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Résumé

"Yea further, (if lawfull to compare an idolatrous place with so divine a work) was not the Temple at Hierusalem adorned with the figures of Cherubims, that thereby the Nations of the Earth might know it was the habitation of the living God? and, why not in like manner this Temple composed by Astrological figures, that after Ages might apprehend, it was ancienly consecrated to Coelus or Coelum Heaven?"

Perhaps the clearest expression of the Stuart Court 'self-image' is to be found on the Banqueting House ceiling, where James is represented as Solomon; an antique Britain is characterised in the form of James's mythic ancestors, the first Christian King Lucius and the founder of a united Great Britain, Trojan Brute. Here, the past is seen to bear witness to the present, the restored Golden Age inaugurated by James's reign.

The Jones-Webb survey of Stonehenge, commissioned by James around 1620, is concluded with the above figures of Cherubim and Astrology. The "most notable antiquity of Great Britain", as the monument is entitled, becomes an analogue of Solomon's temple and the new Jerusalem heralded by Stuart rule finds physical expression on Salisbury plain. Here the stones are moulded into the general antique virtue represented by the Vitruvian theatre plan, a circle and triangles, the geometrical forms of neoplatonism; transformed in this way Stonehenge becomes a crumbling monument of the 'Albion and Jerusalem' antiquity pictured on the Banqueting House ceiling.

The Stuart Court's understanding of itself and its architecture as a 'restoration' of this antique British culture will be examined in the first part of this study with reference to the intended centre-piece of Stuart London, Jones's 'restored' St. Paul's Cathedral. This will suggest connections with the Jones-Webb 'restoration' of Stonehenge, a link examined in the second part. For such links, in conclusion, made Jones's work verifiably British in origin, a thesis which will obviously question the traditional understanding of Stuart architecture as having derived its primary inspiration from Jones's Italian travels. The origins of British Palladianism are uncovered on Salisbury Plain.
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PREFACE

"as mysterious as Shakespeare"
An 'Italian' Cathedral and a 'mistake'.
The enigma of Inigo Jones

"[Jones is]...a cloudy, indistinct figure to whom we must for long pay the homage of detailed inquiry before we can attempt the grand assessment or the vivid sketch. The difficulties are, after all, considerable, especially where the architecture is concerned. At least forty-five buildings were executed from Inigo's designs. Of these only seven survive, all much altered, while of the remainder there exist only the most exiguous records or, in many instances, none."

[John Summerson on Inigo Jones, (1964)]

In his Preface to Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court (1973) Roy Strong points out that three hundred years after Jones's death, "he remains a largely unexamined and mysterious figure"; more recently, John Harris notes that Jones is "as mysterious as Shakespeare". With this and Summerson's warning in mind, what follows proposes a 'speculative reconstruction' of the ideas behind one of Jones's vanished buildings - St. Paul's Cathedral, as it had been 'restored' under James I. This will require an examination of another historical enigma, Stonehenge - a 'restoration' of which Jones's assistant, John Webb, published in Jones's name in 1655; for ambiguity surrounds the very authorship of this 'restoration'. Such a study could be seen to take its place alongside architectural speculation focussed on the other 'British enigma' standing in Jones's London, the now vanished Globe Theatre - represented by the contradictory views of the geometry of its plan offered in Frances Yates's Theatre of the World (1969), and John Orrell's The Quest for Shakespeare's Globe (1983).

Since architecture expresses the values, priorities, political and religious ideals of the culture which it is made to serve, it follows that the fragmentary evidence which survives of Jones's St. Paul's can be seen to help compose a broader picture of the Stuart England of Inigo Jones. Hence by piecing together these fragments it is hoped that a picture will gradually emerge, 'jigsaw-like', of how Jones's Cathedral was intended to be seen by Stuart eyes. A 'programme' for what the restoration represented will be suggested - the study of a coherent visible, iconographic and invisible, geometric scheme.


for the Cathedral. In particular, this study will examine in detail two contemporary drawings - the plan of London in Jones's day, and Jones's early, unrealised elevation for St. Paul's.

Jones's work was not merely a neutral repair but was also sponsored by the desire to remove a Catholic past expressed in Gothic skin. No new building was ever proposed. Instead Jones's work involved the addition of symbols to an existing surface, a 'symbolic overlay' and an alteration in silhouette. The encasing of old St. Paul's became a key aspect and expression of Stuart Court iconography, or of state mythology - intended both as a celebration of achieved ideals and as an omen of a future glory. Such encasing was by no means unique in the Renaissance; in 1450 Leon Battista Alberti began a transformation of the mediaeval church S. Francesco in Rimini, later followed by a new facade to S. Maria Novella in Florence. And in the 16th Century the problem of harmonising new work with older, Gothic parts was addressed at the Cathedrals of Milan and S. Petronio, Bologna. In this country the Orders were superimposed on Elizabethan Houses as essential marks of the new fashion - at Longleat, Wollaton, and Burleigh. In Oxford, the five Orders were applied as a 'frontispiece' to the Gothic tower of the Old Schools in 1613.

Historically, few commentators have recognised the symbolic importance of this Stuart Cathedral encasing or the meaning behind Jones's symbols; the work is frequently presented as a problem of mere 'beautification' or Roman ornamentation. Nor has the significance of Stonehenge to Jones been fully explored. Traditionally the Jones-Webb study of the stones has either been ignored or considered separately and then dismissed as a 'blunder', a judgement resulting from its failure to fit within what amounts to a standard approach of compartmentation and stylistic attribution. Jones's work has equally suffered from such compartmentation, under headings of 'Architecture' and 'Stage' for example. However, the fact that Jones placed images of his buildings, including St. Paul's, on the Court stage suggests this compartmentation could be inaccurate.

Since the publication of Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* in 1715, historians have fallen in line with Campbell's self-interested presentation of

---

Jones's work as having stemmed, in essence, from Palladio. The purpose of this thesis is to question this traditional interpretation. A brief survey of the historical study of Jones's Cathedral and Stonehenge forms a necessary introduction.
An 'Italian' Cathedral; commentaries on Jones's St. Paul's

"Inigo Jones's position as a disciple of Palladian architecture is well established...[his] notes on three of Palladio's villas establish a further reputation as England's first architectural historian".

With this claim A.A. Tait concludes his article 'Inigo Jones - Architectural Historian' (1970). Tait focuses on the notes made by Jones in his copy of Palladio's Quattro Libri (1570), and, as the quotation implies, from this Jones's interest in history is established as having centered on Italy. Through a concentration on 'stylistic' sources, most commentators have followed a similar path, tracing the roots of Jones's work to Palladio's Italy - the Italy Jones undoubtedly visited and admired. In this way Jones's architecture has traditionally found its origins abroad. Recently, however, this approach has been questioned. Per Palme, in the foreword to his Triumph of Peace, A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House (1957), observed that,

"Recent investigations...[have turned Jones] into an importer rather than a creator of architecture. His buildings are described as Vicentine palaces shipped from the Brenta and unloaded on the banks of the Thames...As depicted by the history of art, the buildings of Inigo Jones drift like unmanned ships on the sea of time. They have found no anchorage in their own age".

Palme asks the important question "what happens to a style, born and bred in one cultural climate, when it is adopted in another?" It is this question, more than any other, which this study will attempt to answer with respect to Jones's St. Paul's.

Historical studies of Jones's Cathedral started in the early 18th Century and traditionally have divided into three main areas - concentrating on Jones, the old Cathedral, and Wren's new Cathedral.

At the beginning of the 18th Century the architecture of Inigo Jones became absorbed within the 'Palladian' movement sponsored by Kent, Burlington, Campbell and others. For these 18th Century enthusiasts of Palladio, Jones became a precursor, and his buildings, such as the Cathedral, became bound up with their own work. This was literally the case, for

---

example, within Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1715 ed.) and John Vardy's *Some designs of Mr Inigo Jones and Mr Wm Kent* (1744). In the same way, a view of Jones's new west front for St. Paul's by Henry Flitcroft was published in William Kent's *The Designs of Inigo Jones, Consisting of Plans and Elevations for Publick and Private Buildings...with some Additional Designs* (1727). This was the first (and last) publication of a scaled image of the west front, albeit here 'corrected' by the inclusion of unbuilt statues and concluding a book of Kent's own designs. Later, Horace Walpole in *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762-71), was to further frame Jones's Cathedral within his account of 18th Century 'taste'. This 'Palladian' appropriation has had an inevitable effect on subsequent interpretations of Jones's work at old St. Paul's.

Peter Cunningham, in *Inigo Jones; A Life of the Architect* (1848), whilst presenting Jones's Cathedral work as a matter merely of repair, advanced the curious speculation that,

"it was the wish of the King and of Archbishop Laud that the whole edifice should have been rebuilt by Inigo. This will account for the unseemly addition he is accused of making, when he placed a classic portico before a Gothic Cathedral. It was not as a part of old St. Paul's that Inigo designed his magnificent west front, but as an instalment of a new building. The King under-took the whole repairs".6

This last statement is certainly incorrect. Here the Cathedral of Cunningham's imagination would seem bound up in the great Victorian 'Gothic' versus 'Classic' debate. Despite the absence of any evidence of plans for a "new building", this idea has found a recent echo in Graham Parry's *Hollar's England* (1980). Parry imagined Jones's Cathedral "in an Italianate cloak, thus giving London a modern cathedral without the expense of total rebuilding";7 here Jones's work fulfilled the bald requirements of 'look' and 'function'. In *Georgian London* (1945) Summerson comments that

---

5 The Banqueting House, along with the Queen's House, Greenwich, ('corrected' to the 18th Century eye with additional statues) and Gunnersbury House, Middlesex, appeared in vol.i of Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1715); along with further Campbell work, vol.ii (1717) contained views of Jones's Whitehall and Covent Garden.


around 1640, "scaffolding comes and goes at St. Paul's and leaves the Gothic hulk frilled with Italian lace". For Eric Mercer, in *English Art 1553-1625* (1962), Jones's work represented "a royal scheme to give a Palladian look to St. Paul's". More recently, in Cerutti Fusco's *Inigo Jones, Vitruvius Britannicus* (1985), Jones's Cathedral is once again placed in a Roman context, this time with direct 'stylistic' sources in Italian church design.

A number of works have concentrated solely on the old Cathedral. In his *Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral* (1868) Henry Hart Milman, Dean of St. Paul's, claimed that "Inigo Jones was an Italian in all but birth...In Italy he had found the models which he condescended to imitate". William Longman, in *A History of the three Cathedrals dedicated to St. Paul in London* (1873), presented a series of plates attempting a reconstruction of the old Cathedral regularised along Victorian lines and freely disagreeing with contemporary illustrations. Not surprisingly, Jones was again presented as having "Italianised" the Cathedral. W.S. Simpson's *Chapters in the History of Old S. Paul's* (1881) attempted a "walk around old St. Paul's", after which Jones's work, featuring briefly, was merely a matter of "repair".

For historians of Cathedral architecture this century old St. Paul's has come to represent a triumph of 'mediaevalism' spoilt by the attentions paid to it by the Stuart Court. For Benham, in *Old St. Paul's Cathedral* (1902), Jones's work was an "incongruous" addition,

"it was, no doubt, fortunate that Inigo Jones confined his work at St. Paul's to some very poor additions to the transepts, and to a portico, very magnificent in its way, at the west end. He would have destroyed, doubtless, much of the noble nave in time".

---


12 *Chapters* (1881), ch.iv, ch.v. See also *Gleanings* (1889), *Old City Life* (1894).


For William Lethaby, under the shadow of William Morris, the old Gothic Cathedral became a triumph of the mediaeval craft guilds and, consequently, of constructional method. Lethaby presents an idealised past, with the Cathedral at its centre, to criticise the industrialised London of his day; his article in *The Builder* of 10 October 1930, concludes,

"I must make a quotation from one of William Morris's lectures: 'Consider London of the fourteenth century - a smallish town, beautiful from one end to the other; streets of low whitewashed houses, with a big Gothic church standing in the middle of it; a town surrounded by walls, with a forest of church towers and spires, besides the Cathedral and the abbeys and priories; every one of the houses in it, nay every shed, bearing in it a certain amount of absolute, definite, distinct, conscientious art'. Think of the difference between that and the London of today".16

As a consequence of this mediaeval romanticism Jones's work makes only a brief appearance - Lethaby's last article merely noting that "early in the seventeenth century large works of renewal and adornment were undertaken".17 Like Longman, Lethaby also attempted a physical reconstruction of the old Cathedral.18 For Cook, in *Old St. Paul's Cathedral, A Lost Glory of Medieval London* (1955), the old Cathedral was once again "dressed in classic attire by Inigo Jones",19 work which "ruined the mediaeval aspect of the western arm"20 where the portico was a "somewhat incongruous addition"..."grafted on to the west front".21 Most recently *A History of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1957) - edited by the Dean, W.R. Matthews, with W.M. Atkins - echoes the same bland 'Palladian' interpretation, with Jones "thoroughly imbued with the Italian spirit and particularly...the works

---


19 Cook, G.H., *A Lost Glory* (1955), caption to fig.37.

20 Ibid, p.84.

21 Ibid, p.26 and fig.41.
of Palladio"\textsuperscript{22} and even judged "lacking...in a just appreciation of the undoubted beauties of gothic architecture".\textsuperscript{23}

Finally, Jones’s Cathedral necessarily features in works on Christopher Wren, frequently cast as a mere posthumous sponsor of Wren's own Cathedral and a general 'Classicism' based, once again, on Italy.\textsuperscript{24} This unquestioning assertion of the Italian origins of Jones's Cathedral has led to a misunderstanding of Jones's own views about history and, consequently, to the importance of one work in particular - the Jones-Webb study of British archaeology entitled \textit{STONE-HENG Restored} (1655).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} \textit{A History of St. Paul's Cathedral} (ed. W.R. Matthews, W.M. Atkins, 1957) p.158.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{24} See Whinney, M., \textit{Wren} (1971), pp.11-12.
\end{itemize}
A 'mistake'; commentaries on Jones's Stonehenge

"the wild theory of the great architect is only another illustration of the ignorance of the learned. Inigo was a courtier; and his rough notes...contain perhaps less of his own views upon the subject, than of ingenious illustrations of the hypothesis of the learned sovereign by whose command he had entered on the inquiry".


Peter Cunningham's early incredulity at what he understands to be Jones's study of Stonehenge, his "monstrous supposition", set the tone for most of the early consideration this century. In 1928 Gotch found STONE-HENG Restored "incomprehensible",

"how Inigo, who had studied and drawn Roman remains in Italy, and was himself a skilful designer of the revived Classic architecture, could have led Webb to confound the uncouth and rugged stones of Stonehenge with the carefully wrought and well-proportioned work of the Romans, is incomprehensible. It is equally hard to understand how Webb, who was as serious a student of Classic architecture as his master, could have adopted and elaborated such a theory".25

James Lees-Milne in 1953 summarised STONE-HENG Restored as "Jones's ludicrous claim that this monument was built by the Roman Britons in honour of the sun god Caelus";26 as an apology on Jones's behalf, Lees-Milne offers the curious explanation that,

"It is...likely that Jones was far from satisfied by his conclusions, which might even have been dictated by the King, and that he managed successfully to avoid publication of them during James's lifetime. If this was so, then Webb did his memory no service by resurrecting them...How...Webb could have believed such nonsense is a mystery".27

In his otherwise well rounded discussion of the meaning of Jones's Banqueting House in 1957, Per Palme fails to mention the Jones-Webb study of Stonehenge.

More recently, however, this study has been better understood. Summerson in 1966 observed that "if, to us, the solution is ludicrous, we must also admit it to have been, in its time, intelligent".\(^{28}\) After pointing out that *STONE-HENG Restored* constituted "one of the most remarkable pieces of evidence we possess about the way Jones's imagination worked", Stephen Orgel in 1973 observed that the study is "always profoundly informed by Jones's vision of Britain as the true heir of Roman culture".\(^{29}\) Chapter five will discuss Orgel's work on *STONE-HENG Restored*, together with that by Frances Yates (in 1969), Graham Parry (in 1981) and Annarosa Cerutti Fusco (in 1985). Despite these studies, Harris and Higgott's *Inigo Jones, Complete Architectural Drawings*, published in 1989, in concentrating on the traditional task of finding stylistic origins for Jones's architecture mentions *STONE-HENG Restored* only twice, in passing.

The early search for the origins of Jones's work in Italy and the dismissal of the Stonehenge thesis on the grounds of illogicality have, I suggest, obscured the fact of how important it was for the Jones-Webb partnership that Stonehenge have the claimed 'Romano-British' builders. Indeed, the very illogicality and contortion of the evidence in *STONE-HENG Restored* is in itself proof of such an importance. Christopher Chippindale, in 1983, whilst concentrating solely on the myths of Stonehenge, presented the architects' 'restoration' as part of the continual historical search for a 'legitimate' past centred around the stones on Salisbury plain. For the history of Stonehenge, "shows during eight centuries what we have felt about the past and its remains...Naturally, ideas of Stonehenge have followed the fashions of the age. In medieval times it found a place in patriotic schemes of early British history. The 17th-century age of learning marks the first attempt to analyse it. In the 18th century its history was submerged under religious dogma".\(^{30}\)


\(^{29}\) Orgel, S., (with Strong and Harris), *The King's Arcadia* (1973), p.82.

Implied in any recognition of Jones's need for such direct links to British history is a questioning of the traditional understanding of what his architecture itself was designed to represent.
Style versus Intention

"those parts of the casing of St. Paul's where the existing building restricted Jones, show a common style...Jones derived his style from Palladio".

[De Beer, E.S., (1940)]31

Historically, then, the work of Inigo Jones on old St. Paul's has been seen primarily as a question of architectural 'style', a 'style' imported from the Italian city states of Jones's day - of Rome, Venice and Vicenza. Jones certainly travelled to Italy, and regarded the work of Palladio as an important source, but a concentration on such foreign, architectural sources has left Jones's Cathedral and Stuart architecture in general isolated from the broader aims and policies of the culture from which it was derived - an independent, English culture seeking to rival and not merely imitate Italy. For, through its 'tangibility', architecture became an important realisation of Court policies by which this rivalry was to find form. It is, therefore, these national aims and the history which justified them, which should be examined to explain why Jones's work was patronised and what his architectural backdrop represented to the various players in the drama of Stuart England.

Some books have now examined the fuller implications of Stuart iconography in general - recent studies by Parry, Strong and Yates. However, apart from Per Palme's study of the Banqueting House, no recent attempt has been made to interpret a single building by Jones in the light of the clues offered by these authors. No book, recent or otherwise, has yet offered a detailed analysis of Jones's Cathedral, perhaps his single most important building.32 What follows is an attempt at such a study. This involves examining the neglected issue of the role of Jones's Gothic inheritance, and mediaeval arts in general, in the architect's work. Prompted by the notion that the intentions of Jones's Cathedral for his own time have traditionally been misunderstood, an attempt will be made to present a more complete picture of the complexities of Stuart architecture. But first the


32 The most recent detailed study of Jones's work on the Cathedral is the 'Master Mind' article by Summerson quoted at the start, subsequently reprinted with amendments in Summerson, The Unromantic Castle (1990). There is a detailed survey of Jones's work on the Cathedral by Summerson, The History of the King's Works (ed. Colvin, H.) (1975), pp.147-153.
evidence itself of Jones's 'surveys' of Stonehenge and St. Paul's Cathedral should be outlined, and the problem of authorship, record and date implicit in this evidence discussed.
CHAPTER ONE

"his Majesties commands...what possibly I could discover"
Two Court 'surveys', a problem of authorship, record and date.
Chapter One

Fragments of a lost Cathedral; three 'surveys' of old St. Paul's by the 'Surveyor of the King's Works'

"By the Lords Comiss[i]on[ers] for the busines of the Cathederal Church of St. Pauls.

Upon consideration and debate...of the best wayes and meanes for the advancing the works intended for the repairiraton of the Cathederal Church of St Pauls and upon conference therof had with Inigo Jones Esq. Surveyor of his Majesties Works...the said Mr. Inigo Jones (who for the good of works intendes to attempt the said repair gratis) be app[ointed] Surveyor of the said works. And that he from tyme to tyme shall nominate a Substitute to be put in [when] he shall thinke fitt".

[Feb.4, 1633, Whitehall, SP 16/213 f.28]

The Norman Cathedral of St. Paul was built on the site of a Saxon church which had burnt down in 1087. The Cathedral took over a century to build and was the largest landmark in the mediaeval city - 650 feet from east to west, 325 feet north to south - it was larger even than Wren's building which replaced it. Contemporary map panoramas tended to emphasise this dominance, such as the one which, for example, decorated 'The Londinium Arch' in James I's 1604 triumphant entry into London (Fig.4). However, of this "huge and graceful" Cathedral, as Webb termed it, little survives. With the exception of a few fragments, only the tomb of John Donne is intact and built into Wren's new St. Paul's, preserved along with a number of books from the old Cathedral library. No scale drawings exist of old mediaeval St. Paul's.

