagsgesellschaft, 1985).

\textsuperscript{12}An example of the secrecy of the craft can be seen in the refusal of the last surviving Almain armorer working in England (1634) to teach the art of forging armor. This incident is cited by Dillon as being one of the reasons behind the dwindling of the armorer's art in England in the seventeenth century. See Dillon, "Sir Henry Lee", 170.
Many of the images in *Der Weisskunig* link the merit of a vocation’s product in respect to its relevance to war. Even the court painter whose work Maximilian oversees (figure 11) paints depictions of arms and armor among the other motifs on his canvas. The omnipresence of warrior games is stressed in an image of the young Maximilian at play with other children;\textsuperscript{13} just learning to speak (as the text illuminates), Maximilian is inculcated with the older youths’ training in the arts of war, tournament, and hunting.

Of the dozens of representations of armored kings found in *Der Weisskunig* it is a given that Maximilian should appear appareled in his field-armor for scenes depicting combat. What is less expected is his armored presence at a stately banquet (figure 12). In this scene, the White King greets dignitaries from behind his dining table wearing a cuirass, base, and crown. He is flanked by Queen Mary and the queen mother. Clearly, the occasion does not necessitate the King’s appearance in armor. That the King ever attended a banquet in armor is, for strictly practical purposes, rather unlikely. What the woodcut reflects, however, is the stateliness associated with armor. It was not a costume which commanded a limited utilitarian function. Maximilian’s armor serves here as a visual enhancement of his power, appropriate for a scene in which he receives the praise of a nobleman. The image is emblematic of Maximilian’s desire, even off the battlefield, to be seen as engaged in knighthly activities.

\textsuperscript{13}See plate 10 in the 1985 reprint.
A particularly relevant image from *Der Weisskunig* celebrates Maximilian's consecration of a compact with Henry who appears in the text as the "Red/White King", a probable allusion to the English banner of St. George (figure 13). Maximilian can be identified by his dragon crest which he wears in several images throughout the narrative.\textsuperscript{14} The image references the Hapsburg-Tudor alliance and displays the wearing of armor as a ritualized element of the dialogue between rulers. Outfitted in full regalia and on equal ground, Maximilian and Henry express a unity of purpose and authority. Politics, it can be seen, was an affair conducted with a treaty in one hand and the sword close by the other. Behind each sovereign, armored retinues are gathered in anticipation of their king's command. With his solemn profile and raised visor, Maximilian bears a striking similarity to his 1508 equestrian portrait also executed by Burgkmair (figure 10).

Maximilian's *Triumphal Arch* (completed ca. 1515) and his *Triumphal Procession* (uncompleted at his death) are, as their names suggest, a rich source of imperial martial splendor. Both large ensembles of woodcuts (174 and 137 images respectively) were produced by a number of court artists with the intention of reflecting the nobility of the Emperor through classical precedents. The *Arch*, for example, is inscribed as having been "constructed

\textsuperscript{14}The modern text describing the image wrongly identifies Maximilian as his son King Philip. I am thankful to Donald LaRocca for helping with this identification. The dragon crest was commonly used throughout Europe; Henry VII and Henry VIII often incorporated it into their heraldic designs. Maximilian may have chosen to portray himself with the dragon crest as a reference to St. George.
after the model of the ancient triumphal arches of the Roman emperors of the city of Rome.\textsuperscript{15} Both the *Arch* and the *Procession* provide a comprehensive look at what aspects of his reign Maximilian most hoped to emphasize as well as providing a wealth of detailed information on contemporary costume and armor.

It is in the detailed preface of the *Arch*, written by Maximilian's historiographer Johann Stabius, that we have the most direct contemporary exegesis of the significance of the king's appearance in armor. "Armor," wrote Stabius, "signifies the administration of justice which includes the preservation of peace and quiet." This he compares with the princely robes of state which represented "administration of equal justice for rich and poor alike."\textsuperscript{16} Stabius makes it clear throughout the text that much of the iconography appearing in the *Arch* is directly borrowed from classical precedents. It seems quite likely therefore that the political meaning imputed to representations of the king in armor was also an acknowledged aspect of the common vocabulary of rulership imagery.