The written record is equally fragmentary. William Dugdale's The History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London (1658) is the only 17th Century work to concentrate on the Gothic Cathedral, and on Jones's subsequent 'repair'. It was written before the old Cathedral was destroyed, and necessarily represents the most obvious source for what we may now know about old St. Paul's. Dugdale had access to reports and accounts compiled, as it appears by numerous marginal references, by "Joh. Web. gen.". Here is to be found a plan and a view of the south elevation of the old Cathedral, complete with spire (Fig.67) before Jones's work, and views north, south and west after Jones's resurfacing, all engraved by Wenceslaus Hollar (Fig.70). Dugdale

---

1 Webb, J., VINDICATION (1725 ed.), p.27.
also includes views of the inside, and of the many tombs in the old Cathedral. In conclusion Dugdale states that his purpose was "to give some representation, as well to the present age, as future times, of what it hath been". His work was republished, along with a history of Wren's Cathedral, in 1716 and again in 1818. Contemporary maps and panoramas record a number of distant views of Jones's work. Other written sources for the intentions behind 'restoration' include various sermons, poems, diaries, and masques. An important practical record are the Work's accounts in the Guildhall Library, London, and Lambeth Palace Library. The Public Records Office also has State papers relating to the work.

An important general source for the study of Jones is his annotations to the books comprising his library, the majority of them at Worcester College, Oxford. Here are works on such as the history of the Roman Empire, and books covering the related subjects of mechanics, geometry, music, fortifications and architecture. The collection includes his Plato, Alberti, Scamozzi, Vasari and the famous Palladio. Jones's Lomazzo is in a private collection. Editions of Serlio with Jones's annotations are held at the Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal, and at Queen's College, Oxford, whilst his Vitruvius is at Chatsworth House. Chatsworth also holds

2 See also Holland, H., Ecclesia Sancti Pauli Illustrata (1633).
3 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.192.
5 SP 14, 16. (State Papers (Domestic)).
9 Queen's College hold Serlio, S., D'Architettura Di Sebastiano Serlio, Venice, (1560-2 ed.), whilst the Canadian Centre for Architecture hold Jones's 1600 ed., TUTTE L'OPERE D'ARCHITETTURA ET PROSPETTIVA DI SEBASTIANO SERLIO BOLOGNESE, (the first three books); Chatsworth hold Vitruvius, Barbaro ed., Venice, (1556).
the vast majority of Jones's masque drawings.\textsuperscript{10} The rest of Jones's drawings, other than for the masque, are held at the R.I.B.A. Drawings Collection, Worcester College and the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, and at Chatsworth.\textsuperscript{11}

Despite the evident grandeur of the old Cathedral, for at least one foreign sightseer in London in 1592, although "large and remarkable", old St. Paul's had otherwise "nothing of importance to be seen".\textsuperscript{12} The Puritan city fathers had had little time for the Cathedral\textsuperscript{13} and it had progressively fallen into disrepair during the 16th Century. A fire after a lightning strike in June 1561 had destroyed the spire, together with the nave and aisle roofs,\textsuperscript{14} thus diminishing the impact of the Cathedral on the London skyline. Elizabeth promptly ordered the Lord Mayor and Archbishop of Canterbury to collect money from laity and clergy, and gave timber and a thousand marks in gold for repairs to the roof. However, although according to Dugdale "divers modells were then made of it",\textsuperscript{15} the spire was not replaced and the accounts for this work were closed in 1566.

Continual exposure to the London coal smoke had led to stone corrosion and, Dugdale reports, James's

"princely heart was moved with such compassion to this decayed fabrick, that for prevention of its neer approaching ruine...considering with himself how vast the charge would be; as also, that without very great and publick helps, it could not be born".\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} For Jones's masque designs see Strong, R., Orgel, S., \textit{Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court}, ii vols., (1973). Two drawings (for proscenium arches) are in the R.I.B.A. Drawings Collection ('The Triumph of Peace', 'The Temple of Love'), a design for an arch is in the Paul Mellon Collection, and a backdrop including the Whitehall Banqueting House itself is in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.
  \item \textsuperscript{11} See Harris, J., Higgott, G., \textit{Inigo Jones Complete Architectural Drawings} (1989).
  \item \textsuperscript{12} From the diary of the Duke of Wurtemberg, 1592. Rye, W.B., \textit{England as Seen by Foreigners} (1865), p.8.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} See Strong, R., \textit{Lost Treasures of Britain} (1990), p.134.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Dugdale, W., \textit{History} (1658), p.133.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid, p.134.
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
At one level Jones's later building work represented an attempt to halt not only this decay but also to restore the Cathedral's moral decency after centuries of abuse - the most blatant of which was the infamous 'Paul's Walk' down which even prostitutes were to be found. Private dwellings squatted in the Cathedral yard, and cellars undermined the very foundations of the Cathedral. The story of Jones's removal of the many encroachments around the old Cathedral is summarised in the *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)* for the years 1620 - 1643. To take but one of the many entries in the State Papers, on August 24, 1632:

"Upon information this day given that not withstanding former directions by the order of the 9th of May for the filling upp of the sellers & vaults discovoured upon the taking downe of the house of Elizabeth Porter widow at the west end of Paules. Yet the said sellers & vaults are not filled and that it does appeare that by reason of the said vaults & sellers the foundations of the said church may have received further damage. It was this day ordered that Ewin Birch, one of the messengers of his Majs Chamber shall take unto him two experienced Master Masons and...cause them to certifie in writing...how far the said foundations are endamaged thereby".

The most notable of these encroachments was St. Gregory's church, removed by Jones from the south west corner of the Cathedral as part of his 'restoration' only to be rebuilt, after the Civil War, ironically using materials left over from the 'restoration' itself. There were three Stuart enquiries into the physical state of old St. Paul's, and three surveys by the Royal 'Surveyor', Inigo Jones.

The first of these was initiated in July 1608, when, at the insistance of the

---

17 The shame of visitors to London noting this decay was used as an inducement to repair by Gyles Fleming in *Magnificence Exemplified: And The Repaire of Saint Pauls exhortd unto* (1634), p.47.


20 See items indexed under 'St. Paul's Cathedral'.

21 SP 16/213 f.24.

Earl of Salisbury, James asked the Lord Mayor and the Bishop of London to organise a survey of the Cathedral and prepare estimates for a general repair and a new spire. Although Jones was not as yet Surveyor of Works (and in any case the Cathedral was not a Royal responsibility) there survives an elevation by Jones for a new termination to the Cathedral tower24 (Fig. 79) probably dating from this survey. However, nothing came of this tower project or indeed of the proposed general repair.

Twelve years were to elapse before James set up a royal commission to examine the state of the Cathedral, with Jones listed as a commissioner along with, for example, George Abbot, Francis Bacon, Lancelot Andrews, the Earls of Pembroke and Arundel and the Duke of Buckingham.25 Jones probably produced drawings for this commission, for a letter by him to Arundel dated 17th August, 1620, notes that "The plan of all the incroachments about Paules is fully finished".26 A complete survey of necessary repairs to decayed stonework and estimated costs was undertaken, beginning in April 1620 (this included for the rebuilding of the tower).27 James promised £2000, Prince Charles £500,28 and Bishop King £100 a year from his revenue. Portland stone was also stored but the collection of money went slowly29 and no actual building work was started, other than demolition30 and new glazing.

It was only after Charles I and William Laud, Bishop of London since 1628, had assembled a second commission on 10 April 1631, that work itself
was to begin. This time Jones's name was not on the actual commission list and he acted in his capacity as 'Surveyor' without fee (as the epigraph of this chapter shows); indeed the restoration itself fell only marginally into the concerns of the Office of Works, funded as it was mainly by subscription from laity. 31

1 The Work's accounts and site operations. The second commission began their meetings on 16 December, 1631, and legal moves to gain possession of the leases of houses encroaching on the Cathedral were begun in January 1632. 32 Work was not supposed to begin until £8,000 to £10,000 had been raised, 33 but on 26th June 1633, with only £5,416 13s 6d actually collected, £2,000 was issued by the paymaster Michael Grigg and the refacing began at the south-east end (W.A.1) and proceeded along the south elevation to the west end. 34 The monthly pace and object of work is recorded in the Work's accounts, with the west end accounted for separately. 35

While Jones was certainly much involved with the actual building work, as State Papers and Work's accounts reveal, John Webb, as Jones's 'Clerk engrosser' 36 from beginning to end, controlled much of the site operation on

32 SP 16/213, f.11a.
33 SP 16/239, no.20.
34 See Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.139. SP 16/231, no.31.
35 W.A.1 1633 April-1633 Oct. South East end.
W.A.2 1633 Nov.-1634 Sept. East end, South and North sides.
W.A.3 1634 Nov.-1635 Sept. West end.
W.A.4 1634 Oct.-1635 Sept. East end, South and North sides.
W.A.8 1636 Oct.-1637 Sept. West end.
W.A.14 1640 Oct.-1641 Sept. West end.
the Cathedral. It was probably through this work that Webb received much of his training, with building techniques used later elsewhere. The monthly accounts record Webb's payment for "double engrossing this book viz one for the paymaster, and one to remain in the office". In December 1639 (W.A.13) Webb's payment entry expands on this role, including his annual salary,

"to John Webb for his paynes and attendance in assisting to Draft up all the monthly Accompts for the worke, and for draweing faire ingrossing and enteringe into a Ledger Booke the Bargaines made from tyme to tyme with the severall workemen, Quarrymen and undertakers, and for Copying severall Designes and Mouldings and makinge the tracings of them according to Mr Surveyor's directions for the workemen to followe for all the tyme, being with the worke began at first seaven yeares, viz for the three first yeares after the worke at £13, 13s, 4d Ann and for the fower last yeares after the worke at £20 per annum".

The Work's accounts were signed jointly every month by Jones, Grigg and Carter. Throughout the work Edward Carter was paid for being "Substitute to Inigo Jones Esquire Surveyor of the worke for his Attendance". In a surviving document Webb defines his work against that carried out by Carter,

"Mr Webbe copied all ye designes from ye Surveyors Invention, made all ye traceries in great for ye worke, & all ye mouldings by ye Surveyors direction so yt what the Surveyor invented & Mr Webbe made, ye substitute [Carter] saw putt in worke & nothing else".38

Webb's accounts testify to the industry, ambition, enormity and detailed nature of the work. In the tradition of mediaeval Work's accounts for the building of the Royal palaces, the scale of work on which compares, the

inaccurately states that the "work achieved at St Paul's was the remodelling of the whole of the exterior, apart from the central tower"). See also Summerson, J., *The History of the King's Works* (ed. Colvin, H.) (1975), p.150-1.

37 Relieving arches used at St. Paul's were employed by Webb at Lamport Hall, see Bold, J., *John Webb* (1989), p.87.


accounts for St. Paul's provide a comprehensive record of much of the actual site work - including crafts employed, names of individuals, quantities of materials, price and progress of the work. Listed in order of craft importance, entries for Masons, Carpenters and Labourers in particular provide detailed descriptions of progress, but other trades are also listed such as Masons' apprentices, Timber and Stone cutters ('Sawyers'), Smiths, Bricklayers, Glaziers, Painters, Plumbers and Paving setters. In this way the accounts reflected the work itself, divided as it was into trades headed by Masons. At night, watchmen were employed to guard the work and materials (W.A.7 May 1637 onwards). Materials listed include stone, timber, iron, rope, lime, sand, nails, paint ('colors'), oil, brass, lead, elm and oak board. Against these, quantities are frequently legible; in November 1639 payment was made for the carriage of 234 tonnes of Portland stone from Paul's wharf to St Paul's (W.A.13). Details include the payment at the start of work of a joiner for making office furniture for 'Mr Surveyor' (W.A.1), and Webb's reimbursement in June 1635 for the purchase of a book (W.A.4).

Work on the site was evidently dangerous. From July to October 1635 monthly payments were made to an injured workman, and by November a surgeon was necessary (W.A.4). In November 1637 an allowance was made to a widow whose husband was killed by a fall of scaffolding (W.A.9), in July 1639 carpenters roofed over the great west door to protect the work and workmen from "the fall of the old stone and rubbish from the topp" (W.A.11), and in November 1640 a workman was paid an allowance after a section of wall fell on him (W.A.15).

Workmen were paid for the number of days worked on specific jobs - for example, in July 1640 the accounts make reference to painters employed "by the day" (W.A.13). Work was divided up vertically by the form of the building, referred to as the upper and lower "battlements" (W.A.7 August 1637, W.A.13 May 1640). Webb also appears to have been responsible for some of the site measurement - in April 1640, for example, he was specifically paid for "helping to take the measurements of the Mason's Casse Worke" (W.A.13). In this he combined the modern roles of architect, land and quantity surveyor. Indeed, the complexity of 17th Century site operations and coordination of craft skills can be gleaned from these accounts. In October 1635 carpenters were employed in "making provision for the masons to take up their work on the north side", including making enclosures and

(1982), for example Westminster, p.290.
putting up scaffolding, then in November of that year masons were paid for "making of Anchor holes" (W.A.5). These anchors would seem to have been the means by which the new stone was to be tied back to the old, and, along with 'cramps', were made by smiths (W.A.13 November 1639). In January 1640 reference is made to masons "putting in of Irons to holes" (W.A.13). Masons underpinned the wall plates and cut holes in the stone for the carpenters' roof trusses, and subsequently plumbers worked on roof leadwork (W.A.5 July 1636). Labourers assisted throughout in digging foundations, making mortar, carrying stone and timber into the 'Yards' from Tower wharf (or Paul's wharf for west front stone (W.A.10)), dismantling scaffolding and carting away rubbish. New timber was stored in a separate "Timber Yard" (W.A.5 September 1636) whilst old timber from the roof was evidently reused as boarding (W.A.11 November 1638).

At the west end Jones designed a great portico surmounted by statues of both Stuart Kings, funded directly by Charles. Webb tells us that Jones set the portico out with what he concluded to be the Roman method of optical correction.40 Behind these columns were three great marble doorways, visible in one of Hollar's engravings.41 The accounts provide a 'diary' of progress on this portico. The foundations were begun in July 1635 (W.A.3).42 Then in November 1635 labourers were paid "for bringing upp the Stonework of the foundation of the Portico", in June 1636 Masons levelled these foundations and carpenters planted stakes in the ground for the fixing of guide ropes for the setting of the bases; in the following month masons brought up the foundations adjoining the old wall for the pilaster bases to stand on (W.A.6). In June 1637 carpenters erected scaffolding for the first, second and third stones to each column and railed-in the base mouldings to "save from breaking", in August scaffolding for the fourth and fifth stones was erected (W.A.8), and by March 1638 carpenters had erected

41 W.A.12 April 1640, masons paid for carving the marble for the doorways. Fulham Papers 43, June 1640.
42 Two centuries later a rather dramatic, colourfully speculative view of this portico was offered by Roy Strong (Fig.80), in 'Britain's Vanished Treasures', The Sunday Times Magazine, Nov.19, 1989. This was largely reprinted (without the Cathedral illustration) in Lost Treasures of Britain (1990), pp.134-5. Strong notes that the "the ceiling above was coffered, carved and gilded", but I can find no evidence of this.
43 Labourers were paid for this work.
scaffolding for the "last six stones" (W.A.10) - making eleven 'monumental' stones to each column, built up, it would appear, simultaneously (probably to keep each course level). Then in September labourers brought stone from Paul's wharf for carvers to work on "the great Capitalls". From then on a large number of carvers worked on these throughout 1639 (W.A.12). In December 1638 the seven carvers working on the Capitols (W.A.12) were roofed over to keep the work dry (W.A.11). In May the "great Marble door" at the west end was set and in August 1639 scaffolding was extended "for the taking up and setting of the great Capitols" (W.A.11). Work then proceeded on the architrave, frieze and cornice, models of which were started in September 1639 (W.A.11) and completed the following month, with black and gold lettering painted in the frieze (Fulham Papers 43), and subsequently put in situ (carpenters were later paid to take this model down (W.A.13 December 1639)). In April 1640 carpenters took down west front coverings made for the security of the marble work and were employed in making centerings for the "great round windowes" over the west end aisle doors (W.A.13). In May 1641 a model was made for "foliage in the freeze" and for part of the great west door, and in September a painter was paid for drawing "letters in great for the front of the west end" (W.A.14).

The actual recasing was extended only over the nave, whilst the 14th Century choir was treated as a matter of repair (the old stonework was taken out and replaced, flying buttresses repaired, and new foliage for the windows was carved by Edmund Kinsman). The mediaeval glass was boarded up and taken down to be repaired (W.A.5 January 1636). From August 1634 (W.A.2) to June 1635 (W.A.4) the "great East window" was repaired and in October scaffolding dismantled and re-errected in the north and south Yards (W.A.5). To the transepts Jones carried the nave encasing around the west walls and north and south facades, but the eastern transept walls were, like the choir, merely mended. The whole centre part of the north transept facade was taken down and rebuilt (W.A.13 February 1640), as was the gable end to the west front, demolished in July 1639 (W.A.12) after the covers had been built. Whilst a certain amount of the work was carried on from inside the Cathedral (carpenters were paid for scaffolding on the inside (W.A.7 June 1637)), especially around the windows (W.A.15 August 1641), the inside was similarly repaired, not resurfaced. Perhaps if work had not been

---

44 W.A.1 September 1633 (windows), W.A.4 November 1634 (choir buttresses repaired), W.A.5 January 1636 (repair of stone "flowers on the topp of the pinacles").
interrupted by the Civil War, and money had been raised, these parts might also have been encased, but there is no actual evidence of this intention. Indeed, Summerson argues from the Work's accounts that, unlike the Romanesque transepts and nave, the Gothic work forming the choir was "highly valued and there was no thought of modernisation". The extent and care of the repair work evident from these accounts certainly makes it seem unlikely that a future encasing was intended. However, the old idea of replacing the spire had not been abandoned, a project which would have necessitated the demolition and rebuilding of the central tower; indeed by 1641 this was scaffolded inside and out, and by the time of the cessation of work after September 1642, judging from the accounts, nearly all the intended external work had probably been completed. The extent of Jones's encasing can clearly be seen in Hollar's views.

There is no clear view, to scale or otherwise, of the mediaeval west front. Hence there is nothing to record what the two west end towers to either side of the Cathedral (cited in W.A.13 April 1640) looked like and therefore whether they were identical. Matthieu Merian's 1638 engraving of London (Fig.66) shows the old Cathedral without towers, as does that by Visscher (Fig.68) and a sketch by Hollar (Fig.66). However, in August of 1640 stone was transported for new towers at the west end (W.A.13) and in November (W.A.14) payment was made for "taking downe the upper part of the Two Towers". These evidently contained staircases (W.A.13 September 1640), which may have provided access to the lower nave aisle roofs. During September 1641, at the same time as the cornice of the portico was being set, a mason, Gabriel Stacey, was working on Jones's new towers (W.A.14) and

47 These towers have been discussed by Longman, W., The Three Cathedrals dedicated to St. Paul (1873), pp.34-36: "the first question is, whether there were any western towers? Dugdale does not mention any, nor are there any in Hollar's plates...The turrets represented on each side of Inigo Jones' portico do not deserve the description of 'a strong tower of stone' [Stow],...and are hardly large enough to be used as a prison. They may, however, have been rebuilt by Inigo Jones on the foundations of larger towers, but, it must be stated, there is no evidence of this. No drawings or plates are known to exist which would settle this question, and consequently no towers are given in Mr. Ferrey's restorations". Summerson, in Architecture in Britain 1530 to 1830 (7th ed., 1983), p.136, assumes that Jones's southern tower was "a recasing of the old tower of St. Gregory-by-St-Paul's, the other a duplicate for symmetry", but in the 'Master Mind' article (1964), Summerson had noted p.184 "the two ancient but remodelled towers".
Hollar's plates record what these identical towers looked like.

The Romanesque nave, encased in rusticated masonry, had an applied Order of a 'quasi-Tuscan' character appropriate, perhaps, to the massive ashlar character of Jones's walls. It would appear that Jones used all the Orders on St. Paul's - for, as Summerson notes,

"Jones deliberately thought in linked episodes within a wide range of stylistic moods - near-Tuscan for the body, Doric for the lesser doorways, Ionic for the greater and, for the grand Royal approach at the west, Corinthian".48

Summerson adds that the 'quasi-Tuscan' was appropriate "to the generally archaic, primitive character of the Romanesque nave...[Jones] was enveloping".49 Further iconography is recorded by the accounts, citing carved cherubim (W.A.9) and lions' heads (W.A.5 February 1636) - one of the latter surviving.50 Hollar illustrates the head of a winged cherubim over each keystone of the nave windows, and Sir Roger Pratt reports that lions' heads formed a frieze.51 Timber models were evidently made of these.52 In Jones's nave recasting he removed the crenellations, or 'battlements' as the accounts termed them, and topped the quasi-Tuscan Order with what Pratt reports were "vast Pineaples".53 Models were made of these in November 1639, and the following month the accounts record payment for the carving of five "pyne Apples" (W.A.13).54 Above these, according to Wren, Jones placed obelisks which ran along the sides of the nave and transepts.

---

48 Summerson, J., *Inigo Jones* (1966), p.104. Rykwert, J., *The First Moderns* (1980), p.138, after commenting on the Corinthian portico notes: "the Norman walls becoming an astylar Tuscan; Ionic columns framed the transept doors, Doric the nave ones. It may be that the Composite would have been used in the choir".

49 Summerson, J., 'Master Mind' article (1964), p.188.

50 In the collection of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's.


52 In January 1636, Andreas Carne, listed as carver and mason, modelled a lion's head in clay (W.A.5) and in June 1638, Enoch Wyatt was making models of cherubim (W.A.9).