Throughout the *Arch* the royal personages of Maximilian's ancestry are depicted in full armor, thereby stressing the Emperor's knightly pedigree. The entire line of Merovingian kings, for example, is attired (anachronistically) in early fluted armors. Ultimately, the *Arch* serves to trace Maximilian's family tree

\textsuperscript{15}Translated in Strauss, 1980, 726-730.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 730.
back to the great Trojan warrior-prince, Hector. As in all his major commissions, the Arch stressed the importance of armor but not to the exclusion of less martial accoutrements. The Arch was meant to serve as an exemplum, with the ideal of rulership thus inscribed:

all future princes of Austria, as well as other great personages, who desire to traverse the Portal of Honor shall be distinguished not only by their external princely vestments or armor, but also by the princely virtues of their hearts.17

Such wide-reaching honorific proscriptions notwithstanding, the Arch reveals the key element of the Emperor’s accolades to be devoted to war. The Arch panel most germane to this study is Dürer’s woodcut of Maximilian and Henry meeting in 1513 for their invasion of France (figure 14). Dominating the foreground are the equestrian figures of the two sovereigns as knightly commanders. Fully armored, they clasp hands in a gesture of allegiance extending back to antiquity. Their visors are raised to reflect their friendly relationship with both helmets mounted with a crown to designate their rank. The Emperor wears the distinct Hapsburg miter-crown while Henry appears wearing a coronet; Maximilian thus stands as the figure of greater prestige, a status further emphasized by his more central position in the composition. Close behind each sovereign flies their national flag which visually associates the two countries as well as serving as a means of identification.

At the center of the image the two sovereigns appear at the head of a

17ibid.
combined allied force of pikemen. While they are associated with the foot-
soldiers, their elevated status separates them as noble leaders of an obedient
and trained army. Above this scene, the Battle of Spurs is dramatically enacted
as a heavy cavalry charge, with the French horsemen retreating to the right.
Its chivalric representation is not without exaggeration. That the battle was, in
fact, more of a brief skirmish than a direct assault did not inhibit Dürer's
recording of the event as a grand mêlée in the medieval tradition. This
suggests that the court artist, like the Emperor himself, was anxious to present
an image of warfare that was more ideal than real. Records indicate that rather
than a head-to-head cavalry encounter as portrayed here, the French garrison
was surprised by the allied forces and turned and fled to avoid a rout. The
nobles who would have received impressions of the print (and composed the
heavy cavalry), however, would probably have preferred to envision their
participation in the conflict as the decisive (if not exclusive) factor in the victory.

In the distance, a town meant to be read as Thérouanne or Tournay is
being bombarded by cannons. The two sovereigns in the foreground, more so
than the battle and bombardment relegated to the background, epitomize the
campaign against France. It is the alliance that is stressed in the verse
inscribed at the top of the image:
To Holland then he [Maximilian] took his court
to lend the King of England his support.
Soon great armies were assembled;
the French were much afraid and trembled.
Many of them saw their last day;
Terwan was taken, so was Tornay.

In this rendition, the Emperor's assistance to Henry is stressed as a mark of
his political devotion. The final couplet does not fail to note the military
significance of the undertaking. This sentiment is echoed in a second poem
employed for the *Arch* which underscores Maximilian's influence upon the
young English King:

The King of England was impressed
how in each war he [Maximilian] did his best.
Therefore he joined in an alliance
to help bolster the defiance
and jointly with war the English his enemy to vanquish.

Triumphant arches of antiquity were intended to be markers under which
the victorious sovereign would pass during his triumphal procession. So
Maximilian, having his paper arch, required a paper procession to complete the
pageantry. Silver cites the *Procession* as one of the first instances of text
combined with images in tribute to a sovereign.\footnote{Silver, 1990, 296.}
Of the ten completed
woodcuts depicting Maximilian, only one presents him without his armor: his
coronation in the presence of the Pope. It will be remembered that this event
did not actually transpire (see footnote 2 of this chapter). Maximilian's artistic
program remedies this shortcoming by altering the historical reality. The
processional pageant car representing his marriage to Mary of Burgundy shows him with his robes of state over his armor. This woodcut may have been the work of Dürer who also executed a never-completed central triumphant chariot with Maximilian.\textsuperscript{19} It was, once again, Hans Burgkmair who provided the bulk of imperial images for the Procession.

Dominating the fanfare are twelve floats depicting the Emperor’s various military campaigns. The Procession allowed Maximilian to present even his less auspicious encounters - such as the empire’s loss of the Swiss Confederation and the prolonged Venetian campaign - as a part of a grand and noble series of victorious engagements.\textsuperscript{20} At the conclusion of the battle pageants lies the trophy car with the entire panoply of war. (figure 15). More than simply the spoils of war, the richly decorated arms and armor constitute the very essence of Maximilian’s victories.\textsuperscript{21}

Maximilian’s monumental tomb structure in The Hofkirche at Innsbruck

\textsuperscript{19}In Dürer’s drawing, Maximilian appears in his robes of state without armor underneath. See figure 7-16 in Silver, 1990.

\textsuperscript{20}Hale has forwarded an alternate reading of the inclusion of these failed campaigns in the Procession. He suggests that the losses are acknowledged along with the victories as a reflection of the “legally justified and gloriously undertaken deeds of war.” John R. Hale, Artists and Warfare in the Renaissance (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) 184. Neither the images nor the later inscriptions, however, indicate the outcome of the unsuccessful battles. By definition, losses would not be emphasized in a triumphal procession and so their inclusion was probably intended to obscure the factual results in favor of the greater glory of the Emperor.

\textsuperscript{21}The employment of armor as a symbol of fruitful victory are far from unique to Maximilian’s triumphal iconography. Silver cites the source of the armor carriage design in the Procession as being inspired by Valturio’s De Re Militari of 1460. See Silver, 1990. Mantegna’s famous Triumphs of Caesar (1486-92) also features a central vignette of proudly displayed decorative armors which would most probably have been known to the artists working for Maximilian on the Procession. Unlike the classicalizing Italian triumphs which often depicted the sovereign in armor all’antica, however, Maximilian employs contemporary armors for his pageant.
stands as the final tribute to "the Last Knight." There Maximilian rests in the company of history's greatest warrior-kings, all cast in bronze and standing in larger-than-life size majesty (figure 16). King Arthur, Julius Caesar, Otto I, Hadrian, and over a dozen others stand in solemn splendor around the raised, kneeling figure of Maximilian. Nearly every figure in the noble retinue is clad in armor, each more fastidiously ornamented than the next. Even those depicted in robes of state, such as Frederick III, are shown grasping a sword as a reflection of his authority and imperial continuity. Although nearly all the sovereigns around the tomb predate the invention of full-plate armor, they are depicted nonetheless wearing full armor rendered all'antica through fantastical designs. Only Maximilian and his son Philip appear in contemporary armors. Unlike the elaborate armors which grace the other emperors, Maximilian appears in a plain field armor, a reflection of his active service and perhaps intended as a sign of humility. He wears a mantle over his armor and a mitercrown upon his head. With his hands clasped in prayer, he offers himself as a humble and pious Christian leader. What one is most struck by, however, is the image of Maximilian the soldier. This inclination can further be observed by

---

22Work on the "wholly novel design" began as early as 1502 but was not completed until well after the Emperor's death. As late as ca. 1565 additions were still being added to the monument. It was the product of several artists, with the majority of the larger-than-life size figures designed by sculptors Gilg Sesselschreiber and Stefan Godl. See Vinzenz Oberhammer, Die Bronze Standbilder des Maximilian Grabales in der Hofkirche zu Innsbrucke (Innsbruck, 1935); and Gert von der Osten and Horst Vey, Painting and Sculpture in Germany and the Netherlands: 1500-1600 (Baltimore: Pelican, 1969).