54 Enoch Wyatt again made the models, altering them until "approved of by the Surveyor".
A letter of 25 April 1668 from the Rev. Dr. William Sancroft to Wren, although complaining about Jones’s work, hints at the technical difficulties the architect had to overcome,

"This Breach has discover'd...two great Defects in Inigo Jones's Work; one, that his new Case of Stone in the upper Walls, (massy as it is) was not set upon the upright of the Pillars, but upon the Core of the Groins of the vaulting: the other, that there were no Key-stones at all to tie it to the old Work; and all this being very heavy with the Roman Ornaments on the Top of it, and being already so far gone outward, cannot possibly stand long".56

Perhaps the 'Roman Ornaments' to which Sancroft refers were the obelisks Wren's drawings record placed on top of this upper wall.

Money was raised as work progressed. The Chamberlain of London, Robert Bateman, kept a record of contributions to the restoration drawn up at the end of each year.57 Laud himself promised an annual donation of £100.58 In 1634 the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London were urged to improve their efforts to raise contributions by a reminder that the King had promised £500 a year for ten years and had taken the west front under his care,59 although others in fact contributed. For money was evidently donated for repair of specific parts, divided into west end, steeple and general repairs.60 Much of the work was paid for by fines - with money coming from such

---

55 Hollar records an obelisk on each of the corners of Jones's Cathedral; however, in this 'Pre-Fire' drawing Wren shows one crowning each upper 'pier', throughout the nave and transepts (Hollar leaves these empty and 'uncelebrated'). Here, Wren is probably correct, since these obelisks may well have also been necessary to perform a structural function in preventing the roof from spreading, as Gothic pinnacles would have done in the same location (certainly Wren is accurate in his record of pineapples at the head of the lower 'piers').

56 Quoted in Wren, S., PARENTALLIA (1750), p.279.

57 See Guildhall MS.25,474 vi.vols., 1633-40, audited accounts of money received by the Chamberlain of London for building work, recording sums received and names of contributors - individuals, chiefly nobility and church dignitaries, listed in approximate order of importance, followed by contributions from the livery Companies and Wards of the City, and from Counties.

58 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.104.

59 SP 16/259, no.22.

60 Guildhall MS 25,474, vol.v.
unlikely sources as fines for profanity, adultery, and incest.\textsuperscript{61} Between September 1631 and October 1643 £101,330 4s. 8d was raised, an amount including £10,971 16s. 2d from the King and £21,237 from the counties.\textsuperscript{62} The Work’s accounts record the amount spent per month, and total for that year; between October 1639 to September 1640, £1,172, 10s, 91/2d was spent on the west front alone (Fulham 43). At the end of each year, Webb was paid an additional sum for presenting these accounts to the Cathedral commissioners, a fact which may explain the detailed nature of the descriptions. A yearly account of the work was to be rendered at the Council Chamber at Whitehall on All Souls Day, (2nd November) at two in the afternoon.\textsuperscript{63} In addition, other accounts were kept of a purely financial nature, maintained not by Webb but by the Chamberlain of London.\textsuperscript{64}

\textbf{2 Surviving Drawings.} On Jones’s death the Cathedral drawings were inherited by Webb, who subsequently bequeathed them to his son, William, under the prevision that none should be sold. However, many, including those for the Cathedral, evidently were and we next hear of Jones’s designs through John Aubrey, writing between 1669 and 1696, who reports,

"Mr. [John] Oliver, the city surveyor, hath all his papers and designes, not only of St. Paul’s Cathedral etc. and the Banqueting-house, but his designe of all Whitehall, suite-able to the Banquetting house".\textsuperscript{65}

This is the last mention of what must have been a substantial collection, for few scale drawings of the Cathedral work by Jones survive of those evidently available to Aubrey.\textsuperscript{66}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[61] SP 16/275, no.35; 16/283, no.72.
\item[63] SP 16/213 f.28.
\item[64] MS.25,475, 25,476, 25,478, 25,479, 25,486, 25,488. Day books, monthly summaries and rough cash books recording money received by the Chamberlain of London and payment to Officers of the Cathedral, 1631-44.
\end{footnotes}
As part of Webb's Cathedral site work, a drawing in his hand dated 1637 shows a design for a pulley\textsuperscript{67} (Fig. 79), the only site drawing to have survived. Apart from the 1608 tower design, there are three surviving drawings in Jones's hand for the Cathedral work. One represents an elevation for the north and south nave doors\textsuperscript{68} (dated 1637) (Fig. 79), another a north transept elevation design\textsuperscript{69} (undated, but presumably post 1633) (Fig. 79) and the third records what is evidently a 'pre-built' design for the west front\textsuperscript{70} (Fig. 55), without the portico and any visible reference to the royal benefactor. This drawing has no scale or date, leading commentators to date it through Jones's apparent stylistic development, tied to the various restoration campaigns - 1608, 1620, 1631 - as the catalogue entry for this drawing points out.\textsuperscript{71} On stylistic grounds Summerson first dated it to 1608, but has since revised this to 1630-1.\textsuperscript{72} John Harris, on the basis of stylistic similarities with the Banqueting House, attributed it to "about 1620", but has also recently revised the date, in line with Gotch and Wittkower, to post 1633.\textsuperscript{73} Annarosa Cerutti Fusco dates the scheme at 1621, again on the basis of a similarity of style with the Banqueting House.\textsuperscript{74} Per Palme points out that the fact that the drawing for a door is dated 1634 (it is in fact dated 1637) does not mean the others are of this date. He dates the drawing for the west front to the early 1620's,\textsuperscript{75} and links it to the work of the 1620 commission. Whilst perhaps no definite conclusion can be reached, no one

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{67} From Stafford Letters, vol.24-5 (133), 14 July 1637: Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, Central Library, Sheffield.
\item \textsuperscript{68} In R.I.B.A. Drawings Collection, Jones-Webb Cat., Drawing 32.
\item \textsuperscript{69} At Worcester College, Oxford, see Harris, J., Tait, A.A., (ed.) Catalogue of the Drawings... at Worcester College, Oxford (1979), no.14.
\item \textsuperscript{70} In R.I.B.A. Drawings Collection, Jones-Webb Cat., Drawing 31.
\item \textsuperscript{71} Ibid. See Harris, J., Higgott, G., Complete Architectural Drawings (1989), p.241.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Cerutti Fusco, A., \textit{Inigo Jones Vitruvius Britannicus} (1985), p.273.
\item \textsuperscript{75} Palme, P., \textit{Triumph of Peace} (1957), p.23 n.1.
\end{itemize}
now argues for 1608 and this thesis will provide evidence to suggest a dating after 1620, in line with the consensus based on stylistic analysis.

With no scale drawings of the actual built west front in Jones's hand having survived, the picture is further confused by there being no record of the vertical dimensions of the old Cathedral within which Jones had to work. The only scale drawings are a little known and rather crude west elevation by Daniel King (Fig.72), undated but probably taken from Hollar, and the much reproduced drawing by Flitcroft published by Kent in 1727. This purports to show the design of the west front as executed to scale (Fig.55) sixty years after the Cathedral had disappeared - a copy, perhaps, of a lost drawing by Jones or Webb. Hollar's contemporary engravings confirm Flitcroft's elevation, but not the proportions, since Hollar shows the executed design in perspective. However, Flitcroft's columns are each topped with a statue, eight in all, and as such represent the design rather than a survey, since only two statues, one of James the other of Charles, were actually executed.

Sir Christopher Wren recorded part of the plan of the old Cathedral, and gave a glimpse of Jones's external work to the west face of the transepts. The drawings concerned were executed in 1666 as part of his work for the commission for the repair of the old Cathedral after damage inflicted by the Civil War (Fig.79). However, it is impossible to distinguish in these, with any precision, Wren's work from that by Jones. A section records the Gothic choir internally (Fig.79). One of Wren's later 'Warrant Design' drawings would seem to incorporate Jones's portico, although it cannot be trusted since, like the rest of the old Cathedral, it is much altered (new statues and columns are added, for example). After the Cathedral was largely destroyed in the Fire of 1666 two sketches by other artists recorded Jones's work in ruins (Fig.73).

76 Kent, W., Designs of Inigo Jones (1727), vol.ii, pl.50. Flitcroft's drawing is in the library at Chatsworth.
79 Sketch of the south transept of the Cathedral after the Fire of 1666, by Thomas Wycke (1672), [Guildhall Library, London], sketch of the west front, anon., [Dean and Chapter of St.
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Chapter One

As the preface pointed out, there is little direct evidence with which to 'picture' the architecture of Inigo Jones. For this reason alone another 'survey' by the King's Surveyor becomes significant - that of Stonehenge, carried out, or so we are told, in 1620, thus coinciding with one of Jones's surveys of the Cathedral.
Jones's 'survey' of Stonehenge, *STONE-HENG Restored* (1655), and the problem of authorship.

"what judicious Eye, that hath once beheld the Remains of...the monstrous Buildings of the Romans in Italy, can afterward fancy any such thing as Roman Magnificence in this formless uniform Heap of massy Stones at Stone-Heng? there being as little of Proportion or Resemblance betwixt this and those, as betwixt St. Pancrace Church and St. Paul's".


The principal legends of British national origins were gathered together in the 12th Century by Geoffrey of Monmouth, a monk, and presented in the *Historia Regum Britanniae* of around 1130. In this the British race became heirs to a lost antiquity, first a Trojan and later an Arthurian Albion. An important cornerstone of Geoffrey's narrative was the enigmatic monument on Salisbury plain, Stonehenge. According to Geoffrey's legend, the 'stones' had once been called the 'Chorea Gigantum' or 'Giant's Dance', because in remote times they had been removed by Giants from Africa to Ireland. There they had stood, on Mount Killaraus, until their 'magical' transportation by Merlin to Salisbury Plain. The ancient British King Aurelius was told,

"I wot that never another man in thy kingdom is there that is brighter of wit than he, whether it be in foretelling that which shall be or in devising engines of artifice. Bid him come hither and set his wits to work, and I warrant he shall build thee a memorial to last!" \(^{80}\)

Geoffrey maintained that Aurelius was buried within the "Giants' ring", together with Uther Pendragon and Constantine III. Despite critics such as Polydore Vergil, \(^{81}\) Geoffrey's 'history' was to exercise an enormous influence on actual British history up to and beyond the time of Jones. \(^{82}\)

With the Reformation came a growing interest in national origins and antiquities, with the purpose of illuminating the early Church and defending

\(^{80}\) Geoffrey's *History* (1963 ed.), bk. viii, ch.10, p.163.


Sir Philip Sidney had described Stonehenge as one of the seven 'Wonders of England', as Jones himself was to note, and the monument became an object of much curiosity in Jones's day. In 1648, Sir Balthazar Gerbier used the enigma posed by the stones as a metaphor for the mystery of the architectural Orders themselves,

"nor are there any of the new searchers of orders and ornament that doe agree in their measures though they all take them on the ancient modells. It should seeme that there is some mystery therein, like as that which is said of the stones on the great Salsbury plain whereof the just number is hardly found".

For Gerbier, Stonehenge would seem to resist enumeration by almost magic properties - the legacy, perhaps, of the myth of Merlin's original authorship. John Aubrey reports that the Duke of Buckingham ordered a pit to be dug at Stonehenge in 1620 - much in the manner of contemporary archaeology organised by members of the Court on sites at Troy, Corinth and the like.

Later in the same year, whilst staying nearby at Wilton House, the King himself was intrigued by Stonehenge, as the introduction to Jones's study informs us. Stonehenge evidently became part of the discussion of the arts at Wilton, prompted by William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. Hence the Court architect received,

---


85 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.40.


87 Reported in John Aubrey's 'Monumenta Britannica' (ed. Fowles, J., Legg, R., 1980), p.76. Webb also records Buckingham's explorations: "...the Right Noble George, late Duke of Buckingham, out of his real Affection to Antiquity, was at the Charge in King James his Days, of searching and digging there", VINDICATION (1725 ed.), p.123.

88 Arundel, for example, was involved in digs at Ephesus, Pergamon, Troy, Corinth, Samos and Scio. See Levine, J., Humanism and History (1987), p.84.
"his Majesties commands to produce out of mine own practice in Architecture, and experience in Antiquities abroad, what possibly I could discover concerning this of Stone-Heng".

Implied in this request is the notion that Stonehenge was 'architecture', and antique architecture at that. In this way Jones was prompted by Court patronage into the role of antiquarian and, Webb tells us, was even acknowledged as such by one of the leading antiquarians of his day, John Selden. Curiously enough, it was Selden, along with William Harvey, who persuaded Webb to publish Jones's 'survey', for

"nor should it ever have been published, had not our famous Anatomist Doctor William Harvey, John Selden Esquire and the best Antiquaries then living, overpersuaded me to it, lest a Work so grateful to his Country should utterly be lost".89

Selden must have praised notes and not the finished book, for he died a year before publication. Harvey himself seems to have excavated at the monument, for, according to Webb, an "abundance of...[sculls] were digged up by Dr. Harvey".90 This association with the "famous" and "best" illustrates the continual importance of Stonehenge to the Jones-Webb partnership, finally represented by publication itself.

Inigo Jones's 'survey', published by Webb in 1655 as The MOST NOTABLE ANTIQUITY OF GREAT BRITAIN, Vulgarly called STONE-HENG, ON SALISBURY PLAIN, RESTORED, represented the first attempt to analyse the various mediaeval legends concerning the stones and thus became the first 'reasoned' hypothesis about Stonehenge's origins after Geoffrey's more fanciful account.91 STONE-HENG Restored opens with a set of enquiries,

"Among the ancient Monuments whereof, found here, I deemed none more worthy the serching after, than this of Stone-Heng; not only in regard of the Founders thereof, the Time when built, the Work it self, but also for the Rarity of its Invention, being different in Form from all I had seen before".


90 Ibid, p.123.

In this way Jones's study formed part of the movement towards antiquarianism, away from the Trojan and Arthurian fables printed by William Caxton and eulogised by Michael Drayton. John Leland, one of the first antiquarians, undertook a survey of English antiquities before 1548, and this project was later extended by, amongst others, William Camden and Selden. Camden's *Britannia* was first published in 1587 and represented a milestone in the antiquarian enterprise. Selden's evident interest in Jones's Stonehenge survey formed part of this. However, the more 'scientific' methods of recourse to sources and archaeological survey which characterised this antiquarian study were in Jones's hands employed to support a version of the British history still reliant on the old authors. Whilst Jones opposed Geoffrey's specific attribution of Stonehenge to Aurelius, he nevertheless had an interest in presenting the stones as proof of a heroic British past, and specifically Roman occupation, on the history of which Geoffrey was one of the principal authors.

However, as the preface pointed out there is an ambiguity surrounding the very authorship of *STONE-HENG Restored*, in that Webb claimed in the preface that

"This Discourse of *Stone-heng* is moulded off, and cast into a rude Form, from some few indigested Notes of the late...Inigo Jones...the desires of severall his learned *Friends* have encouraged me to compose this Treatise. Had he survived to have done it with his own hand, there had needed no Apology. Such as it is, I make now yours. Accept it in *his name*, from *J. W.*"

This ambiguity is illustrated in one part of the text itself, in which 'Jones' notes,

"Had I not been thought worthy (by him who then commanded) to have been sole *Architect* thereof, I would have made some mention of the great stones used in the work, and *Portico* at the West end of *S. Pauls Church London*." 93

But this passage cannot have formed part of Jones's survey made in 1620,

---


93 Jones, I., *STONE-HENG* (1655 ed.), p.35.
since as has been seen the "great stones" for the portico were not lowered into place until 1637-8 and Charles's rule is noted in the past tense. Two possibilities suggest themselves. The first that Jones added this reference, after Charles's downfall in 1646, to the notes started in 1620 which Webb claimed to have found - and hence during the last six years of his life, for, as Tait observes, Jones's scheme would

"seem to have been a problem that Jones pondered intermittently and long...both he and Webb may have turned their attention to Stonehenge again in 1647/8 when they were both once more engaged at Wilton". 94

Or, secondly, that this passage was added, or altered, by Webb writing for Jones and using the term 'I', possibly in the three years between Jones's death in 1652 and publication. Tait notes,

"If there was a division of labour between Jones and Webb in making the notes for the original manuscript, it is probably Webb who concerned himself with this historical and literary part of the investigation of Stone-henge". 95

Webb later claimed that Jones's "Notes were not found, much less Stone-Heng restored written, until long after his Death", 96 but, given that only three years had in fact elapsed, this is certainly an exaggeration - as, perhaps, was Webb's general claim to overall authorship.

Frances Yates has discussed the problem of authorship, coming down in favour of Jones. She points out that Webb's dedication to Philip, Earl of Pembroke, the only surviving member of those probably gathered at Wilton in 1620, would seem confirmation of the truth of the story of the King's


95 Tait, Ibid, n.6: "The whole text of Stone-Heng was obviously revised and rewritten by Webb after Jones's death in 1652, using the surviving notes as his source. However, there is a distinct difference between the historical set pieces on the Druids, Boadicea, Ambrosius and the Romans in Britain, pp.3-55, and the classical and architectural analysis of the rest. After the illustrations and their explanation pp.55-56, there comes more history but of an architectural or antiquarian sort, making a pointed contrast with the prolix first fifty pages. On the evidence of Webb's fondness for detail and detailed explanations as shown in his Vindication, it is probable that much of the first fifty-five pages are his work. They are perfectly in keeping with the style of his surviving but incomplete essays on the 'Ionic Order' and 'of wyndowes', at Worcester College".

instruction to Jones, which was then "added to in later years". Indeed, after his citation of Harvey and Selden in defence of Jones's reputation, Webb mentions "the learned Sir Justinian Isham Baronet, and Sir John Penruddock knight" (evidently the "Friends" cited in Webb's 1655 preface urging him to publish) who, together with "divers others yet surviving, can testify what I say is Truth". Stephen Orgel echoed Yates's view in only allowing Webb "composition" of the work, and concluded,

"Webb was not a notably inventive man, and there is no reason to suppose that Stone-Heng Restored is not a fair representation of the notes from which he was working".

Most recently, in 1989 John Bold noted that Webb "was acting, initially at least, as witness to the ideas of his master".

Whilst accepting Jones's authorship, eight years after publication the architect's argument was dismissed by the Physician in Ordinary to Charles II, Dr. Walter Charleton, in CHOREA GIGANTUM: or...STONE-HENG, ..Restored to the DANES (1663) (quoted in the epigraph). Charleton's counter claim for Danish builders led Webb to a VINDICATION OF Stone-Heng Restored, published two years later. Webb's reply repeated the basic arguments of the first study; but the work is long winded and disorganised, in contrast to STONE-HENG Restored, a fact which might further suggest Jones as author of a substantial amount of the original.

The Stuart architects had other 17th Century critics. John Aubrey, for example, whilst reading Jones's book "with great delight" noted that

"having compared his Scheme with the Monument itself, I found he had not dealt fairly...he framed the monument to his own Hypothesis, which is much differing from the Thing it

97 Yates, F., Theatre of the World (1969), p.82, and p.177-8, "There seems to be no reason to disbelieve Webb's statement that this book is really by Jones, or closely based on manuscript notes by him". Incidentally, Walpole makes passing reference to an edition of STONE-HENG Restored "which formerly belonged to that Earl", a fact which might also indicate a continued interest in Stonehenge amongst members of the Court, Anecdotes of Painting in England (1782 ed.), vol.ii, p.272.


 Whilst rejecting Jones's Romano-British Stonehenge in favour of Druid builders, Aubrey did not question the architect's authorship, and Jones's study evidently stimulated his own researches into ancient British remains, specifically at Avebury.102

Rival theories in the 18th Century as to the origins of Stonehenge, linked to the desire not to attack the much admired 'Palladian', led to allegations that Jones's book was a forgery. William Stukeley, in *Stonehenge, a Temple restored to the British Druids* (1740), claimed that Jones's Barber Surgeons' Anatomy theatre (1636-7) was based on a (now lost) ancient oval Druid monument at Eglwys Glominog, Lhanykil (the modern Llanycil), Merionethshire; in the course of this Stukeley noted "And this appears to me a strong presumption, that Inigo Jones did not make the ground-plot of Stonehenge, publish'd under his name".103 However, Stukeley had a vested interest in proving *STONE-HENG Restored* a forgery, in that his Stonehenge was of Druid origin and not Romano-British. With Jones holding the Druids in such esteem by copying their monuments in his own work, so Stukeley's argument implied, the architect would never have made the mistake of providing a Romano-British pedigree for Stonehenge, so obviously also a Druid monument. Charleton and Jones came jointly under fire in 1730, when a clergyman named Wallis published *A DISSENTATION In Vindication of the ANTIQUITY of STONE HENGGE, In Answer to the TREATISES of Mr Inigo Jones, Dr Charleton, and all that have written upon that Subject.* Wallis offered no alternative to Romano-British or Danish builders, preferring instead the mystery itself.


103 Stukeley, W., *Stonehenge, a Temple restored to the British Druids* (1740), p.25.
Chapter One

John Webb or Inigo Jones? The problem of authorship at Stonehenge and the Cathedral

"there was published by Mr Web a Booke intituled Stonehenge-restored (but writt by Mr Inigo Jones)."


In the end it is impossible to come to any firm conclusion on the exact division of labour in STONE-HENG Restored, hinging as it does on the scope and extent, or indeed very existence, of Jones's "few indigested Notes". Perhaps in the citation of these enigmatic notes Webb in fact played down Jones's role, thereby implying a larger share in the work for himself than that of mere 'editor', to impress the new authorities. Or perhaps Webb wrote the whole book, writing as if in the person of Jones and citing the Royal Surveyor's notes to give the forgery an authentic base. Although, if Jones really played no part at all, what motivated Webb to produce a forgery rather than use his own name - given he himself tells us the study had met with approval before publication? And if Jones's notes did exist then surely they formed at least the idea of STONE-HENG Restored. Surely one of Webb's last acts of homage to his master was the publication of these notes, praised by both Selden and Harvey, part of his role as chronicler of Jones's career.104 In any case, what would seem reasonably certain are the date and fact of Jones's survey, 1620, the date of publication by Webb, 1655, and that Jones's name appears on the title page. Following this, henceforth the work will be referred to under Jones's name, but implied in this is a partnership evident throughout their work.

For in the end perhaps the problem of actual authorship is relatively unimportant, for Jones and Webb worked so closely together it is often impossible to detect either's hand specifically. The division of work at St. Paul's might be a clue to unravelling their collaboration at Stonhenge, Jones executing the 'survey' - which included design - with Webb then tracing and organising the actual building work or, for Stonehenge, subsequent publication. This later, retrospective work might be seen as much like his involvement with the 1663 commission investigating the repair and 'tidying

up' of Jones's Cathedral.\textsuperscript{105}

The 'repair', or more properly 'restoration', of the old Cathedral at the heart of the city was perhaps the most important of Jones's commissions. The three surveys not only testify to the abuse and physical disrepair of the Cathedral but, more significantly, to the symbolic importance both James and Charles attached to St. Paul's as the spiritual centre of the reformed faith and, as Dugdale put it, "one of the principall ornaments of the Realm".\textsuperscript{106} Indeed, much of the damage to the Cathedral's fabric dated from the time of the reformation itself.\textsuperscript{107} In examining this symbolic content to the work, over and above the mere practical repair, a general picture of the Stuart Court's 'self-image' emerges. The focus of this picture in St. Paul's mirrors Jones's opening scene for the masque \textit{Britannia Triumphans}.

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{106} Dugdale, W., \textit{History} (1658), p.135.

\textsuperscript{107} See \textit{A History of St. Paul's Cathedral}, (ed. W.R. Matthews, W.M. Atkins, 1957), p.122 notes the: "many purges during the brief reign of Edward VI, all of which, unfortunately, did untold damage to the architecture of the building".
\end{flushleft}
PART I: ALBION AND JERUSALEM
CHAPTER TWO
"the King in great state came from White-hall to Paules"
Stuart London as second Rome and new Jerusalem.
The Stuart Court and the 'Idea' of Empire; St. Paul's Cathedral and Britannia Triumphants

"A curtain flying up discovered the first scene, wherein were English houses of the old and newer forms intermixed with trees, and afar off a prospect of the city of London and the river Thames; which, being a principal part, might be taken for all of Great Britain".

On the Sunday after Twelfth Night, 1637, the masque Britannia Triumphants was performed to the assembled Court of Charles I, a production jointly credited to Inigo Jones and William Davenant, the Queen's poet. Following the suspension of Parliament in 1629, these celebrations marked one of the last phases of a Court which had moved increasingly towards absolute rule, the purest expression of which was the 'perspectivised' masque itself. As a mode of political 'speech' voicing the ideals of Stuart monarchy, this masque reveals certain of the intentions behind the refacing of St. Paul's, for an image of the Cathedral formed the object of the 'perspectivised' Court scene (Fig. 71). Here, as the stage directions indicate (Ins. 59-62 above), the view of the Cathedral "might be taken for all of Great Britain". With the King seated directly in line with the Cathedral, the physical arrangement of the masque itself expressed St. Paul's as a central symbol of Stuart monarchy - a fact most obviously reflected in the refacing by the new statues of both James and Charles and an inscription proclaiming rule over Britain, France and Ireland.

With the aim of healing domestic differences James outlined the theory of 'Divine Right' in front of the assembled Lords and Commoners on 21 March 1610,

"THE State of MONARCHIE is the supremest thing upon earth. For Kings are not onely GODS Lieutenants upon earth,

1 See Orgel, S., Strong, R., Theatre of the Stuart Court (1973), p.661.
4 The convention of the 'historical year' was used until 1752 in England, whereby the year was deemed to begin on 25 March. The published date for this speech of 1609 is therefore adjusted to 1610. (Tanner and Sommerville both cite 1610, Strong 1609).
and sit upon GODS throne, but even by GOD himselfe they are called Gods. There bee three principall similitudes that illustrate the state of MONARCHIE. One taken out of the word of GOD; and the two other out of the grounds of Policie and Philosophie. In the Scriptures Kings are called Gods, and so their power after a certaine relation compared to the Divine power. Kings are also compared to Fathers of families: for a King is truely 
*Parens patriae*, the politique father of his people. And lastly Kings are compared to the head of this Microcosme of the body of man".5

In thus receiving Divine authority for their actions directly, the English monarchy since the Reformation had argued independence from and equality with the Pope.6 It follows that, in their role as 'Defenders of the Faith', the Stuart monarchy might establish an empire separately from, but equal to, that of Rome. In line with the 'Golden Age' mythology which had surrounded Elizabeth,7 the assumption of such imperial symbolism by the Stuart Kings8 mirrored the general northern imperial claim, most notably that made by Charles V. 'Divine Right' came to represent the doctrine to which James, and later Charles, wished to give physical form in London, much as the popes themselves had used architecture to express the changing nature of their authority.9

At the core of this Stuart claim to have renewed the Holy Roman Empire was the Reformed Church of England, representing as it did the English Protestant statement of independence from the Roman Church - as T.S. Eliot put it, "the first and most complete incarnation of English policy".10 Hence,

---

5  James I, *THE KINGS MAJESTIES SPEACH To the Lords and Commons... Wednesday the xxi of March* (1609), p.'B'.


8  See Williamson, Ibid, p.105. Parry, G., *Golden Age Restor'd* (1981), Preface: "A chorus of acclaim greeted James's accession as the beginning of a new golden age, and indeed, after the uncertainty of Elizabeth's last years, the security and peace that the Stuart succession appeared to offer made the future look very bright."

9  See Westfall, C.W., *In This Most Perfect Paradise* (1974).

London, as the imperial capital of this state religion, was to become remodelled as the new centre of the world - the second Rome and the new Jerusalem.
Stuart London as the New Jerusalem and Second Rome; St. Paul's Cathedral as Solomon's temple and a second St. Peter's

"Your City hath beene anciently stiled Augusta...Not to weary mine eyes wandring and roving after private, but to fixe upon publicke alone, your Royall Exchange for Merchants, your Halls for Companies, your gates for defence, your markets for victuall, your aquaeducts for water, your granaries for provision, your Hospitalls for the poore, your Bridewells for the idle, your Chamber for Orphans, and your Churches for holy Assemblies; I cannot denie them to be magnificent workes, and your City to deserve the name of an Augustious and majestick City".

[King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), pp.45-46]

In 1610 the royal propagandist George Marcelline hoped "that under the name and family of Steuart, all Christendome shall flourish in an absolute Monarchy...so that it may be said of you, That...you are a Caesar".11 Per Palme has pointed out that the new Stuart Banqueting House was intended to establish firmly in stone the role for James as an Augustus exercising imperial sway, and a second Solomon presiding in judgement;12 this formed the first installment of London itself projected as a 'renewed' Jerusalem and imperial Rome.

In echoing Vitruvius's dedication to Augustus, John Webb wrote in 1665 that "Augustus Caesar will be ever glorious, for leaving Rome a City of Marble, which He found ignobly built";13 in announcing plans to improve London, James inevitably evoked these stone achievements of Augustus,

"We doe well perceive in Our Princely wisdom and providence, now, that our Citie of London is become the greatest, or next

11 Marcelline, G., The Triumphs of King James the First (1610), p.69, p.73. Marcelline would seem a somewhat mysterious figure. Along with Triumphs, his main works appear to be 'Vox Militis'; foreshewing what perils are procured where the people...live without regard of marshall discipline, [adapted from Barnaby Rich's Allarme to England], London, (1625), and Epithalamium Gallo-Britannicum: or, Great-Britaines, Frances, and the most part of Europes unspeable joy, for the most happy union, and blessed contract of...Charles, Prince of Wales, and the Lady Henrette Maria, London, (1625).


13 Webb, J., VINDICATION(1725 ed.), The Epistle Dedicatory.
the greatest Citie of the Christian world...as it was said by the first Emperour of Rome, that he had found the Citie of Rome of Bricke, and left it of Marble, so that wee whome GOD hath honoured to be the first king of Great Britaine, mought bee able to say in some proportion, that wee had found our Citie and suburbs of London of stickes, and left them of Bricke".14

As a matter of physical repair, Jones's work on St. Paul's formed an extension of the domestic 'improvements' announced in these proclamations - by implication built according to Vitruvian rules, since Augustus had been Vitruvius's master. Such visual control may have been new to London, but it followed European example; ordinances had been passed in Florence in the late 14th Century, for example, regulating the form of facades along a portion of the street connecting the Cathedral and the Palazzo Vecchio.15

In line with the claim for Stuart London as a second Rome, St. Paul's was to be refaced as a rival to St. Peter's. John King's A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), in announcing the restoration plans declared "finally, this unto you, as S. Peters in the Vatican at Rome",16 and as late as 1672, Sir Roger Pratt commented on Jones's Cathedral "I yet doubt whether St. Peters...could hardly if at all be brought to suit with such and so old a body as our Paul's".17 Such rivalry was compatible with the Stuart view of history which placed British Christianity older than the Church of Rome, as Pagitt's CHRISTIANOGRAPHY of 1640 claimed: "By which computation of times I gather, that the Faith was preached in Brittain some years before there was a Church founded in Rome by Saint Peter".18 This rivalry reached one of its clearest expressions in one element in particular - Jones's new portico for the west front, the dimensions of which were clearly conceived as a rival to St. Peter's19 (the plan of St.Peter's was illustrated by Serlio, bk.iii,

16 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.47.
19 Rykwert, J., The First Moderns (1980), p.137: "the columns were 56 feet high...rivalled only by Michelangelo's 110 foot portico for St. Peter's". In his 1568 edition of Vasari's Delie vite
the very addition of the portico had the effect of extending the plan of the Cathedral. Following Michelangelo's projected portico for St. Peter's, Jones's columns rivalled those of the Pantheon, as the largest surviving free-standing Corinthian portico in the western world since antiquity. Following Michelangelo's projected portico for St. Peter's, Jones's columns rivalled those of the Pantheon, as the largest surviving free-standing Corinthian portico in the western world since antiquity.20 Chapter one quoted Jones, or Webb writing for Jones, boasting about the size of the stones used, for through this portico, according to Webb, St. Paul's was designed to contract nothing less than "the Envy of all Christendom upon our Nation, for a Piece of Architecture, not to be parallel'd in these last Ages of the World".21 In this way, the general aim of the refacing was to signify the replacement of the authority of both the Pope and St. Peter's in this country by the King and St. Paul's. Further, as heirs to the true Church, the Stuarts came naturally to identify themselves with Solomon, builder of the first temple; and London, as the home of this pure religion, would in turn become the new Jerusalem.

Themes expressed in sermons from 1620 onwards clearly sought to constitute London as the new Jerusalem, and illustrate the atmosphere of political propaganda that surrounded the first commission examining St. Paul's. As but one example, John Jones, curate of St. Michael's, Bassishaw, in Londons Looking Back to Jerusalem delivered at Paul's Cross on August 7th 1630, noted,

"Though God hath tossed our neighbour-nations, and made them like a wheele, and as the stubble before the winde; yet this Iland, or Britaine, our deare Country, hath stood like the Center, with unmooved firmenesse".22

In a Court sermon preached before James in June 1621, William Laud, then Dean of Gloucester, brought the standard analogy between the Jewish and

---

21 Webb, J., VINDICATION (1725 ed.), p.27.
British Solomon to bear on the building schemes of the day. The ambition was to unify City, Church and Empire under the concept of the new Jerusalem, for both State and Church,

"were commended to the Jewes, and both are to us; And both under one name, Jerusalem...Therefore when you sit downe to consult, you must not forget the Church; And when we kneele downe to pray, we must not forget the State: both are but one Jerusalem".

Exhortations made by Laud on behalf of St. Paul's merged with these political and spiritual ambitions for a united Commonwealth.

In line with this, St. Paul's was to be restored in succession to the temple of Solomon. In James's Court frequent allusion was made to Solomon's temple, later reflected in Rubens's Banqueting House ceiling (Fig. 6). Sir John Harington's famous letter of 1608 describing the riotous festivities at Theobalds reports that "One day a great feast was held, and, after dinner, the representation of Solomon his Temple and the coming of the Queen of Sheba was made...before their Majesties". Jones used twin Solomonic columns as part of the iconography in designs for Lady Cotton's tomb (Fig.11) and palace of Oberon (Fig.12), an obvious reference to Solomon's temple where at the entrance two columns, Boaz and Jachin, were to be found (I Kings ch.vii, v.21). This Solomonic theme pervaded practically all Stuart propaganda in favour of restoration; after James announced his intentions to restore the Cathedral in 1620, Psalm 102 was read,

"Thou shalt arise, and have Mercie upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea the set time is come.


24 Laud, W., *Seven Sermons Preached upon Severall Occasions* (1651), p.6. The text was Ps.122, 6, 7: "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem"; "Peace be within thy Walls, and prosperity within thy Palaces".


For thy servants take pleasure in 
her stones: and favour the dust therof" (v.13-14).

Dugdale tells us these lines were "pertinent to the business in hand". In the sermon supplied by James the Bishop of London further proclaimed St. Paul's at the centre of a Royalist new Jerusalem, for "This Church is your Sion indeed, others are but Synagogues, this your Jerusalem the mother to them all".

This Solomonic theme was expressed throughout Jones's Cathedral iconography. In Ezekiel, "above the doore" of Solomon's temple were to be found "cherubims and palme trees" (ch.xli, v.17-18) - mirrored in Jones's 'pre-built' new west front design (Fig.55). Inside Solomon's temple were carved lions, together with cherubim and palm-trees (I Kings, ch.vii, v.36). As chapter one noted, there was a winged head of a cherubim over each keystone of the nave windows, and the surviving carved lion's head had once formed part of a frieze.

Jones's Solomonic transformation of the old Cathedral was also to be achieved through the Orders themselves. From Abelard onwards, the idea of the Temple as an image of universal harmony had been ever-present to mediaeval builders. Following this, in the 17th Century - and in neoplatonic philosophy in particular - Solomon's temple and the Tabernacle of Moses became generally held as the ultimate origin of the Greek and Roman Orders as described by Vitruvius, the prototype of antique harmony in architecture (the Orders thus floating free of their Pagan, Roman bondage). Abroad, Juan Bantista Villalpando in 1604 provided the earliest literal and pictorial

---

29 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), pp.46-47.
32 Rykwert, J., The First Moderns (1980), p.135: "In biblical commentary generally, and in hermetic thinking more particularly, [the Temple]...was the image of production as the path to salvation. There can be little doubt that many masons in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw certain tasks as aspects of the masonic 'work'".
source for this view,\textsuperscript{33} (the influence of which will be discussed later). In Britain this biblical origin was echoed in some of the first books on Vitruvian Order, by Joseph Moxon in 1655 and Sir Balthazar Gerbier in 1664.\textsuperscript{34} With Solomon's temple as the prototype of architectural Order, it is perhaps hardly surprising that Jones used all the Orders on St. Paul's. It follows that in a general sense the Orders became emblematic for James cast as the British Solomon. Per Palme has noted the influence of Villalpando and further observes that,

"the King and the bishops saw beyond the splendour of Greek and Roman antiquity the scriptural Jerusalem dressed in porticos and superimposed orders in the manner of Inigo Jones's designs for St. Paul's and the Banqueting House".\textsuperscript{35}

This attempt to refound the capital in rivalry to the old centres of Christendom was a norm of imperial mythology; James's parallel to Solomon itself echoed one of the great commonplaces of the mediaeval iconography of kingship.\textsuperscript{36} Constantine had given expression to the role assigned to the Christian cult in the political fabric of his empire through a vast architectural programme in the great centres of his realm.\textsuperscript{37} Byzantine rulers claimed that the sempiternal 'genius' of ancient Rome had been transferred to 'New Rome' on the Bosphorus, and what remained on the banks of the Tiber was mere bricks and stone out of which the genius loci, the life perennial, had evaporated. On entering the restored Santa Sophia, Justinian (483-565) cried


\textsuperscript{34} Moxon, J., title page to \textit{VIGNOLA...the rules of the Five Orders in Architecture} (1655), quoted 2 Chron. 3.3, "Now these are the things wherein Solomon was instructed for the building of the house of God". Gerbier, B., \textit{A Brief Discourse Concerning the Three Chief Principles of Magnificent Building} (1664), pp.2-3: "the great Architect and Surveyor of Heaven and Earth, prescribed the Rules and particular Orders for the Building of a floating-Pallace, (Noahs Ark) and the glorious matchlesse Temple of Solomon, the perfect House of Prayer".


\textsuperscript{37} For Constantine's building activities see the work of Eusebius of Caesarea (260-340), in particular his life of Constantine.
"Solomon, I have outdone you". At about the same time a coherent architectural programme was to claim for Ravenna equivalent status with the five great patriarchates of the Christian world. Charlemagne, according to one of his chroniclers, built his churches and palaces to accommodate all his Court, "following the example of Solomon"; he also apparently planned to establish the Roma futura in Aachen. Following the removal of the papal Court to Avignon by Clement V during the 14th Century, the concept of a 'New Rome' became located there - titled as such by Opicinus de Canistris (1296-1350) on his map of Europe. The Sistine Chapel is modeled explicitly on the Temple building by repeating its dimensions, and, much later the three principal ceremonial spaces in Lyon, when restored in the 17th Century, were also identified with Solomon's temple and Rome. Indeed, Stuart claims for Britain as the new Jerusalem were hardly unprecedented. In emphasising the special nature of the British people, Bede had evoked the Old Testament model of the new Israel (incidentally, also claimed by the Franks and the Spanish Visigoths) echoed later by John Fortescue (1394?-1476?). Thus it was that 'Rome' migrated from one incarnation to another.

Perhaps the most notable attempt to re-establish an existing city on imperial terms in the 16th Century was made in Rome itself by Sixtus V (1585-1590). Nicholas V (1447-55) had been the first to use architecture throughout Rome to represent his position in the Church (his 'new Rome' had consciously attempted to rival Solomon's temple) and in 1574 Gregory XIII had passed regulations dictating a conformity of street appearance. Following this, Sixtus V's proposals for Rome of 1585 intended the re-establishment of the city as capital of a Christendom revitalised through the counter-

41 See Kantorowicz, E., The King's Two Bodies (1957), p.83.
44 See Westfall, C.W., In This Most Perfect Paradise (1974).
reformation.\textsuperscript{45} New roads were to be built visually linking existing monuments, classical and Christian, thus 'revealed' from within the mediaeval city mass. Symbols of ancient Rome, such as obelisks, were relocated to proclaim a continuity between the Bishops of Rome and the old Roman Emperors; these 'overlaid' roads and monuments represented to the old mediaeval city its new imperial status and thus the restoration of Rome's antique glory (Fig.9). Jones would have known of this through the gift by a friend, one Edmund Bolton, of G.F. Bordini's engraved \textit{De Rebus Praeclare Gestis a Sixto V Pont. Max.}, Rome, (1588).\textsuperscript{46} As will be seen, it was exactly this method of 'overlay' which the Stuarts were to adopt in their attempts to establish mediaeval London as the capital of the British Church, with the restored Cathedral at its centre.

During the Renaissance such imperial transformations of existing cities were often manipulated through the 'device' of the 'Entry'\textsuperscript{47} - the elaborate thematic presentation of the monarch as a 'Roman Emperor' following the celebrations of conquest in ancient Rome. There remains fairly complete documentation of the 'antiquizing' of Paris for the Entry of Henry II in 1549\textsuperscript{48} and of Charles IX and his bride in 1571.\textsuperscript{49} Officially sponsored painters and architects built in perspective triumphal arches, theatres, obelisks, all erected along the route of the royal procession. Roman vistas formed a backdrop for the passing of Charles IX as a new Augustus through his capital which became projected as a New Troy. The device of Charles IX, twisted columns enriched with vine, sought to identify his rule with the temple at Jerusalem (following Bernini's Baldacchino in St. Peter's, such twisted columns were to appear on the Banqueting House ceiling framing an image of James also cast as Solomon).


\textsuperscript{46} In 1607 Bolton made Jones a gift of a copy of this work, with the inscription: "30th December, 1606. As an earnest and a token of a friendship which is to endure for ever with Inigo Jones, I, Edmund Bolton give this book. Mercury son of Jove to his own Inigo Jones through whom there is hope that sculpture, modelling, architecture, painting, acting and all that is praise worthy in the elegant arts of the ancients, may one day find their way across the Alps into our England" (trans. from the Latin by J.A. Gotch, \textit{Inigo Jones} (1928), p.44). Bolton was in Italy on the New Year of 1607, possibly with Jones, Gotch p.43.

\textsuperscript{47} See Strong, R., \textit{Art and Power} (1973), and \textit{Splendour at Court} (1973).