23Maximilian had desired that the figures be gilt but his death curtailed any further progress until his grandson Ferdinand had work continued on the monument.
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comparing the large size of the bronze kings with the smaller casts of the saints also near the tomb. Even a few of the saints appear in military attire. Most ironic is the depiction of St. Maximilianus in armor. A late third century saint, Maximilianus was martyred for refusing to serve as a soldier in the Augustan legion. When ordered to wear the Roman military badge he responded, "I will not do it: I cannot be a soldier." This was obviously unacceptable for the name-saint of the militant Emperor and so Maximilianus, conscientious objector or not, was suited in armor all the same.

Far fewer armored images of Henry have survived. This is, in part, due to the lack of a strong tradition of printed images in England. The propagandizing pageantry of Henry was to a large degree enacted in the public eye. Maximilian had also actively engaged in public displays of martial power but his vast empire necessitated alternative means of reaching the diverse factions throughout the realm. Henry could more easily present himself and his ideas to his people without undertaking an enormous print campaign. Grand tournaments and actual processions intended on "impress[ing] the populace with the reality of an authority" precluded the creation of fictitious paper

---


25Maximilian was not a common name for the period and the martyrdom of St. Maximilianus was not one of any familiarity in literature or art. Writing in the sixteenth century, Camden suggested that the origin of the Emperor's name was not derived from the Saint (of whom he makes no mention) but, rather, a composite of the two virtuous Romans: Q. Fabius Maximus and Scipio Aemilianus. E.G. Withcombe, The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977) 215.

processions like those employed by Maximilian. Woodcuts, which so affixed the spectacle of Maximilian's reign in the minds of his contemporaries and succeeding generations, were not employed by the early Tudor monarchs. Caxton's use of woodcuts as book illustrations in the 1480's suggests that the possibility for propagandistic programs was available in England; Henry either didn't perceive the potential of the mass-produced images or selected to expend his energies in other art forms. Two prints of Henry were produced later in the 1540's but neither can be seen as attempts to aggrandize Henry's military prowess.⁷

Art still had a central role to play in Henry's court. Court artists provided a record for Henry's glories and documented his many lavish events. Many happenings deemed significant by the King were captured in prose and paint. Unfortunately, many of the painted images created for Henrician aggrandizement in processions and pageants by Holbein and other court artists decorated temporary structures which were destroyed shortly after their production.

For his court portraits Henry seems to have preferred to be depicted in his richly ornamented robes of state. Even in some of his military images he

---

⁷The first, an engraving by the Dutch artist Cornelis Matsys, is a rather unflattering late portrait possibly executed after an already existing image of the Henry. The second is a 1548 woodcut of Henry by Jacob Faber, and was used as the frontispiece of Hall's Chronicles. It depicts Henry seated at a council meeting in an interior wearing robes of state and may have derived from a now destroyed painting in Whitehall by Holbein. See Arthur M. Hind, Engraving in England, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), vol.3 "The Tudor Period". For illustrations of the two prints, see plates 8 and 9.
appears wearing fur-lined robes rather than riveted steel armors. More so than Maximilian, Henry devoted his energies to cultivating an image of courtly opulence which accounts for the corresponding emphasis on fine materials and massive jewelry in his portraits. Henry's love of armor was an important facet of his reign but clearly not central to his self-identification. He does not seem to have produced a court portrait in armor as Maximilian had done. Nonetheless, images of Henry in armor are not wanting and may represent only a fraction of what once existed.

One of the most important Henrician manuscripts to have survived is the Great Tournament Roll of Westminster. It was a document commissioned to record the glorious spectacle of Henry's majesty, much as the tournament did for members of the Tudor court. Like Maximilian's Triumphant Procession, the painted illuminations read as a parade of kingly wealth and accomplishments. The manuscript itself, rich with gold leaf and bright colors

---

28 For example, the anonymous painting at Hampton Court of Henry crossing the Channel to Boulogne in 1520 (minuscule as he may appear in the vast scene) shows him in a heavy coat with a bright tunic underneath. For an illustration of the painting, see Robert Lacey, The Life and Times of Henry VIII (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1992) 34-5.