\textsuperscript{48} See McFarlane, I.D., \textit{The Entry of Henri II into Paris 16 June 1549} (1982).

\textsuperscript{49} See Yates, F., \textit{Astraea} (1975), pp.222-3.
The poetry of Langland and Lydgate record old St. Paul's as the object of the Court processions of Henry VII. In 1588 Elizabeth proceeded with 'great splendour' to St. Paul's, to give thanks on the defeat of the Spanish Armada. By report\textsuperscript{51} the Queen was seated in a kind of triumphal chariot, with four pillars, two to the rear supporting a canopy and an imperial crown, two to the front a lion, dragon and arms of England. Following this, James employed a formal Entry, in 1604, to consolidate his claims to the throne and prophecy the future harmonies of Stuart rule.\textsuperscript{52} This not only presented James in imperial terms, like Elizabeth, but it also served to remind the King himself of the popular expectations of his rule. Each triumphal arch was made to carry references to one of the virtues physically embodied in, and radiating from, the monarch. These arches represented the first 'systematic' use of the Orders within the city, understood from the start as expressive of the harmony and order that would result from James's reign. The last arch, at Temple Bar, presented James cast as Augustus, identified with the Age of Saturn. Indeed, for Marcelline in 1610 the triumphal object of James's rule itself was "thereby to bring the new birth againe of the former Golden days of Saturne".\textsuperscript{53} In representing such virtues of Stuart rule to the macrocosm of the city and country at large, these arches represented a triumphal 'overlay' on the disorder of mediaeval London, and as such a temporary 'ordering' which the later, more permanent architecture of Inigo Jones would consolidate. Such a consolidation can also be found within the microcosm of the Banqueting House, where Golden Age themes first performed in the masque were later 'frozen' in Rubens's ceiling panels - and, like the masque, served to justify the policy of absolute rule pursued by Charles.

James's Entry also served to display to the city at large the monarch's divine nature, 'radiating' from his physical presence. As a consequence of

\textsuperscript{50} See Malcolm, J.P., \textit{Londinium Redivivum} (1803), vol.iii, pp.152-158. Young, A., \textit{Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments} (1987), p.24 notes: "Henry used public display to impress the authority of his presence upon his subjects. He began this process with his carefully-timed triumphant entry into London twelve days after his victory at Bosworth, the event climaxing with the presentation of his three banners at St. Pauls, one of which was the fiery red dragon so important in the new national mythology."

\textsuperscript{51} See Malcolm, J.P., \textit{Londinium Redivivum} (1803), vol.iii, p.166.

\textsuperscript{52} For an analysis of this entry see Parry, G., \textit{Golden Age Restor'd} (1981), pp.1-39.

\textsuperscript{53} Marcelline, G., \textit{Triumphs} (1610), p.13.
the sovereign's role as the supreme Governor of the Church of England, as Per Palme notes,

"His proceeding to divine service in the Abbey or St. Paul's, his presence at...ceremonies of a processional character were thus developed into quasi-ecclesiastical shows, comparable in splendour to those of the Roman Ecclesia triumphans... Whenever the sovereign took part in a Ceremony of State, this spell surrounded his Sacred Presence. He was the Anointed of the Lord, the Christus Domini, sacred by holy oil to a superhuman life of kingship". 54

Hence, it was only on the arrival of the monarch himself into the city that a new Golden Age could be proclaimed. Following, therefore, this entry of James to the City of London in 1604, the processional route itself may suggest a 'reading' for the Stuart London of Inigo Jones.

"The study of Architecture, . . . Tryumphs and the like"; St. Paul's Cathedral as the object of Triumphal Procession

"The next Sunday being Midlent Sunday, the King in great state came from White-hall to Paules Church, accompanied with Prince Charles, many of the chief nobility, and seven or eight Bishops, and at Temple barre, the Lord Maior, Aldermen, and Recorder, received him, and presented him with a purse of gold, and from thence attended him to Paules, the streets being rayled on both sides, and the several Companies of London in their severall places, in their Liveries and Banners, gave their attendance all the way to Paules".

[Report of the Progress of James I in 1620, to announce the Cathedral restoration, Stow's Annales (1631 ed.), p.1033].

If we plot the London buildings of Inigo Jones on a map of his day (Fig.1) we find that a large number face onto the main route from Whitehall to St. Paul's Cathedral. This was the route the royal procession took, starting at Whitehall Palace and progressing past the New Exchange, Covent Garden, Somerset House and Temple Bar, concluding at St. Paul's.

The possibility of a royal route through London has been implied by two commentators. Whilst discussing a projected Triumphal arch at Temple Bar John Harris observed in 1982 that "with the portico complete, Jones saw the approach road, Fleet Street, as a triumphal way", and, prompted once again by this arch, in 1981 Graham Parry noted,

"the Christian emperor would be able to ride from his Roman hall of state at Whitehall to his restored Temple at St. Paul's, meeting his citizens at an arch that proclaimed the felicity of Stuart rule by means of emblems of public contentment on the entablature".

Neither Harris nor Parry examined the consequences of this on our understanding of any of Jones's City buildings.

In line with the Stuart City understood as constituted by such a route, each of Jones's buildings should not be considered on its own (as is generally

the case), but in its particular place from Palace to Temple, as part of an ordered sequence. This architectural sequence embodied specific themes of monarchy, as the temporary arches of James's entry had displayed. This was the new imperial City Charles could have seen, or wanted to see, and it is this 'linear' City we should examine.

The 'idea' of the Triumph is linked to Jones's architecture in Webb's claim of 1660 that he was

"brought up by his Uncle Mr. Inigo Jones upon his late Maiesty's command on the study of Architecture, as well that which relates to building as for masques, Triumphs and the like".57

This might help explain the significance to Charles of Andrea Mantegna's nine-panel composition *The Triumph of Julius Caesar*, for which he paid the huge sum of £10,500. A sketch by Van Dyck presented Charles in such a procession, with the Garter Order on the Feast of St. George's Day, held at Windsor or Whitehall (Fig.7). The monarch is here pictured under a cloth of Gold, set within architecture of antique Order (Fig.8) - evoking Charles's dream of an imperial Whitehall. Indeed, the intended location for Van Dyck's panels, of which this sketch was merely the first stage, was Jones's Banqueting House.58 Of course, Van Dyck may here be recording an actual procession within the Banqueting House. The background buildings in the 'King's Procession' drawings of Henri III (in which the King is pictured progressing in 1582 through Paris from the Louvre to the Church of the Grands Augustins, which was the chapel of the Order of the Holy Spirit which he had founded) relate to the allegorical figures of the procession.59 Indeed, this processional route had similar implications for the city building programme.60 A triumphal arch forms the backdrop in Van Dyck's famous equestrian portrait of Charles (Fig.10), designed for the gallery at St. James's where it formed a *trompe l'oeil* climax to walls hung with the Roman


60 Ibid. Yates points out (p.176) that the bridge at Pont-Neuf was built to facilitate the 'allegorical' traffic of the Royal procession.
Emperors of Titian and Giulio Romano\(^61\) (Van Dyck was buried in 1641 in the partially restored St. Paul's - the 'imperial chamber' forming an appropriate mausoleum for the painter of the Stuart imperial image). Triumphs were frequently enacted by the Court within the masque. In *Albion's Triumph* (1632), for example, Charles was cast as a Roman Emperor with various figures taken from Onuphrius Panvinus's *De Ludis Circensibus* (1581), depicting the Roman Triumph.\(^62\) The action progressed through a series of triumphal settings designed by Jones to close on "a prospect of the King's palace of Whitehall and part of the City of London seen afar off" (Ins.338-40). It was from Whitehall that the royal progress entered the city, an entrance which was to have been through triumphal arches in a new palace facade.

For the completed Banqueting House represented the first part of an intended larger palace at Whitehall. The Banqueting House was the earliest of a series of 'overlays' onto the mediaeval city, equivalent in action to the resurfacing of mediaeval St. Paul's itself. The Whitehall project embodied in microcosm the ideal Stuart city, as Summerson notes,

"one can conceive it as some kind of ideal city, an insulated New Jerusalem, opposing its sublime symmetries to the Boeotian sprawl of London and Westminster; not a walled inward-looking city but one with a fixed and formidable stare to north, south, east and west (the Escorial again)...Penetrated, the city would be a model Rome".\(^63\)

And like the journey through the 'ideal' city (constituted by the royal route) culminating at St. Paul's, the main route through the intended plan for Whitehall culminated at a chapel. Jones's buildings, in consolidating the traditional royal route through London, made permanent themes of monarchy displayed to the public on such Triumphs - virtues often enacted in Court circles within masque in the Banqueting House. In this sense both masque and Rubens's ceiling - presented as they were at the start of the royal journey - represented a 'key' to the themes of Stuart monarchy embodied in the later buildings witnessed on the route itself.


\(^{62}\) Identified in Ibid, p.453.

The royal route progressed along the Strand. Whilst from here there was never any view of the Covent Garden piazza and church, begun by Jones in 1631, one may have been intended. For in Hollar's engraving of this area published in 1658 (Fig.3), only a thin strip of buildings evidently separated the Strand from Covent Garden. Jones's buildings, forming Covent Garden's arcade, were limited to the north and east side, with the church (also St. Paul's) demarcating the western boundary. To the south, running down to the Strand, Hollar's view records a grove of trees and garden wall of Bedford House, in the Strand. Plans showing perimeter building plot dimensions leave this southern boundary open.64 Was this open ground left clear as the consequence of a plan to open up a view from the Strand to the new piazza, only halted by the Civil War? Certainly, if correct, this would explain a problem historians have traditionally had with the new piazza's seeming 'incompleteness',65 from Colen Campbell onwards, and Jones's acceptance of a square only three sides of which were formed by buildings (even though the Earl of Bedford, who sponsored the scheme, owned the land on the fourth, Strand side).66

Covent Garden was built as a 'private' speculation by the Earl under the Royal proclamations outlined earlier. Indeed, a Royal licence was granted in 1629 allowing the Earl to build on Covent Garden despite a restraint on building in the parish.67 Hence, had a view been made possible, it could have been looked upon as a successful example of these regulations, from the vantage point of the royal progress. John Orrell has pointed out that James took a personal interest in the execution of these proclamations, particularly on developments that he actually saw on his journeys in and about London.68 Further, James's regulations imply the desire to bring the whole Strand frontage to the progress itself and indeed London into unity with Covent

64 Two plans in the Earl of Bedford Papers, Y3, box 3 2/4, at Alnwick Castle.
65 Channing Downs, in 'Inigo Jones's Covent Garden: The First Seventy-Five Years', J.S.A.H., vol.xxvi, March 1967, p.28: "Many writers have assumed that Inigo Jones intended a row of houses to 'complete' the piazza, and...Campbell engraved a plan showing this arrangement".
66 The Bedford House Gardens formed the south side. Later such a view was opened up, down Southampton Street connecting the Strand to Covent Garden, although no doubt not with the Triumph in mind.
67 In the Earl of Bedford Papers, Y3, box 1 2/2, at Alnwick Castle.
68 Orrell, J., The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb (1985), p.44.
Garden, all built within the regulated language of arcaded, linked facades (such colonnades had been part of Nicholas V's vision for Rome around 1450).69

Work on private houses owned by members of the Court along this stretch of the royal route was also encouraged, for in 1624 two thousand tons of Portland stone were given to the Duke of Buckingham by the King for the embellishment of York House, the Duke's London residence, next to the Strand.70 Some of this stone was evidently taken from St. Paul's, for according to Dugdale building material collected by the first royal commission was later "borrowed", on the failure of the work, to build the water gate at York House.71 Perhaps in the linking 'idea' of this royal route we have an explanation for such a gift. Work was also carried out in 1617 by Jones to Arundel House, together with a new Strand entrance to Edward Cecil's House, the design of which included a balcony - perhaps specifically designed to overlook such royal occasions. Later, in 1641, Webb was to design a monumental frontage to Durham House, granted to the 4th Earl of Pembroke by Charles I.72

In Progressing along the Strand, Charles would next have passed the New Exchange, forum of commerce in the city, followed by Somerset House, the residence of the Queen. Both were the subject of schemes by Jones involving new facades onto the Strand, neither of which were ultimately to be built.73 To Somerset House he projected a monumental front on an unprecedented scale. Like Webb's later Durham house facade, both fronts might be understood as an exercise in presenting a backdrop to, and permanent reminder of, the idea of the Royal procession, and therefore become linked in a sequence. Indeed, Jones's next scheme on the Strand formed a direct celebration of the royal route itself, a triumphal arch.74

71 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.137.
72 See Bold, J., John Webb (1989), pp.70-74, fig.46.
73 For discussion of Jones's designs see Harris, J., Higgott, G., Complete Architectural Drawings (1989), Somerset House p.193, p.254, New Exchange, pp.36-37.
Mediaeval London was comprised of two cities - the 'City of London', and the 'City of Westminster'.\textsuperscript{75} These formed related but distinct ecclesiastical centres, both of which, naturally enough, had temples - Stow's 'Survey' of 1598 listing "the Cathedrall Church of S. Paule in London, and the Colledge of S. Peter at Westminster".\textsuperscript{76} By report a wooden structure had stood in Saxon times on the site of St. Paul's, and, as the first Saxon church in the capital, the Cathedral pre-dated the Abbey (a Benedictine foundation).\textsuperscript{77} A degree of rivalry had always existed between the eastern and western temples.\textsuperscript{78} The Stuart attentions on St. Paul's might thus be seen to have expressed the Cathedral 'restored' in eminence to Westminster Abbey, the Gothic expanse of which was left untouched. For clearly the Cathedral became the focus, over and above the Abbey, for the outward expression of Stuart rule; in the city of Westminster itself this was achieved through Jones's Banqueting House, and, with limited resources, perhaps the Abbey and Palace as neighbours in Whitehall were seen as forming one Royal 'entity', and the Cathedral in the City another. The City comprised the Diocese of the Bishop of London, and, with Laud as Bishop and later Archbishop, it was natural that the metropolitan Cathedral should form the focus of his Church. In any case, St. Paul's had the advantage over the Abbey as far as any proposed building work was concerned in being sited at the end of a clear processional route and attracting finance from the rich Companies of the City of London. In marking the boundary between the two Cities, Jones's arch celebrated this traditional distinction.

A wall had been built in mediaeval times to enclose the City of London, and Jones's proposed arch replaced one of the old gateways to Westminster, known as Temple Bar, at the end of the Strand. As the home of the Companies, in line with other trading cities, the City of London traditionally possessed a degree of independence from the monarch, with its own 'monarch' in the form of Lord Mayor. Contained within this 'inner' city, the annual Lord Mayor's pageant started at Temple Bar and proceeded to St. Paul's.

\textsuperscript{75} Frans Hogenberg's map of 1572 shows the walled city of London with Westminster - for a discussion see Young, A., \textit{Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments} (1987), p.80.


\textsuperscript{77} See Maitland, W., \textit{The History of London} (1756), p.483.

\textsuperscript{78} For a contemporary history of the mediaeval Cathedral, see Dugdale, W., \textit{History} (1658), pp.1-49.
Paul's, and presented themes in parallel with, but independent from, those of the Court. The report of the royal procession of 1620, quoted above, reveals that the principal officers of the city, all on horseback, met the King at Temple Bar, where the Lord Mayor presented the King with a purse of gold and "Robert Heath, Recorder, congratulates his entrance into the City".79 On this occasion Temple Bar and St. Paul's were physically linked by "the foreraile...covered with a fair blew cloth".80

Two designs would seem to have been prepared for the authorities of the City of London for a triumphal arch to mark this entrance at Temple Bar (1636-8) (Fig.2), one in Jones's hand the other in Webb's. It is possible that Webb's arch was intended as part of a theoretical treatise,81 thereby representing the idea of the triumph in such a work. Both designs were based on the arch of Constantine; the 'attic storey' of Jones's 'pre-built', undated Cathedral west front design also drew from the arch of Constantine. Jones's annotations in his two editions of 'Serlio' record, in particular, his detailed study of the triumphal arches (bk.iii, ch.i, fol.101-134), noting against Serlio's arch of Constantine in his 1560 edition "this cornis mar[ked] G is 1/7 part of[f] the base" (fol.115).82 The Stuart Kings naturally identified themselves with Constantine as the first to embrace Christianity and found a second Rome and a new Jerusalem. Jones's arch, if constructed, would therefore have been a sign of Stuart London's refoundation in emulation of imperial Rome. An equestrian statue of Charles surmounted Webb's arch, a norm of imperial symbolism (Fig.5); more specifically, Charles was here clad in armour, as a chivalrous knight following the ancient Britons within Court masques such as Jonson's Barriers (1610) (Fig.14). With their general Golden Age imagery, cornucopiae and the like, both designs were prefigured by the temporary arch at Temple Bar in 1604, proclaiming as it did the return of the age of Saturn.83

79 Nichols, J., Progresses of James I (1828), vol.iv, p.598.
80 Ibid., p.597.
82 In his 'Palladio' bk.iv ch.xvi p.61 Jones notes "Paladio thinkes this Templ not Anticke but I do beeleeve yt to bee make in Constantines time when Architecture was much falen and they yoused to build wth fragmentes of Antike buildinges as in his Arch se Serlio".
83 The designs for the arches were published by Stephen Harrison in Arches of Triumph (1604). Graham Parry interprets the entry in Golden Age Restor'd (1981), ch.i.
Unlike the arches of 1604, used sequentially, Jones's arch can be seen as a return to the original Roman meaning of the arch as a symbolic gateway through which the Emperor established sovereignty over the City. One design pictured military might in the form of British naval power, together with Charles flanked by Neptune. At a general level this celebrated the imperial virtues of Britain's sea power. However, this can be understood to carry a specific political message, for at that time Charles was engaged in a conflict with the city over contributions towards the Royal Navy, the payment of ship money representing one of the main themes of Britannia Triumphans of the same year. Jones's scheme was thus in part politically motivated by a specific dispute, for in passing through this arch Charles would be seen to signify a 'victory' over the city on this issue, as he had in Britannia Triumphans. In this Jones made visible the emblematic nature of his work in general.

In 1973 Harris associated the new portico to St. Paul's with Temple Bar, "a great secular Roman entrance to Fleet Street, that would lead to the triumph of Caroline Laudianism expressed in stone". For after the Lord Mayor's greeting, the royal way led to where the Bishop of London waited to receive the monarch, beneath one of the most magnificent porticoes in the world at the newly refaced Cathedral of St. Paul. As the object of the triumphal journey itself and the most important focus for Stuart attempts to publically proclaim a new Golden Age, Jones's Cathedral was to represent the ultimate achievement of Stuart rule presented on the route, the restoration of the 'true' faith expressed in stone.

The Stuart Cathedral itself incorporated the iconography of the Triumph. Chapter one noted that in recasting the nave Jones removed the crenellations and topped the Order on the face with "vast Pineaples". As a rare fruit in England at this time, the pineapple would seem a strange choice. However, a giant pineapple, or pine-cone, was to be found in the atrium of St. Peter's, which Jones must have seen on his stay in Rome in 1614.

---

86 'pineapple' was understood to mean 'pine-cone'. O.E.D. (1933 ed.), "'Pine-apple', 'Pineapple': The fruit of the pine-tree; a pine-cone".
Further, the pine-cone was linked in imperial imagery to the Triumph, for the processional approach to old St. Peter's (a kind of Via Triumphalis) contained a font of ablutions in the shape of a pine-cone. A pine-cone was to be found in the courtyard of the Triconchos of the Great Palace at Constantinople (where the Emperor enacted the part of Christ in the Triumphal Entry on Palm Sunday). It has been seen that above these pineapples Jones placed obelisks along the sides of the nave and transepts (Fig. 79). Like the pineapple, obelisks were often associated with the Triumph, one being used in the 1549 Entry of Henri II into Paris, for example. The fine Corinthian portico, as an 'emblem' for the 'rediscovered' architectural Orders, in itself stemmed from James's Triumphal arches of 1604, the first royal structures to embody the Orders.

As the introductory report indicates, the royal procession to St. Paul's provided the 'medium' for James's announcement of restoration plans in 1620. This alone illustrates the importance of the idea of the royal procession to the planned refacing, spelling out the intentions behind restoration - a 'programme' to glorify the goal of such royal progresses and to consolidate a traditional decorated route, whilst making permanent the monarch's 'divine' virtues displayed on such occasions (in 1620 James had progressed "with a kinde of sacred pompe"). As part of the progress, the resurfaced St. Paul's further reinforced the King's authority over both the City of London and its temple.

The large central doors to the west front of old St. Paul's, retained in Jones's two designs, were opened on the occasion of royal or civic processions. Stow reports that on the feast day of St. Paul,

"the Dean and Chapter being apparelled in Coapes and Vestments, with Garlands of Roses on their heads, they sent the body of the Bucke to baking, and had the head fixed on a Pole,

90 Ibid.
92 King, J., A Sermon at Paule's Crosse, on Behalfe of Paule's Church (1620), p.50.
borne before the Crosse in their Procession, untill they issued
out of the West doore; where the Keeper that brought it, blowed
the death of the Bucke". 93

Jones's St. Paul's was consciously designed as a 'backdrop' to such Court
and City spectacles, or public 'theatre'.

93 Stow, J., Survey (1633 ed.), p. 368.
Theatrical Orders and stage-sets; Jones's Cathedral designed as a backdrop to Court 'theatre'

"The open space at the west end of the Cathedral has been used for many purposes: for grand religious or civil pageants, for the mustering of the citizens for many varied causes".


The Cathedral fronted one of the main ceremonial spaces in London. One of Jones's first acts when building work began in 1633 was the extension of this space, with, as Dugdale reports, "the Houses adjoyning to, and neer the Church, being compounded for, and pulled down". Such a controversial clearance was motivated as much from the need to open up this processional space as it was to dignify the Cathedral. In this way the area fronting the west end, including that under Jones's portico itself, can be seen consciously designed as a 'stage' for the enactment of Court ritual such as the Triumph. The report of James's progress in 1620 continues that,

"at the great West dore of Paules...[James] kneeled, and having ended his Orisons, he was received by the Deane and Chapter of that Church, being all in rich Capes, the Canopy was supported by the Arch Deacons of the Diocesse".

Porticoes such as that at St. Paul's were often referred to as 'theatres'. An entrance structure serving as a ceremonial space was termed 'theatre' by Pope Nicholas V within his vision of paradise, as was the benediction loggia begun by Pius II in front of the Basilica of St. Peter, and a manuscript produced for Ercole d'Este termed the piazza fronting the Cathedral in Ferrara "theatre". Other aspects of Court ritual took place at the Cathedral. Four of the Gunpowder conspirators were executed in front of St. Paul's in 1606; on the execution of the Jesuit Henry Garnet, Roger

95 It was on the grounds of this unilateral clearance that Jones was to be tried by the Puritans. *D.N.B.* entry for Jones.
Widdrington in 1679 declared that it "was transacted,..upon the Stage,..in the midst of the City before the gates of St. Paul's, to which...there was a great conflux of People assembled".100

Royal propaganda was frequently delivered in the form of Court sermons, preached next to the Cathedral at Paul's Cross. It was at Paul's Cross that James chose to announce publicly his intention of restoring the Cathedral itself, and where later preachers, such as Gyles Fleming, were to plead for the advancement of the work.101 Here the skin of old St. Paul's housed 'theatre-like' boxes, in which the Court sat when listening to preachers. This was illustrated in a contemporary drawing by one Henry Farley (Fig.74); if we look at the scene as a whole it reminds us of the Elizabethan theatre, groundlings and notables, pit and galleries, and, in the midst, the pulpit as stage - Millar Maclure goes further and states "Indeed it was a theatre".102 Sermons at this pulpit rivalled the plays of the public theatres in eloquence and power to move, also sometimes matching them in length. Here the Court could call on such formidable 'performers' as Lancelot Andrewes, George Abbot, Joseph Hall, John Donne, James Ussher and William Laud. Indeed Alberti had advocated that religious orders be located near theatres, amphitheatres and piazzas so that preachers might address the citizens,103 a passage which Jones's annotations to his 1565 Italian translation of the L'architettura show he studied.104

Unlike his Puritan contemporaries Charles was enthusiastic about the theatre, commissioning Jones's Cockpit-in-Court, at Whitehall (1629-31), and Paved Court theatre, at Somerset House (1632) - buildings amongst the first to embody the Vitruvian Orders. It was noted that the first coherent use of the Orders was on James's arches of 1604, the design of which was

---

100 The Tryall and Execution of Father Henry Garnet (1679), p.8.
102 Ibid, p.4.
104 Jones's annotations to bk.viii, ch.vii.
adapted to the notion of public theatre. Jones's Orders themselves first appeared within the masque. Following this, Jones's architecture at St. Paul's equally takes on a theatrical quality. Palme points to the *frons scenaes* of Palladio's Teatro Olimpico as inspiration for the disposition of the Orders to Jones's Banqueting House facade, and Harris comments that Jones's 1608 design for the new central tower to the Cathedral (Fig. 79) has "the insubstantiality of theatre architecture...re-created from the background of a masque", with Jones's early west front design a "mirror image" to this 'theatrical style'. Indeed, the 'skin-deep' masque backdrops controlled by machine were similar to the new machine-built facades. As the 'higher reality' of masque appeared a delusion after the Civil War, so Jones's architecture came to be abused as mere 'stage-sets' - with the architect himself entitled "The King's Surveyor, and Contriver of Scenes for the Queen's Dancing Barne". Fuller described Jones's new surface as the "Cloak and Cover of Saint Pauls" and Samuel Pepys noted,

"It is pretty here, to see how the last church was but a case wrought over the old church; for you may see the very old pillars standing whole within the wall of this".

Writing in 1668 Pepys saw past this layer, now in ruins, to the mediaeval mass upon which had been attempted a 'masque-like' transformation. When understood as the concluding stage of the royal procession, Jones's west front and portico can, in conclusion, here be suggested designed as a backdrop or 'stage-set' to such Court 'theatre', echoed in the existing theatre of Paul's Cross. Chapter eight will provide further evidence for this notion.

This chapter began with one of the most literal expressions of St. Paul's viewed in this 'theatrical' perspective, to be found in *Britannia Triumphans*. In this the ancient British magician Merlin (Fig.13) was superimposed on the

---

view of St. Paul's, both placed at the centre of a 'restored' London. Indeed, it is this very restoration which has equally restored Merlin to life,

"The great devourer of mysterious books
Is come, Merlin, whose deep prophetic art
Foretold that at this particle of time
He would forsake's unbodied friends below
And waste one usual circuit of the moon
On earth, to try how nature's face is changed
Since his decease". (Ins.192-198)

Jones's work on old St. Paul's was often termed 'restoration'; in 1620 Bishop King urged the Cathedral "undergo this worke of restauration"\(^\text{112}\) and in 1658 Dugdale praised Charles "for the restauration of this then ruinous fabrick, to its antient splendor"\(^\text{113}\) - a restoration by then achieved through Jones's 'antique' skin. Indeed, the portico inscription itself praises Charles for his 'RESTITUIT'.\(^\text{114}\) Such a term might be explained when, as Britannia Triumphans suggests, Jones's Cathedral is understood as a sign of the Stuart 'restoration' of Merlin's Albion. For to overcome the theatricality, or inauthenticity, surrounding the Stuart Court and its 'renaissance' Geoffrey's British history was frequently evoked in Court propaganda.

\(^\text{112}\) King, J., *A Sermon at Paul's Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church* (1620), p.4.


\(^\text{114}\) CAROLUS D:G. MAGNAE BRITANNIAE, HIBERNIAE, FRANCIAE: REX F:D: TEMPLUM SANCTI PAULI VETUSTATE CONSUMPTUM RESTITUIT ET PORTICUM FECIT.
CHAPTER THREE

"a peece rather of good Heraldry, than of Architecture"
St. Paul's as a Court restoration of 'The Fallen House of British Chivalry'.
The restored Cathedral and 'Empire of Great Britain'

"chivalrous and romantic allusions...could be implicit in the conception of 'ancient architecture' in this period. Ben Jonson seems to think that the architecture of the days of pure Arthurian chivalry was the true 'ancient' architecture. The 'truth of architecture' aimed at in such a romantic-classic medley as Jones's design for the fairy palace might therefore have been imagined to be that of the days of ancient British chivalry".


Chapter two discussed the imperial themes of Stuart rule, as presented in masque, in pageant, and made physically manifest in London constituted as a second Rome and new Jerusalem. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the basis of this imperial claim - the Stuart Court's interpretation of British history, a theme frequently identified in Court masque but traditionally unexplored in Court architecture. As a starting point we might take Frances Yates's two sentences, quoted above. However, notions of chivalry were not limited to "the fairy palace" of masque alone, as Yates implies, or to a specifically mediaeval setting. In 1981 Graham Parry noted in passing,

"Inigo Jones was the first to realise the architectural consequences of this [British]...history, and Ben Jonson draws attention to their belief that the architecture of the age of Chivalry must have been Roman in style".2

Neither Yates nor Parry explored any building in detail in the light of their observations.

The preface examined the traditional interpretation of Jones's work on St. Paul's - as an exercise in an architectural 'style' based on Palladio. But, as Yates and Parry imply, the Stuart notion of a 'revival' of British history expressed in architecture prompts a reinterpretation of Jones's Cathedral. This will emphasise Jones's design for St. Paul's conceived as a *restoration*.

---

1 Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong have discussed this theme in Stuart masque in *Theatre of the Stuart Court* (1973).

Stuart London refounded as 'New Troy'; Jones's temple to Brute and Arthur.

"Brute, - past the realms of Gaul, beneath the sunset
Lieth an Island, girt about by ocean,
Guarded by ocean-erst the haunt of giants,
Desert of late, and meet for this thy people.
Seek it! For there is thine abode for ever.
There by thy sons again shall Troy be builted;
There of thy blood shall Kings be born, hereafter
Sovran in every land the wide world over.'
...with a prosperous wind [he] sought out the promised island,
where he landed at last in safety at Totnes. At that time the
name of the island was Albion...When he came to the river
Thames...[he] founded his city there and called it New Troy".

[Geoffrey's History (1963 ed.), Book i, ch.11, 15-17, p.18,
p.25, p.27].

According to Geoffrey's history, ancient British Kings descended from
Brute, the grandson of Aeneas of Troy; for following Diana's prophecy, in
antiquity Brute had conquered the land and founded London as 'New Troy'
(quoted above). Geoffrey's Albion reached full glory when, centuries after
Brute, King Arthur reunified the country and went on to conquer most of
northern Europe, thus forming an ancient British Empire in rivalry with that
of Rome. After the death of Arthur the country was overrun by the Saxons,
but not before the last of the British rulers, Cadwallader, had received from
an angel the prophetic message that Britons would one day recover their
heritage. The Stuart Court saw in all its actions the fulfilment of this very
prophecy - including an 'antique' restoration of St. Paul's.

In this way James's act of union was presented as a restoration of the
Albion of Brute and Arthur. Such prophecies, or 'sleeping heroes', have
obviously been employed throughout history to provide a sanction for the
establishment of authority and the consolidation of new regimes. Following

3 Discussed by T.D. Kendrick, British Antiquity (1950), R.F. Brinkley, Arthurian Legend in the
17th Century (1932), and G.J. Gordon, The Trojans in Britain (1924).
4 Geoffrey's History (1963 ed.), bk.xii, ch.17, p.262.
the Trojan ancestry traced for the Romans by Virgil this quest for Trojan origins had many European parallels. Indeed, James was certainly not the first British monarch to cultivate this 'history'. Francis Bacon, who served on the 1620 Cathedral restoration committee, when writing two years later noted that the naming of Henry VIIth's son as Arthur was "according to the Name of that ancient worthy King of the Britaines". Henry VIII cultivated the legend of Arthur's empire to justify his breach with Rome, and the emerging Church of England was to have a parallel claim to British ancestry, explored in the next chapter. Following Elizabeth, elaborate geneologies were drawn up to document James's Trojan and Arthurian ancestry, becoming a common theme of Stuart propaganda. Thomas Heywood's TROIA BRITANICA: or, Great Britaines Troy (1609), for example, took the form of a chronicle "from the first man, unto us, this second time created Britons, with a faithfull register...of memorable thinges done in Troy and this Island". Later Heywood was to produce the parallel Life of MERLIN...His Prophesies, and Predictions Interpreted...Being a Chronographical History of all the Kings...from BRUTE to the Reign of our Royall Soveraigne King CHARLES (1641). Trojan origins were stressed as one of the opening themes of James's Entry of 1604; inside one arch music sounded from a gallery, birdsong filled the air and two choristers from St. Paul's sang in "sweete and ravishing voyces" declaring that "Troynovant is now a sommer arbour". Several manuscripts of the 14th Century had pictured the old Cathedral alongside this Trojan foundation myth, as did Faithorne's map of London


7 See Mac Dougall, H., Racial Myth in English History (1982).


10 See Levis, H.C., Notes on the early British engraved Royal portraits...1521-C18th. (1917).

11 Heywood, T., TROIA BRITANICA (1609), Dedicatory Epistle.


13 Manuscripts, B.L., Nero, D.ii (dated 1307), and Reg.13, A. iii. See Simpson, Gleanings (1889), p.127.
(1658), which also featured Jones's work on the old Cathedral (Fig.1). On the ceiling of Jones's Banqueting House James is directly identified with Brute (Fig.6), and, as has been seen, Jones's 'restored' St. Paul's was pictured as the backdrop to Merlin's return in *Britannia Triumphans*.

In this way Stuart London's antique status was established - and subsequently refounded through such as Jones's architecture as a 'New Troy' in succession to Brute's capital (much as Paris had been under Charles IX, discussed in chapter two). This 'official' Trojan past reinforced London's claim to be a second Rome, since, as Aeneas's grandson, Brute was related to the founder of Rome itself. This intention to restore an antique Albion through architecture was proclaimed within one Court production in particular, a masque centred on the future Stuart monarch, Prince Henry.

Ben Jonson's *Prince Henry's Barriers* was performed on January 6th, 1610. Jones's efforts were still mainly limited to the scenic design for masque, a world of Ideas which his later architecture would embody in more permanent form. In *The Barriers*, which celebrated the first official Court appearance of the Prince, a prophecy of the 'new' architecture was delivered by 'The Lady of the Lake', emphasised by Jones's stage sets depicting antique ruins entitled 'The Fallen House of British Chivalry' (Fig.15),

*The Lady of the Lake first discovered:*

"How brighter far than when our Arthur lived  
Are all the glories of this place revived!..  
Only the House of Chivalry (howe'er  
The inner part and store be full, yet here  
In that which gentry should sustain) decayed  
Or rather ruined seems, her buildings laid  
Flat with the earth that were the pride of time,  
And did the barbarous Memphian heaps outclimb;..  
When in a day of honour fire was smit  
To have put out Vulcan's and have lasted yet" (Ins.24-45).

Vulcan here alludes to the destruction of Troy;15 Vulcan had burnt Troy, but in vain, for it had been rebuilt at Rome and at 'New Troy', or London - and,

---


so it is implied, refounded by James. In The Barriers Jonson described the form an architecture rivalling Troy might take. For in describing Albion's 'House of Chivalry' this masque records one of the first articulations of the terms in which Jones's future architecture was understood by the Stuart Court - the Arthurian "porticos", "obelisks", "arcs triumphal" and "columns" Jones was to use to restore St. Paul's. The 'restoration' of an architecture composed of these antique elements clearly had the power to 'renew' lost, chivalrous virtues,

"O, when this edifice stood great and high,...
When to the structure went more noble names
Than the Ephesian temple lost in flames;
When every stone was laid by virtuous hands,
And standing so (O that it yet not stands!),...
There porticos were built, and seats for knights
That watched for all adventures, days and nights;...
With arcs triumphal for their actions done,
Outstriding the Colossus of the sun,
And trophies reared of spoiled enemies,
Whose tops pierced through the clouds and hit the skies" (Ins.46-63).

All of which reconciles what some have seen as an apparent conflict in the 'marriage' of mediaeval chivalry and antiquity in its revived form.16

Jonson's architecture reflected the antiquity of Geoffrey's Albion; as a specific source in 'Geoffrey' a passage in which Arthur's capital is described "a match for Rome" (Book ix, ch.12) might be suggested17 - thus prefiguring Stuart London as Rome's rival. With this in mind, Jones's architectural Orders themselves might also be seen 'validated' against Geoffrey's History. The portico inscription, in including the mediaeval notion of the British Kings as heirs to France, also echoed Geoffrey.

16 For example Roy Strong, in 'Inigo Jones and the Revival of Chivalry', Apollo, vol.lxxxvi (1967), p.104, on Prince Henry: "This strange combination - at once trying to satisfy an international baroque image and yet appealing to the old insular chivalrous myth - is reflected by the talents of those in his employ. Jonson could write a masque as complex as Hymenae, an antiquarian reconstruction of Roman marriage rites, and yet adopt the mode of Orlando Furioso or the Faerie Queene".

Chapter Three

Prince Henry had been made a Garter Knight in 1603, and the antique scene, centred on St. George's portico, can in part be understood as a Garter celebration. In this way the 'restored' use of the architectural Orders became proclaimed early on as a backdrop to celebrations of the Order of the Garter.
"so signall a monument of his renowned ancestory piety"; Garter Knights, City Companies and St. Paul's Cathedral

"Yet may we very well affirm, Knighthood to be neer as ancient as Valour and Heroick Vertue...And therefore...may we derive the Original of military Honor, whence most of our Europeans account it their greatest honor to derive their Original, namely, from Troy".

[Ashmole, E., Order of the Garter (1672). p.5].

With its stained glass and tombs, the old Cathedral represented one of the finest memorials in Stuart London to mediaeval chivalry. Sidney had been buried at St. Paul's in 1586. Two years later Elizabeth gave thanks at the Cathedral for the delivery of the Protestant monarchy from the Catholic Armada, when eleven ensigns taken from the Spaniards hung from the lower battlements. Many shields permanently decorated the Cathedral walls; shields in the stained glass in the choir must have been restored as part of Jones's repair work - the Gothic windows of Wren's 1666 sectional drawing (Fig.79). Indeed, one William Parker left £500 for "the repairing of the Windowes of Pauls Church". It was this chivalrous iconography which Jones's restoration physically and symbolically absorbed.

This was true in general of Elizabethan chivalry, 'overlaid' as it was by an outwardly 'new' order proclaiming the harmonies of Stuart rule. By report Charles I quoted Pamela's prayer from Sidney's Arcadia when on the scaffold. Arcadia was quoted by Sir Henry Wotton when advocating an architecture which must have seemed very unfamiliar to English eyes. Although Jousts and Barriers continued up to the commencement of the reign of Charles I, chivalrous spectacles of Tournament and Barriers effectively

18 See Simpson, W.S., Gleanings (1889), ch.iv.
19 Dugdale, W. History (1658), pp.39-113. Holland, H., Ecclesia Sancti Pauli Illustrata (1633), contains a list of monuments, and is dedicated to Laud.
24 Wotton, H., Elements (1624), p.120,
became absorbed into the mythic drama of masque during the reign of James I, when various Orders of chivalry were revamped.

In order to advance his political and religious claims James harnessed national chivalrous traditions by consolidating what became the most ceremonious order of knights within the Stuart Court, 'The Noble Order of the Garter'; this followed the obvious French example of the Order of the Holy Spirit, founded by Henry III in 1578. In old St. Paul's a chantry was dedicated to the Garter Order's patron, St. George, and a number of tombs of founding members with their stained glass survived. With the symbolic duty to protect London as the new Jerusalem - following in spirit their Crusading ancestors - the Order was thought to embody an unbroken link, past the Crusades to Arthur, and, through Roman occupation, once again to Trojan Brute. Thus, much as Jones's architectural Orders, the Order of the Garter became a visible sign of the British history. In reporting this origin in the first Garter history (quoted above), Elias Ashmole, Windsor Herald, implied a link between chivalry and the architecture of Vitruvius (Fig.16), who is cited in the text. As part of the projection of Stuart London as a second Rome, the Order of the Garter became the focus for the idea of a college, or senate of honour, echoing in general the Roman Senate. Proposed to the King in 1617 by Jones's friend Edmund Bolton (an advocate

25 See Young, A., Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments (1987), p.42, p.177-9. Jones was himself involved with the design of a pageant device for Richard Preston, Lord Dingwall, see Ibid, p.90. Incidentally, the gallery to Jones's Banqueting House overlooked the tilt yard.


28 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.36, records the tomb of "Sir John de Beauchamp...one of the Founders of the most noble Order of the Garter", within a Chantry founded by this knight.

29 Sir Henry Herbert, garter knight, paid for the glass to some of the Cathedral windows; see Simpson, W.S., Gleanings (1889), p.92.

30 Ashmole, E., Order of the Garter (1672), p.10 refers to "Roman Knights".

31 Ibid, p.3: "C Marins consecrated a little chappel to Honor and Vertue...the Symmetry and Proportion of the Columnes, and what they supported, were perfected by C.Macius, as Vitruvius informs us, and that according to the exact Rules of Architecture".

32 See D.N.B. Ashmole, E., Order of the Garter (1672), p.8: "The Seminary or Nursery of Senators...[in Rome] may we further parallel it with that of Knighthood among us in England".
of Geoffrey's history) Bolton's Academy was to consist of three classes - echoing no doubt the Roman 'Senatus', 'Equestrian Order', and 'Plebeians'. These ranged from the Garter Knights at the top down to "the most able and most famous lay gentlemen of England", amongst whom we find Jones. Members were to have extraordinary supervisory powers over the arts, examining all English translations of secular learning and authorising all books other than those on theology. In this Bolton consolidated existing book patronage, works frequently dedicated to Garter members.

Garter Knights obviously played a central part in the 'restoration' procession to St. Paul's in 1620. Further, of the twenty five members of the Order, seven, according to Dugdale, served on the 1620 'restoration' committee. They represent the largest single group of Court officials to 'supervise' the early work of Inigo Jones on St. Paul's. 'Supervise', since the workings of Bolton's college might here suggest the way in which the relationship between both operated on the Cathedral. An actual example of such supervisory powers lay in the design of heraldry, for it was the established role of the Garter principal King of Arms to oversee the design and grant the use of such arms to, for example, the London Companies.

Bolton's own works on heraldry were officially 'approved' by the Garter Principal. Jones's scheme for the Cathedral tower of 1608 (Fig. 79) had

33 Bolton expressed his faith in Geoffrey's version of British History. See HYPERCRITICA (1815 ed.), pp. 225-254. In 1600 he became associated with the work of Sidney, Spencer and Raleigh as a contributor to England's Helicon.