29 Returning to the idea of grotesque armors addressed in the first chapter, no images exist of Henry in the imperial gift-armor. Removed from the context of the court pageant, such "grotesque" apparel would not have been suitable for portraiture. In Italy, following the example of Cosimo de Medici, noblemen were occasionally portrayed in classizing armors which contained grotesque elements. To the best of my knowledge, however, depictions of grotesque armors appear very seldom in Northern portraiture. While no individual portraits of Henry in armor exist, there are paintings of individual English courtiers who appear in armor; an example is the painting of Sir Nicholas Carew by Hans Holbein and studio, ca. 1530, in which Carew appears in a plain Greenwich armor grasping his sword. See Starkey, ed., figure V.6.

executed on vellum, was intended to reflect the prestige of both the patron and the event it commemorates. The thirty-six pages provide a glimpse at the King’s participation in the joust and the procession which preceded and concluded the event. Henry appears four times but his presence pervades every page through his symbols and ciphers.

In the first royal depiction, Henry emerges from his tent upon his horse surrounded by twenty-two members of his train (figure 17). The image glimmers with gold shining from the collars of his accompaniment, the "K’s" on his bard and tent, his spurs, and the large sun affixed to the base of his tent. The centrality and brilliance of the figure identifies the King despite his heavily-armored anonymity, as the "Noble Cœur loyal." The image is succeeded by a procession of mounted courtiers with splendidly colored bards.

Henry appears next, again exiting from his tent, by the lists with his two fellow jousters dressed in similar splendor. The image is directly followed by the King’s successful tilting encounter marked by his breaking of the lance on his opponents helm (figure 18). The image of the King’s jousting accomplishment with Queen Katherine looking on from above serves, essentially, as the raison d’être of the work. After the concluding procession, the King appears without his armor, thereby revealing himself to the crowds holding his broken lance as a testament of his skill. A detail in the penultimate scene, however, provides better insight into the symbolic role of armor and the king. The horseman preceding the King carries Henry’s helm surmounted with the royal crown
(figure 19). It is the armor which served as the vessel for the king’s heroism and it is upon the helm rather than the King’s head that the crown resides. The helm stands, like a processional sword, as a potent image of the might of the King to be paraded and venerated. With Henry’s removal of the armor, the King’s identity is revealed, his feats are celebrated, and the Roll is concluded.

A drawing of Henry displays an even more swashbuckling portrayal of the King as jouster (figure 20). As in the Roll, Henry brandishes his broken lance to signify his victory. His rearing steed is equipped with a bard adorned with Tudor roses and a lion, further heightening the heroic stature of the noble rider. The Cross of St. George upon Henry’s breastplate distinguishes him as a warrior of God and of England. One ambassador observing Henry at the tournament was prompted to declare that "in truth he looked like St. George in person." Unlike his formal portraits most associated with his later years, this energetic drawing captures the vigor of the young monarch engaged in the activity which dominated the first decades of his reign. A similar pose was chosen for Henry’s "Great Seal" (figure 21). His broken lance is replaced by a knightly sword, an emblem of war rather than tournament. The Cross of St. George is still proudly displayed upon his chest. Fastened to any royal document, the seal presented the King as the very personification of war.

---

31The image, reproduced as figure 11 in Young, is unattributed in the accompanying text. It bears the watermark of the British Museum and is listed in the credits as being in the British Library.

32Nicolo Sagudino, "To Alvise Foscari"; in Mumby, 346.
It seems fitting to conclude this study with a painting including both Maximilian and Henry (figure 22 and frontispiece).\textsuperscript{33} Interestingly, though of English workmanship, it is a painting remarkably similar to Dürer's woodcut of Maximilian and Henry for the \textit{Triumphal Arch} (figure 16). Through prints Henry's court artists acquainted themselves with the artistic developments of the prestigious continental courts. Dürer's prints were particularly popular with artists throughout Europe. It was most probably his design which provided the model for the English version. This artistic borrowing provides another example of Maximilian's influence on Henry as seen through royal patronage and self-imaging. Though the English composition is horizontal while the German model is vertical, both employ a horizontal tripartite division depicting identical historical events.