36 See Ibid.

37 There are many examples of such dedications. In 1630, James Wadsworth's Further Observations of the English Spanish Pilgrimage, Concerning Spain, was dedicated to Henry, Earl of Holland in his capacity as High Constable of the Castle of Windsor, and "Knight of the Noble Order of the Garter".

38 Those listed by Dugdale (p. 135) are: James I, Thomas, Earl of Arundel, William, Earl of Pembroke (Lord Chamberlain), Lodovick, Duke of Lennox (Lord Steward), James, Marquess of Hamilton, Henry, Earl of Southampton, and John, Earl of Marr. Charles, as Prince of Wales, took part in James's procession to St. Paul's in 1620.


40 Bolton, E., The Elements of Armories (1610), and The Cities Advocate, in this case or Question of Honor and Armes (1628), both dedicated to members of the Garter Order. The
been prepared under the direct patronage of the Garter knight, Sir Robert Cecil.\textsuperscript{41}

Further, with the link between architectural Order and chivalry pictured in Jonson's \textit{Barriers} and implied in Geoffrey's \textit{History} in mind, it is reasonable to speculate that this group of Garter Knights on the restoration committee of St. Paul's understood Jones's surface as expressive of their own chivalrous traditions. For the task of restoring St. Paul's as Solomon's temple, in the new Jerusalem of London, might easily have been identified by the Garter Knights with the mission of their crusading ancestors - the restoration of Jerusalem to the Christian faith (following such mediaeval Orders as the 'Templars' or the 'Brethren of the Chivalry of the Temple of Solomon').\textsuperscript{42} Per Palme has pointed out the importance of Garter Knight ceremonies, together with the armorial coats of the Heralds, in the conception of Jones's Banqueting House.\textsuperscript{43} A union between the visual display of Court order and the 'content' of the architectural backdrop would certainly seem reasonable when we remember that such was the case in the design of masque; and Court order was obviously made manifest through displays of heraldry and chivalrous costume - ceremonial processions to St. Paul's in which the Garter Order performed a central role. Indeed, such links between Jones's 'antique' architecture and the Garter Order can be seen in Van Dyck's sketch, discussed in chapter two, depicting Charles and Garter Knights in procession (Fig. 7).

Bolton's Academy came to nothing, but Garter Knights continued to play their important role in the Stuart Court. Garter worship, at Windsor Castle, became an important element of Laud's Church; Laud's diary records a close involvement with the the design of the Order's chapel at Windsor,

"The fulfilling of which Decrees would make a magnificent and worthy supply of all things necessary unto the service of the


\textsuperscript{42} See Loftie, W.J., \textit{The Inns of Court and Chancery} (1895 ed.), p.32.

\textsuperscript{43} Palme, P., \textit{Triumph of Peace} (1957), p.123: "The ceremonials connected with the cult of sovereignty...fused an ecclesiastical tradition of processional liturgy with a secular tradition of martial display. This compounded is...relevant...if we attempt to describe the Banqueting House as a realm of specific human activities, and, moreover, if we endeavour to understand the interrelation between these and its formal structure".
said Altar...These and all that concern the Order are to be remembered at the next Chapter".44

Indeed, as the 'model' for the High Church ceremonial,45 Windsor chapel can be seen as a 'model' for the Cathedral refacing itself. In Thomas Carew's masque Coelum Britannicum (1634) a circular cloud was viewed, in which, "was a troop of fifteen stars, expressing the stellifying of our British heroes; but one more great and eminent than the rest, which was over his head, figured his majesty. And in the lower part was seen afar off the prospect of Windsor Castle, the famous seat of the most honourable Order of the Garter" (Ins.1075-80).

Centred on the Garter Order, this summed up, as Strong observes, "in a single stage picture a whole complex of Caroline religious, ethical and social ideals".46

The Garter Knights were not the only group linked to Jones's work which might have seen in the act of Cathedral 'restoration' a celebration of the origins of their own institution. For the City Companies, who supplied the building workforce and members from which served on the two committees, shared elements of their composition with the Garter Knights.

Obviously religious rites and ceremonies were interwoven into mediaeval civic life. Whilst discussing old St. Paul's, Simpson points out that the "City Guilds were in their origin, and indeed in their practice, intimately associated with the Church".47 St. Paul's was of special significance to the city, according to Laud "the mother church of this City and Diocese".48 Many of the Companies possessed chantries within old St. Paul's49 and were

44 Prymne, W., HISTORY OF The Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of WILLIAM LAUD (1646), pp.124-125.
45 See Orgel and Strong, Theatre of the Stuart Court (1973), p.70.
46 Ibid.
47 Simpson, W.S., Old City Life (1894), p.63.
48 In a letter to the Barber Surgeons, dated 30th January, 1632. Quoted in Benham, W., Old St. Paul's Cathedral (1902), p.66.
celebrated in the stained glass. Following the Lord Mayor's pageant, the Cathedral and Paul's Cross formed the regular objects of civic processions, on the feast days of All Saints, Pentecost and Christmas. The City Companies were traditionally responsible for decorating the Cathedral on such occasions. On completion of repair work after the fire of 1561 the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and "all the crafts of London in ther leverey" went by torchlight to St. Paul's. In 1605 the Saddler's Company attended a Thanksgiving service for the frustration of the Gunpowder Plot, and subsequently contributed to the restoration. Most, if not all the twelve main Companies contributed financially to the building work, Laud sending exhortations to the city - for example, to the Barber Surgeons on January 30th, 1632,

"The general body of this City have done very worthily in their bounty already, also the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs severally, for their own persons. These are, therefore, according to their examples, heartily to pray and desire you, the Master Warden and other assistants of the worthy Company of Barber Surgeons to contribute out of your public stock to the work aforesaid".

In appealing for such charity, the Bishops of the 17th Century followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, men such as Richard Toclive who in 1175 issued to the city just such an appeal, for the building of the Cathedral itself. A large number of City Companies were employed on Jones's

50 Lethaby reports the Goldsmiths' Company shield, The Builder, Nov. 7, 1930.
53 Simpson, W. S., Old City Life (1894), p. 91.
54 Quoted in Benham, W., Old St. Paul's Cathedral (1902), p. 66. See also record of contributions Guildhall MS. 25, 474 6 vols. 1633-40, which includes names of City Companies.
refacing - the Work's accounts examined in chapter one note Plumbers, Masons, Bricklayers, Smiths and Carpenters.56

Each of the twelve elected the Lord Mayor, chosen in turn since mediaeval times from amongst their ranks. The Lord Mayor's pageant, as it progressed through the city towards St. Paul's, served as a means to present to the citizens a 'programme' of past and future achievements of the Companies. The 1620 progress *The Triumph of Peace*, in celebrating the inauguration of Sir Francis Jones, presented a 'manifesto' for the future year, dictated by 'Peace': "Within this Citty...for one whole yeare / Thy mandats are obay'd, then have a care / To see me safely kept".57 The theme of 'Peace' was indeed to surround the Cathedral committee of that year, on which Francis Jones served (discussed in chapter eight). The following year saw a direct celebration of planned work by the Companies on the Cathedral fabric itself,58 for Thomas Middleton's *Sun in Aries* alluded to the joint repair work at the Cathedral and the New Standard,

*his Lordship being gracefully conducted toward the New Standard, one in a cloudy ruinous habit leaning upon the turret, at a trumpet's sounding, suddenly starts and wakes, and in amazement throwes off his unseemly garments,*

"What noise is this wakes me from ruine's wombe? Hah! blesse me, Time, howe brave am I become!.. Vertue's faire aedifice rais'd up like mee. Why, here's the Citie's goodnes, shown in either, To raise two worthy buildings both together... Nay, note the Citie's bountie in both, still When they restore a ruine, 'tis their will To be so noble in their cost and care, All blemish is forgot when they repaire; For what has beene re-edified a late But lifts its head up in more glorious state; "'Tis grown a principle, ruine's built agen,  

---


Come better'd both in monuments and men".59

New building work evidently formed part of the Lord Mayor's traditional concerns, here bound up with the restoration of a supposed ancient civic freedom as a virtuous product of the Companies' celestial rule over the city, expressed in the progress's title. Indeed, directly after this speech concerning the Cathedral the new Lord Mayor was led to a mountain encircled by the twelve celestial signs.

In line with the Stuart Court, Brute's legendary 'New Troy' was celebrated by the City of London and its Companies - Stow's Survey of London (1633 ed.), for example, introduced Brute's capital bound up with the city structure, the twelve Companies and their ensigns; these ensigns appeared alongside Trojan foundation and Jones's Cathedral on Faithore's 1658 London map (Fig.1). Trojan origins formed a frequent theme within the Lord Mayors' progresses - as with Dekker's Troia-Novae Triumphans Londinii Triumphans (1612),60 in which the twelve Companies were commanded to "guard this new Troy".61 Like the Garter Knights and Villalpando's Orders, the London building Companies, the Company of Masons in particular, traced their origins back to the building of Solomon's temple;62 Bolton's building Companies, for example, had inherited "Arch-mysteries" employed on the temple,

"an hammer Smith, or worker in yron, that being one of those Arch-mysteries...Nay, there belonged in Gods owne judgement so great praise to the particular excellency of some artificers, as that, in the building of Salomons Temple, they are registered to all posterities in Scripture; and their skill is not onely made immortally famous, but a more curious mention is put downe of their parentage, and birth place, then of many great Princes, as in Hirams case, not he the King, but the brasse-founder".

59 Ibid.
60 Reported in Fairholt, F.W., Lord Mayors' Pageants: being Collections towards a History of These Annual Celebrations (1843), pt.ii, pp.11-31.
61 Ibid, p.20.
In this way Stonemasonry and the stone Orders were linked in Solomonic mythology. Bolton further related that St. Paul was himself initiated in such craft mysteries,

"And in the new Testament, S. Paul,...had the manuall Art of Scoenopoea, commonly englised, Tent-making: upon Wch place of St. Pauls trade,...[he] was brought up so, by a traditionall precept, binding such a would studie sacred letters, to learne some one or other mysterie in the Mechanicks".63

Hence, with the task of restoring St. Paul's as Solomon's temple in mind, the masters and apprentices might once again have easily identified in their work on the Cathedral a celebration of their own antique, biblical origins. Indeed, in Portland-Stone in Paules-Church yard. Their Birth, their mirth, their Thankefulness, their Advertisement (1622), addressed by one Henry Farley to members of the 1620 royal commission, the Cathedral was restored on "Pauls-Sion Hill" and the workmen and commissioners were jointly exhorted,

"So now you Workmen, listen what we say...
Learne by the Scriptures what you ought to doe,
Let them direct your hands and conscience to;
Ezra, Ne'miah, Chronicles, and Kings,
And Haggai will show you many things:
How justly men did worke about the Temple,
Which there is Registred for your example".64

The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah report the temple's foundation, Chronicles the architect's name, Hiram, and Kings architectural details; the prophet Haggai exhorted the rebuilding of the temple. With London as the new Jerusalem, the twelve tribes of Israel became a biblical model for the twelve Companies themselves.

On the occasion of the royal procession in 1620, when James announced his intention of restoring the Cathedral, "the Quire...was adorn'd with his own Hangings".65 Company ensigns also played an important role in 'decorating' the City of London on royal processions to St. Paul's. According to Stow's Chronicle of 1631, quoted in chapter two, the route from Temple

64 Reproduced in Simpson, W.S., Old City Life (1894), p.198.
Bar to St. Paul's was decorated with the Companies' heraldic devices; there were "tapestry-hangings all the while hanging out of the windows". On such occasions it was the responsibility of the Lord Mayor to see that members of each Company lining the Cathedral route were properly dressed, in the colours of their craft; writing to each in 1620 he ordered,

"you take special care that all persons of the Livery of your said Company may be in readiness against that time, with their Livery Hoods, attired in their best apparell, to wait and attend his Majestie's coming...Your Standards and Streamers to be sett up, as shall best beseeme the place".67

Indeed, the west front of St. Paul's had traditionally been used as a 'backdrop' for chivalric displays of city armour68 - the hereditary banner-bearer of London marching to the west door where the banner of the city, an image of St. Paul (Fig.25), was presented to the Mayor. In this, for Bolton, "There needs no greater demonstration of the Cities ancient honor,...then...The figure of St. Paul (titularie patron of London) advanced it selfe in the Standard".69

Institutions of chivalry and craft, masonry in particular, were naturally linked in mediaeval city life.70 Following the Garter Knights, in identifying their work with the building of Solomon's temple each craft must surely have seen the task of Cathedral refacing as a triumph of its particular skill, emblematic for the nobility of their craft and, as such, the visual equivalent of their heraldic device. Hence, through Jones's Orders St. Paul's might actually be seen 'dressed' in the Masons' own heraldry, much as it was

---

66 Reported by Nichols, J., Progresses of James I (1828), vol.iv, p.598.
67 Ibid, p.597.
68 See W.R. Lethaby, The Builder, Dec.12 and Oct.10: "Stow, speaking of the Churchyard or Cathedral Close, says that the citizens 'claimed the west side that they might there assemble themselves together with the Lord of Baynard's Castle, for view of their armour of defence of the city'".
70 Rykwert, J., The First Moderns (1980), p.134: "in the seventeenth century...[Orders of chivalry and masonry] were still understood as secret societies, with roots in hoary traditions. It is often forgotten that medieval society was made up of a continuous tissue of these, ranging from the pious associations of agricultural laborers to the grandest orders of chivalry...the link between chivalry and masonry still seemed easy enough to establish. Elias Ashmole makes it in his description of "the elegant and beauteous structure" of St. George's Chapel at Windsor, which was the home of the Order of the Garter".
temporarily during processions (in this illustrating a timeless transfer from the temporary to the permanent, from Ensign to Order). Indeed, the British Solomonic ancestry of Jones's architecture, as understood by the Court, was much the same as both the building Companies and Garter Knights own mythic past, the past of which their ensigns spoke.

Whilst city officials were influential in the refacing, it was, in fact, the private citizen Henry Farley who spread most propaganda in favour of the restoration. For Farley, according to Dugdale "extreamly zealous to promote the work", 71 issued a series of appeals - including Portland-Stone quoted above - between 1616 and 1622 directly addressed to James. The first consisted of three panels, one seeming to record, in advance, the 1620 royal procession and preaching at Paul's Cross (Fig. 74). Whilst urging the King to reface the Cathedral, this panel portrayed Whitehall linked by a procession to St. Paul's and further serves to illustrate the importance of the general idea of such processions to a refaced Cathedral pictured as their backdrop (Fig. 75) (why else would Farley record a procession which, in 1616 had not, as yet, taken place?) Farley included, on the third panel, a speculative reconstruction of his own. This drawing was accompanied by a poem, entitled 'The Dream' in which Farley's St. Paul's became "beautified" 72 with chivalrous emblems. On the west pinnacle,

"...was the picture of King James:
His Armes were in the highest plane,
And then many noble man,
Had their Armes under His". 73

Farley's pinnacles represented the divisions in Stuart society, for to the east was a 'Bishop', "on the toppe his Scutchion stood", to the north a 'Lord Mayor', "the Cittie Armes were highest there", and on the south a 'Farmer', "A wheat-sheafe was his Armes I trowe". 74 Further, Farley included images of Queen Anne, Prince Charles, Princess Elizabeth and finally "Denmarks royall King" (Christian IV, brother-in-law of James, was a Garter Knight). In this Farley's Cathedral bore some similarity to Jones's later restoration, for

72 Farley, H., The Complaint of Paules to all Christian Soules (1616), sec.iii, 'prologue'.
73 Ibid, p.57.
as chapter one noted, on the west front were indeed placed statues of the two Stuart Kings - dressed in armour and as Romans, following, as at Temple Bar, Jones's costume for ancient British knights in masque (Fig.13, Fig.14). It was intended the Stuarts be flanked by past Kings of Britain, as the drawing by Flitcroft of 1727 illustrates (Fig.55), but these were never put in place. Indeed, the whole Corinthian portico was, according to Dugdale, emblematic for an ancient British nobility and religion,

"Nor was the King himself without an high sense of the honour done unto Christian Religion; and the same which would redound to this whole English Nation, by thus restoring to life so signall a Monument of his renowned ancestors piety, (I mean King Ethelbert and the other Saxon Kings) as may seem by that most magnificent and stately Portico, with Corinthian pillars, which at his own charge he erected at the West end thereof".

This pattern of funding - Royal money to the west front, private to the sides - was common in the Renaissance. In this way, Farley's imaginary restoration prefigured not only the idea of the royal procession celebrated by Jones's architecture, but also elements of royal 'heraldry'.

With the possible connections between the architectural and chivalric Orders in mind, 'technical' links are suggested between the design and composition of architectural Order and the design rules of heraldry. Such links might help illuminate a neglected issue: for in the struggle in the late 16th and early 17th Centuries to understand what are often presented as new 'Italian', Vitruvian rules of 'Symmetry' and 'Order' in Britain, existing mediaeval arts of design such as heraldry or emblems of chivalry may well have played a part.

75 Graham Parry, in Hollar's England (1980), notes that these statues were "decorous in Roman costume", plate 76.
76 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.140.
Heraldry and the Orders of Architecture as joint emblems of British Chivalry

"Those obelisks and columns broke and down...
shields and swords
Cobwebbed and rusty;...
More truth of architecture there was blazed...
There porticos were built, and seats for knights".

['The House of Chivalry', Jonson's *Barriers* (1610), Ins.38,-54]

In the Court of Prince Henry as celebrated in *The Barriers*, arms and antique architecture were harmoniously combined, "For armes and arts sustain each other's right" (In.108). This chapter has attempted to establish that an element within the latter, the newly 'rediscovered' architectural Orders, became emblems expressing and confirming the former, the established British Orders of chivalry - a transfer paralleled by the masque in its conveyance of a theme of mediaeval chivalry traditionally expressed by pageants and heraldry. This prompts the more specific notion that the actual design of the Orders may have been thought of in terms of heraldry.

1 "Architectural Heraldry", the Elizabethan Heraldic Column. Architectural elements obviously feature in heraldic grammar - terms such as 'Arched', 'Castle', 'Portcullis', and the antique 'Column' itself. The column has always been important to heraldic design.77 It was employed by Jones to support a shield in his design for Lady Cotton's tomb (Fig.11), and in so doing represented the manner in which the antique column first appeared in this country, before the coherent use of the Orders on the 1604 arches or the later Banqueting House.

Elizabethan royal symbolism frequently employed the column as a heraldic sign. The famous engraving by Crispin de Passe (Fig.24) of 1596 pictures Elizabeth flanked by the two column device, following the representations of Charles V in signifying the northern imperial *Idea*. More

77 Consulting one of the many dictionaries of heraldry, under 'Pillar' one finds: "In addition to appearing, of necessity, to support an arch (q.v.), the pillar, also termed 'column', appears alone as a charge: the order - Doric, Ionic or Corinthian - may be stated. The pillar generally acts as a support for some other charge, even a prosaic object representing a trade or a craft. A whole pillar is likely to be on a mount, but the demi-column is issuant", Franklyn, J., Tanner, J., *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Heraldry* (1970). See also Elvin's *Dictionary of Heraldry* (1889), plate 43, n.50 where a "Pillar or Column (Doric) Ducally crowned" is indicated within a shield.
specifically, the Corinthian columns are made to carry royal arms, heraldry and Order fused in the imperial image. In the printer's mark of John Daye, reproduced in Foxe's Acts and Monuments (1570 ed.), the Corinthian Order once again forms flanking columns of imperial symbolism (Fig.26). The whole image is 'heraldic', for replacing Elizabeth are the royal arms, with the columns themselves on plinths bearing shields. As a clear aspect of Elizabethan imperial symbolism, this early use of Order as Heraldry seems to have gone unnoted by commentators.78 In the frontispiece to James's Works (1616) (Fig.83) Corinthian columns once again carry British royal insignia - Tudor roses, thistles etc. - much as if the column itself had become the heraldic shield. Here royal arms surmount the whole, architecturally Ordered composition.

This was in line with the widespread practice in Elizabethan frontispieces of using the column within a heraldic composition, the Orders forming a coherent architectural whole long before their use as such in Jones's designs. In the shielded frontispiece of Gerard Legh's The Accedence of Armory (1562) (Fig.22) a broken Corinthian column forms an isolated charge; an obelisk draped in arms is pictured at the end. Arms appear pinned to the Corinthian columns in the frontispiece to Stow's Chronicle of England (1631 ed.) (Fig.19), as also in Guillim's A Display of Heraldrie (1610 ed.) (Fig.20). An opening poem79 explains that the 'Display of Heraldrie', or "edifice" as Guillim terms the work, is represented by this frontispiece in which,

"First, England, being thy Scene thou doest present,  
In a Triumphall Arch her Regiment...  
And Head of every Priviledge, the KING  
is set above: From whom those Six beside,  
Betweene the Pillars by their Coats descri'd".

In this way both Order and Heraldry were first pictured as joint elements of the antique revival, or British Renaissance, prefiguring Jones and Jonson's Barriers.

78 For an interpretation of these two images, see Yates, F., Astraea (1975), pp.57-58. No link is investigated between the Orders and Heraldry.