The painting may also be a conglomeration of three works recorded to have been painted by Holbein and others on the entertainment gallery erected for the 1527 Anglo-French tournament in England.\textsuperscript{34} The panels depicted the Siege of Thérouanne, the Battle of Spurs, and the meeting of Henry and Maximilian. Such selections would appear to be in questionable taste for an event intended to celebrate the new alliance with France. The significance of such a gesture has not, to my knowledge, been explained but it can be hypothesized that they served to mark the wonderous nature of the allegiance

\textsuperscript{33} The anonymous painting, possibly after Holbein, was probably executed later in Henry's reign (discussed below) and is in the Queen's Collection at Hampton Court.

\textsuperscript{34} Susan Foister "Holbein as Court Painter", in \textit{Henry VIII: A European Court in England}, 58-9.
in the face of the nations' feuding past. On the other hand, the triumphant images stood as a poignant reminder of the fate of the French forces in their last encounter with the English. The paintings, for which Holbein was paid the large sum of £4.10s., were destroyed with the conclusion of the tournament. The Hampton Court painting serves as a relatively contemporary example of such victory images, but does not give a sense of its function within the larger triumphal setting.

The painting's divergences from the German print are slight but telling indications of the manner in which the English King most wanted to remember the event. Unlike Maximilian's many battles, Henry's siege of Thérouanne and Tournay were his only major claims to military glory; their representation in art would have held great weight as the high-point of his reign. Unlike the composition for the Triumphant Arch, Henry and Maximilian are equated with an equal degree of prominence in the painting. The crowns in the German print which distinguished Maximilian's imperial status are replaced by more egalitarian plumes. While the sovereigns remain the central focus with an emphasis on the handshake, there is a greater stress placed on the heavy cavalry at either side of them. The presence of the cavalry in the foreground reveals that, despite the changes in warfare, the noble horsemen were still regarded as the vanguard of the kings' forces.

The use of color allows for greater heraldic displays such as in the richly decorated bards emblazoned with the appropriate dynastic crest. Armor in
particular serves as a means of identifying the authority of the sovereigns. Unlike all the other fully-armored knights in their company, the Emperor and King wear gilded armors as do their horses. Such representation may not have been artistic whimsy, for listed in a the 1547 inventory of Henry's arms and armor is:

one harnesse for the king's Maietie all graven and pcell guilte, bothe for the field and tilte complete, whiche was commanded to be translated [for the field] at the King's goinge over to Boulogne....\textsuperscript{35} 

The unique richness of their armor, and (more explicitly) the inscriptions above their heads serve as identification of their noble status.

At the center of the painting the two sovereigns appear again side by side on horseback. They are flanked by their pikemen who stand at attention awaiting their sovereign’s command. As in the print, the two are engaged in conversation slightly apart from their troops, reinforcing the notion that all authority emmanates from the dominating presence of the warrior-kings. In the painting, the sovereigns' troops are divided into two distinct national groups rather than amassed into one as in the print. This may be a trivial compositional alteration designed to create greater symmetry; it may, however, aim to make clear the compatibility of the English foot-soldiers with their more experienced German counterparts. Standing at attention near the English tent, the forces demonstrate that Henry had mustered his own forces independent

\textsuperscript{35}Dillon, "Westminster", 255.
of Maximilian's aid.

Cannons are much more conspicuous in the English version, framing the middle scene in front of both tents. They were a possession that Henry had gone to great lengths to procure for his first appearance on the Continent.\textsuperscript{36} The establishment of a proficient artillery was, in fact, among the first undertakings of his reign. Through extensive acquisitions and patronage Henry had succeeded in acquiring, as one Milanese ambassador noted, "cannon enough to conquer hell."\textsuperscript{37} Their presence bespeaks Henry's pride in his accomplishment and indicates the modernity of both monarchs' armies, an accomplishment just as great a victory for Henry as his capture of Thérouanne. Heavy cavalry, foot-soldiers, and artillery were all included as an indication of the extent to which Henry succeeded in updating the English military. The fruits of his labors to modernize his army can be seen in the background of the painting where the artillery bombardment forces the town of Thérouanne into submission.

In the painting's upper third, the allied cavalry clashes with the French cavalry in what is assumedly meant to be the Battle of Spurs. The French line, overwhelmed by the charge, retreats to the right. Henry, who reportedly led his forces from behind, is not visible in the scene. The depiction is nearly identical

\textsuperscript{36} For details on Henry's emphasis on cannons during the 1513 campaign against France see Cruickshank, 63-8.

with Dürer's print. Both courts apparently desired to envision the heavy cavalry battle as the essence of warfare. The English archers who had been responsible for initiating the victorious engagement are nowhere to be seen. In keeping with the chivalric idealization of the conflict, the rain which had in reality put a damper on the sovereign's meeting (as depicted at the bottom of the painting), is conveniently replaced with a blue sky. The painting presents an exemplary vision of kingly virtue with the armored images of Henry and Maximilian at the very center.

Nearly the entire oeuvre of royal depictions, whether armored or not, was devoted to the ideal of kingship. Even the Northern European propensity for veristic portraiture does not interfere with the artists' capturing the seemingly fantastical majesty and wealth of the King. All the works studied here were meant to reverberate in the memories of the courtiers long after the King or Emperor had stepped out of his armor and away from the field of action. Through the union of art and armor, Maximilian and Henry fashioned themselves as Hercules, Hector, Achilles, King Arthur, Caesar, and St. George. Whether directly or obliquely, images of the two sovereigns in armor linked them with the great chain of warrior-kings who had preceded them. It was their desire, through deed and art, to be remembered as personages worthy of a like place in history.
EPILOGUE

With the death of Maximilian in 1519, the ruling classes of Europe were once again thrown into turmoil. The ensuing competition for the succession to the imperial throne heightened the volatile Hapsburg-Valois rivalry. The Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520 was intended originally to create a new compact between the Hapsburg, Valois, and Tudor monarchs. In hindsight, however, the event appears more as a fitting tribute to the "Last Knight" than as the beginning of a new concord, especially when considering that the Hapsburg presence was conspicuously absent at the event.¹

The relationship between Maximilian and Henry yielded, in addition to many fine armors, a dramatically new face to European politics of the sixteenth century, particularly in terms of England's political and cultural development. One can only wonder at what might have transpired had their early friendship culminated in Henry's acceptance of the imperial crown. What remains from this ten-year alliance, however, is not a glorious crown, but a "grotesque" helmet. The conundrum it has posed to viewers today is suitably mirrored by the often perplexing nature of many aspects of their political rapport then.

¹Due to the enmity between Charles V and Francis I, the possibility of bringing the three rulers together, which Cardinal Wolsey had so hoped to do, was doomed to failure.
Perhaps the greatest irony of the gift is found not in its peculiarity but in its interpretation by later observers. Given as a reflection of Maximilian's imperial grandeur in honor of Henry, the English "ayre to Hector," the gift was attributed by succeeding generations - who could not fathom its meaning - to Henry's jester, William Sommers.²

What was meant behind the puzzling iconography may never be completely known, but studying the context within which it functioned helps to understand the still larger stage of European politics and courtly culture in the Renaissance, a Renaissance greatly indebted to the chivalric ideals of the Middle Ages. From the example of the gift, the entire image of the king as knight and patron becomes more readily discernible. The royal workshops, the armored depictions, the political allegiances, the battles and tournaments should all be registered when looking into the leering eyes of Konrad Seusenhofer's masterful horned helmet.

²It is in the 1660 inventory that this connection seems to have first been made. Dillon, "Westminster", 257.
APPENDIX

Translation of text from Der Weisskunig concerning the creation of the royal armor workshops.¹

"How the Young White King Worked Most Artfully (gar künstlichen) in the Armoury and the Mastery of Harneses"

When then the young White King, in his youth, learned about the tournament (Ritterspiel)² and practiced them with his body, he discovered that he could achieve fame and praise in the tournament if he learned and perceived the mastery of making all parts of the harness and the art of mastery. For in these tournaments, he had experienced and realized that he could win not only through his strength but with practice and cleverness as well. Through close study he discovered that one could produce the harness and learn so diligently that he understood all the mastery of the manufacture

¹I am grateful to Professors Wensinger and Frenzel for their patient decoding of the old German text. Neither the text nor the accompanying image appear in the 1985 facsimile of the 1775 printing. The translation here is intended to give a general sense of the content but may be, in parts, misconstrued on account of errors in my transcription from the original. I have parenthetically included the German where there was some question as to whether it was accurately transcribed. Additionally, I have taken the liberty of modernizing the form by dividing the text into sentences and paragraphs for better comprehensibility.

²The term Ritterspiel, or "knightly games", encompasses all forms of martial sports.
of the harness. Out of his special practice and understanding he discovered much pure (reiner) art which was hidden to all others. One could also not indulge in any tournament or even say anything about it unless he knows the same tournament and devotes his essence to it.

Once upon a time it happened that a weaponmaster wanted to dress the young White King in a harness for tournament or battle (Renn oder stechzeug) which was concealed to everyone (die allen und verporten), but the young White King did not want to have it. He spoke to the weaponmaster: "Dress me according to my wishes for it is I that will fight in the tournament and not you. But tell me, have you also jousted?" Thereupon (Rahn) the weaponmaster spoke: "I am, however, full of the same art." Whereupon the young White King gave him the answer: "You sense that I know the art, for there is more than just knowing in the works and the knowing comes not only from seeing but emerges from study of the works. Much misfortune comes from those who claim to know but have not actually done the activity." From that one can perceive the experience and human nature of the young White King. Where does one find a king that does not follow his weaponmaster, but rather, has exceeded him and all other weaponmaster who, in turn, have learned from him?

At another time, the young White King rode into a stupendous battle. When he was putting on his comrades' cuirasses (genessen kiriss) and their fighting armor, his weaponmaster wanted to provide his main harness with
screws so that the enemy could not open it up (aufschlagen). The King asked the weaponmaster which would be better: force or power in his hand or in another hand? The weaponmaster responded: "He who has the power, he is the master." The King then said: "Therefore, I want to be the one with power over my own harness and with the opening of the harness. I don't want to live within your will even though you are concerned with my welfare. You do not however know that out of unconsidered benevolence much misfortune comes."

From all of this, anyone could understand that this was a king, a teacher, and a revealer to other kings in matters concerning the mastery of arms and armor.

From that example, I wish to give further information, namely, that this White King in his city, the one named Innsbruck, fitted out a great armory in which he had made all kinds of armors for the field and tournament, the likes of which are beyond my powers to describe. There were also several people from the clan Treitzaurbehn who knew how to make the harness so hard that one could not shoot through it with a crossbow. This same art seems, in one part, to have died out with the aforementioned people and was lost. But there was a master residing at Möhlaup named Caspar Riederer who was the servant of those people mentioned above. This person informed the young White King about this art whereupon the King thought hard and with great zealousness and, from his own powers of comprehension, he too discovered it and taught it to his court armorer Konrad Seusenhofer. This same young King had the cuirass made in the atelier (bemelten) of his armorer with this artful hardness.
which nobody else knew about. He had the cuirasses made for kings, princes, and powerful lords. Consequently, the young White King outdid the gifts of all other kings. Whatever king he honored with such a gift received great joy from it, for what is greater to a king than a harness with which his body is provided in battle? Furthermore, the White King had wonderous harnesses made for his soldiers in the armory for battles and wars. This King invented a complete art of war harnesses by which one in his armory could produce, simultaneously, thirty breast and thirty backplates so that within one year a vast number of harnesses could be made for his landsknecht who fought and battled on foot. How wonderous and precious was this King!
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