79 On the following page William Sagar, Garter King of Arms, continues this architectural metaphor, for, we are told, never was a "Groundworke truer laid, / to raise a Fabricke to your lasting name".
Elizabethan and Stuart architecture itself expressed a distinctly 'heraldic' character, through the frequent display of shields on walls or within glass, and trophies of arms set within niches - where columns commonly provide a supporting 'frame' or 'surround' (Fig.17). Elizabethan houses were constructed before the concept of Ordered design, that a whole building could be 'generated' from the column and its measured relationship to a beam/entablature, had been fully grasped. However, whilst the spread of such Vitruvian notions was limited, the painting and carving of 'unified', ordered heraldic designs would have been second nature to Elizabethan builders. Heraldry was central to the design of Elizabethan stained glass windows, for example. Later the Orders would be united with stained glass in Laud's movement towards outward and visible signs.

Palladio had awarded the prime location, the centre of the pediment, to the heraldic shield and, following this, arms and ensigns were an important component of Jones's vocabulary - used on the gateways above or, for example, the facades of the Star Chamber, a design for the Temple Bar arch and on many villas. The Jones-Webb designs for Whitehall palace, as published by Kent in 1727, included metopes decorated with trophies of arms inspired by the emblem books (Fig.23) and Bold has noted the heraldic character of Webb's capital designs; the term "architectural heraldry" was

80 Any number of 16th Century buildings, tombs and arches illustrate this relationship between column and arms - particularly on certain elements, such as fireplaces (at Bolsover Castle, Derbyshire), windows (at Broughton Castle, Oxfordshire), doorways (at Blickling Hall, Norfolk) and gateways (Jones at New Hall, Essex, and Hatton House, Ely Place, London). Indeed, it is these traditionally 'heraldic' building elements to which the initial use of the Orders was also frequently restricted.

81 Robert Stickells, working during the Elizabethan period but alive until 1620, displayed a primitive knowledge of Vitruvian theory when commenting on building proportion: "These thinges consisteth in man hime self, for that man is the proporctinall & Reasonable creatuer". See Summerson, J., 'Three Elizabethan Architects', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 40 (1957), p.228.

82 See Eden, F.S., Ancient Stained and Painted Glass (1933), p.179, p.182. Eden notes that "by 1540 or thereabouts, Gothic had largely given place to classical forms for shields and accessories". In this way such windows, with their 'antique' shields, prefigured the Ordered, "classical forms" of Jones.

83 Quattro Libri (1570), bk.ii, ch.xvi. "the fore-part being thus made more eminent than the rest, is very commodious for placing the ensigns or arms of the owners, which are commonly put in the middle of the front".

itself used by one Victorian commentator in reference to Whitehall and a heraldic character has also been identified in Court portraiture of the period.

2 Houses of Heraldry and Order, a Common Stuart Ancestry. Connections between heraldry and architecture are inevitably inferred by the etymology of the word 'House' - both architectural and heraldic - alluded to in Jonson's title 'The Fallen House of British Chivalry' or by Dugdale when observing "younger Brethren do marry, erect, and establish new Houses". Further, both the Orders and Heraldry were understood to proclaim a common past, through jointly reflecting the Stuart Court's own supposed antique-biblical ancestry.

In Edmund Bolton's The Elements of Armories (1610) the notion of heraldry as a component of antique architecture is made explicit,

"Armes are in sort the onely remaining customary evidences, or testimonies of Noblesse, now that neyther Statues, Arcks, Obelisks, Trophies, Spires nor other publike magnificent erections are in use".

It was this ruined antique world that Bolton hoped his friend, Inigo Jones, would restore. With heraldry representing such an unbroken link with Britain's antique past, it is perhaps no surprise to find the shield itself used by the Stuart Court as the symbol for such ruined "Statues, Arcks, Obelisks". For, as the future Stuart monarch, Prince Henry was cast in The Barriers as heir to a virtuous British antiquity, receiving this inheritance from Arthur symbolically encapsulated in a shield, "wherein is wrought / The truth that he must follow" (Ins.95-96) (Fig.14). Hence, as a further sign of this restored

85 Cunningham, A., The Lives of the Most Eminent British Painters, Sculptors and Architects (1831), vol.iv, p.104: "To place the heavy bases of one order upon the slender capitals of another, seems questionable architectural heraldry".

86 See Auerbach, E., 'Portraits of Elizabeth', Burlington Magazine (1953), p.205: "Apart from the purely decorative effect, the image itself...became the superb expression of an almost heraldic monument of the Queen". Palme, P., Triumph of Peace (1957), p.33, adds: "This 'heraldic' formalization must have seemed oddly out of date when confronted with the early Baroque trends in European portraiture". See also Chirelstein, E., 'Lady Elizabeth Pope: The Heraldic Body' in Gent, L., Llewellyn, N., (ed.), Renaissance Bodies. The Human Figure in English Culture c.1540-1660 (1990), pp.36-59.

87 Dugdale, W., THE ANTIENT USAGE (1682), p.50.

Golden Age, the design of the Orders might naturally have been influenced by what was regarded the only surviving antique design art, heraldry - which, in any case, was traditionally linked to architecture.

More specifically, in Heywood's TROIA BRITANICA (1609) as part of the theme of James's ancestry the origin of ensigns was traced to Troy. This antique pedigree was equated with biblical history. The frontispiece of the 'Bishops Bible' (1602) was decorated with heraldic shields of the twelve tribes. These standards were pitched "about the Tabernacle" (Numbers ch.ii, v.2), a notion referred to by Dugdale when linking architecture to ensign, "So that by this you may see, that..[ensigns] be no new inventions of men, so they are also things allowable by the word of God. Neither do Obsequies or monuments ensuing worthy acts want the authority of Scriptures".

Chapter two pointed out that in hermetic lore the Orders found an origin in the Tabernacle of Moses, which prefigured the temple of Solomon also built with the Orders Vitruvius later described. Hence the Tabernacle came independently to represent the embodiment of both heraldry and architectural Order - a virtue enhanced by the fact that both also symbolised the Golden Age of Troy; indeed, in Villalpando's illustrations of Solomon's temple Vitruvian canons and the ensigns of the twelve tribes are pictured jointly 'ordering' the plan (Fig.48).

Scriptural authority for heraldry was further enhanced by links with the secret wisdom of the Egyptians. Coats of arms, emblems and devices found a common origin in the picture language of hieroglyphics, which in their Renaissance form were understood to signify divine mysteries given by God to Moses (a notion stemming from the discovery of Horapollo's manuscript.

89 Heywood, T., TROIA BRITANICA (1609), p.115. The Trojan King, "calling now to mind the Bird that soared
About his rich Pavillion, he ordained
Her picture should be drawne and quaintly skored,
Upon a Crimson Ensigne richly stained,
Till then, they bore no flags, no Scutchions drew,
loves Eagle was the first, in field that flew".

90 Dugdale, W., THE ANTIENT USAGE (1682), pp.34-35.
in 1419).91 An anonymous letter of commendation to Samuel Daniel's 1585 translation of Giovio's *Dialogo* observes,

"concerning the arte of Imprese, I neede not draw the petigree of it, sith it is knowne that it descended from the auncient Aegiptians, and Chaldaeans...by the picture of a Stork they signified...[family devotion]. By a serpent pollicie:...drawing these Charecters from the world, as from a volume wherein was written the wonders of nature. Thus was the first foundations layd of Imprese. From hence were derived by succession of pregnant wittes Stemmata Coates of Armes, Insignia Ensignes, and the old Images which the Romaines used as witnesses of their Auncestors, Emblemes and Deuises".92

Bolton called heraldry "the HIEROGLYPHICKS of Nobility"93 and, alongside a discussion of architectural heraldry Guillim's 'Pillars' were termed "the Hieroglyphicks of fortitude".94 This Egyptian art also became centred on Britain, in such as Minerva Britanna. (or a Garden of Heroical Devices) (1612) by Jones's friend, Henry Peacham, (in this ensigns were, once again, awarded a Trojan birth)95 and in the Cabalistic view of ancient Britain discussed in the next chapter. Bolton, with reference to the works of the Florentine neoplatonic philosopher Marsilio Ficino, even traced British ermine direct to Hermes.96 With Solomon as the patron for such arcana, the Orders supposedly used on his temple also became implicated in these hermetic arts. Further, this common history suggests links in the theory or way in which the Orders and heraldry were designed.

3 Joint 'Elements' of design; Henry Wotton and three 'technical' links between the rules of Order and Heraldry. Bolton equated architecture with arms at the level of the *Idea*,

---


93 Bolton, E., *The Elements of Armories* (1610), Dedicatory poem, entitled 'H.C. To the Gentleman Reader'.


"let an Armes painted on a Surcoat, Tabard, or Shield be blotted out, the privation of the Armories, makes no privation of the Continent...though so I doe no more take it to bee an actual Armes, then the dreame, or Idea of a building is an house".  

In line with this implied conceptual link, joint "Rules and Axioms" as Guillim terms heraldic composition may well have governed the design of heraldry, emblem and Order in the early Stuart Court. Bolton frequently described heraldic composition as the art of arranging an emblem. Whilst these are linked, the exact relationship between such emblems and the Orders themselves is difficult to establish. Certainly the emblematic frontispiece frequently had, as has been seen, an architectural framework, and the occult art of artificial memory united in its workings emblem with 'real' architecture. Jones's use of St. Paul's in Britannia Triumphans was not the only example of an actual building forming part of the masque design, designs which frequently involved the use of hieroglyphs, or emblems for costume and backdrop; indeed, Jonson branded Jones's work "Court hieroglyphics". It is certainly reasonable to suppose that emblematic set design and more permanent architecture were thought of in a similar way by Jones, given he designed both. In this a 'technical' parallel between heraldry and the Orders suggests itself, for both might seem composed as emblems - as their common past seemed to warrant.

Heraldry was also frequently presented as a branch of geometry. Not only were heraldic characters arranged geometrically, but geometric figures themselves became heraldic 'Charges' - circles, triangles, and the 'Shield', or 'Star of David', for example. It was equally a commonplace in Renaissance theory to regard the design of the Orders as a geometric art, one of the first English expressions of this being in John Shute's THE First and Chief

97 Ibid, p.80. See also chapter six.
98 Guillim, J., A Display of Heraldrie (1632), dedicatory epistle.
99 For a discussion of the relationship between Heraldry and Emblem see Daly, P.M., Literature in the Light of the Emblem (1979), pp.27-32.
101 For example, in the dedicatory poem at the beginning of The Elements of Armories it is claimed "GEOMETRIE gives lines in ordred place, Numbers ARTHMETICK".
Bolton implied such a link between architecture and heraldry through geometry,

"Neither are...[merchants marks] of so diverse forme from Armes, or Armories in their perfection, as an excellent piece of Architecture from the first elements of Geometry, out of which not withstanding it rose".102

Here again, the relatively unfamiliar rules of Vitruvian design - rules governed by geometric relationship - may well have naturally fallen within heraldry as a flourishing design art of supposed antiquity. Bolton opens with the fact that in heraldic design "All Arts conjon'd in this do appeare". With Vitruvian canons in mind, one of the most explicit design parallels is contained in Guillim's opening remarks, endeavouring as they do "to give unto this erst unshapely and disproportionate profession of Heraldry, a true Symmetria and proportionable correspondence of each part to other".103 Such geometric and symmetrical qualities are the second design similarities which suggest themselves. Further evidence of 'technical' links between the Orders and heraldry can be found by consulting the albeit scarce architectural writing of the time.

The various English 'treatises' or written work to concentrate on architecture - Shute before the Stuarts, Jonson and Wotton during James's reign - all reveal certain 'heraldic' themes. For example, links between the Orders of architecture and chivalry would account for the particular interpretation of Vitruvius's 'masculine' Tuscan and Doric Orders by Shute in 1563 - both personified as armed, antique warriors, standing on plinths bearing representations of trophies of arms (Fig.18). Jones's copy of Vignola's Regola delle cinque ordini d'architettura (1607 ed.) included shields as antique iconography; Jones's annotations show his study of this work. In Serlio's Architettura - an English edition of which appeared in 1611 dedicated to Prince Henry - Book Four (the first of the five to be published) concludes with a page of shield designs (Fig.21).104 Much later, in 18th

---

102 Ibid, p.22.

103 Guillim, J., A Display of Heraldrie (1632), in "To the Courteous Reader".

104 Here shields are bound up with, as the title puts it, the 'Rules for Masonry, or Building with Stone or Bricks, made after the five manners or orders of Building, viz. Thuscana, Dorica, Ionica, Corinthia and Composita'.
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Century Italy, Bernardo Vittone's *Architettura Civile* (1760) was also to include heraldry with the architectural Orders.105

Chapter two pointed out that the first coherent use of the Orders in London was in the triumphal arches marking James's entry of 1604. In explaining these 'devices' Jonson repeated the connection between Hieroglyphicks, Emblems and Impreses. But of more significance, all would seem tied together in a manner clearly echoing Alberti's definition of 'Beauty' concerning architectural Order in *The Art of Building* - "that reasoned harmony of all the parts within a body, so that nothing may be added, taken away, or altered, but for the worse" (bk.vi, ch.ii)106 - for, as Jonson remarks,

"The nature and propertie of these Devices being, to present alwaies some one entire bodie, or figure, consisting of distinct members, and each of those expressing it selfe, in the owne active spheare, yet all, with that generall harmonie so connexed, and disposed, as no one little part can be missing to the illustration of the whole: where also is to be noted, that the *Symboles* used, are not, neither ought to be, simply *Hieroglyphickes, Emblemes, or Impreses*, but a mixed character, partaking somewhat of all, and peculiarly apted to these more magnificent Inventions".107

Here Jonson would seem to confirm that the architectural Orders - which in composing "these Devices" lay behind this statement - were bound up with the design of emblems and Impreses, the Orders "partaking somewhat of all".

Finally, however, this section provides both a background to and explanation for a statement in the only English treatise on the Orders published during Jones's lifetime, Henry Wotton's *Elements of Architecture* (1624). In this the "masculine Aspect" of the Doric Order is outlined,

"His ranke or degree, is the lowest by all *Congruity*, as being more massie then the other three, and consequently able to support...To descerne him, will bee a peece rather of good.


Heraldry, than of Architecture: For he is best knowne by his place, when he is in company, and by the peculiar ornament of his Frize...when he is alone". 108

Here, Wotton's unique Stuart treatise explicitly links architectural and heraldic Order. Further, his key phrase "rather of good Heraldry, than of Architecture" would seem to suggest a greater familiarity with the rules of the former, and indicate dominance over or absorption of the similar, but newly perceived, rules defining the latter. In other words Wotton can here be seen to introduce the column as part of the established design art, heraldry certainly "best knowne by his place, when he is in company". As has been seen, to contemporary eyes the column was more familiar as a component of heraldry than of what would have been termed 'Architecture' at that date, and with the Orders generally understood as emblems of British chivalry - as proclaimed in The Barriers - such a direct link with heraldry might have seemed natural to Wotton's contemporary reader.

Wotton presents all the Orders as masculine, despite Vitruvian precedent for a female Ionic and Corinthian. He follows Vitruvius only when introducing the Ionic as having "much of the Matrone" about it, proceeding by slipping into the male gender in remarks like "Best knowne by his trimmings" and "These are his best Characters". Wotton's uniqueness lies in this description of all the Orders as male, linked to knighthood through similarity with heraldry. Following Vitruvius, Wotton's columns are ordered in what he terms "rank", with the Corinthian, "His degree, one Stage above the Ionique, and alwaies the highest of the simple Orders" - in this much like the order of knighthood. In like manner, a knight forms the outstretched Vitruvian figure in Jonson's satire of Jones, Tale of the Tub (1633): "A Knight is sixe diameters; and a Squire / Is vive, and somewhat more: I know't by compasse, / And skale of man". With Wotton's Orders forming a nobility, it follows that the "rurall", "Labourer" Tuscan is excluded - for here Wotton "need not consider his rank among the rest"; hence only four main Orders are ranked - Doric, Ionic, Corinthian and what is termed the Compounded Order. Following heraldry, this order finds expression through physical size, relative position, geometric relationship or "measure", and a variety of decoration making explicit 'character'.

The "Frize", with its triglyphs and metopes, clearly aids Wotton's identification of the Doric Order with heraldry, but in general all surface characteristics would seem 'elements' within the columns' essentially heraldic "Characters". Following the "trimings" of Ionic, despite the male tag, the Corinthian becomes "a Columnne, lacivously decked like a Curtezane". On his Compounded Order Wotton observes that "To Know him will be easie by the verie mixture of his Ornaments, and Clothing". This emphasis on costume again echoes Court order, or knighthood. It follows that when stripped of his clothing (or heraldic 'Charge') Wotton's column stands as a 'body', or basic 'element' like a blank shield (heraldic 'Field') - a body of a knight awaiting his 'coat' of arms. 'Rule 7' of Guillim's Display of Heraldrie (1632) dictates,

"In the Blazoning of any Coate, you must evermore observe this speciall rule. First, to beginne with the Field, and then proceed to the blazon of the Charge, if any be".109

In a similar way the costume for masque, invariably drawn direct from the emblem books, was added to the 'body' of an actor to display his 'character'. In this, through an elemental process in which the surface is built-up and with their explicit reference to heraldry, Wotton's Orders again become compatible with emblematic design.

With his Orders thus collectively displaying a Court order, Wotton can be seen to have been building a kind of invisible 'House of Chivalry', with one architectural Order surmounting the other corresponding to rank; indeed on the Ionic he states, "In degree as in substantialnesse, next above the Dorique, sustayning the third, and adorning the second Storey". Perhaps the Tuscan might be included in this structure as a kind of rusticated basement, beneath the other more noble Orders which he 'labours' to support. As the preface noted, the five Orders had been applied in this way as a frontispiece to the Gothic tower of the Old Schools in Oxford in 1613. Hence a third 'technical' parallel can be glimpsed within Wotton's remarks, for in explicitly specifying the Orders as heraldry both are designed to express (as emblems for) an essentially masculine Court "rank".

In summary, the relatively unfamiliar 'Italian' Vitruvian rules governing the design of the Orders can be seen explained in early 17th Century Britain

within the established art of heraldic design, understood by the Stuart Court to be the only remaining art of antiquity and a prominent component of Elizabethan architecture itself. This took place due to three main 'theoretical' similarities. Firstly, both were consciously thought of as emblems, in the tradition of the Renaissance emblem books from which composite characters could be 'built up', as if 'dressing' human or pictorial bodies. Secondly, that the Orders and heraldry were both geometric compositions, governed by the same rules of 'symmetry' and 'balance'. Thirdly, as emblems, both expressed the same notion - chivalry, expressed through an ordered 'rank'. To these interconnections should be added a common biblical and antique origin, an ancestry also shared, not surprisingly, with the Court itself - the honour of which both were employed, often jointly, to display. With the ensign thus graphically presenting the meaning of the Orders, the two became fused - governed by the same rules and expressing the same ancestry. This would seem confirmed by the only two written statements on the Orders made during the Stuart reign, by the Courtiers Wotton and Jonson. For following an image of rusty shields, Jonson's line "More truth of architecture there was blazed", quoted in the introduction, would certainly seem to have a specifically heraldic ring to it. A 'blazon' was a coat of arms, as Guillim's seventh rule indicates, and 'blazonry' the art of decoration within heraldry. Hence, here again we find the 'true' British architecture, not buildings of the "ignorant Goths" (as Jonson's next line explains) but antique architecture, Stuart architecture composed by the Orders, introduced by heraldic terminology. And in this way the Orders themselves become emblems for a British ancestry.

4 The Orders as Court Heraldry on Jones's Cathedral. Wotton's Elements provides evidence of how at least one member of the Court understood Jones's Orders used on St. Paul's, the work on which he praised (quoted in the Epilogue). Further, for any contemporary reading Wotton, the work of Inigo Jones would have provided the only coherent example of the unfamiliar architecture described. Or, perhaps more significantly, apart from Jonson's Barriers, Wotton's Elements advanced the only English explanation for Jones's buildings and the Orders from which they were composed. Rykwert points out that one aspect of Wotton's work was the adaption of

110 See O.E.D., (1933 ed.). Here 'Blazon' and 'Blazonry' are both defined as heraldic in meaning. Guillim's Display of Heraldrie (1632), p.13: "This skill of Armory consisteth of - Blazoning and Marshalling".
Italian High Renaissance building to the British climate;\(^{111}\) moreover, the presentation of the Orders as Heraldry (always badges of national identity) strikes one as a peculiarly Anglicised notion, as if Wotton was out to make an otherwise Italian 'vocabulary' appealing to English minds - echoing the Renaissance centred on the British Court itself.

The first copy of Wotton's treatise was presented to the King, the second to Prince Charles. John Chamberlain reported the work "reasonably commended";\(^{112}\) Jones must have read it, for his copy of 'Palladio' records his familiarity with Wotton's views on the Orders.\(^{113}\) Wotton also presented a copy to George Abbot,\(^{114}\) Archbishop during the preparation of Jones's 1620 survey. Since this copy is preserved in the library of Lambeth Palace William Laud may also have read it. Later, in 1636, Woton also sent a copy to William Juxon (1582-1663),\(^ {115}\) Bishop of London during the actual building work at St. Paul's.\(^ {116}\) Indeed, *The Elements* must have found Royal favour, for it played a part in gaining for Wotton the Provostship of Eton, written as it was for this purpose.\(^ {117}\) Following Van Dyck's joint representation of the Orders of Architecture and Chivalry, it is certainly reasonable to suppose that Wotton's view of the 'heraldic' Orders would have found sympathy with the Garter Knights on the St. Paul's committee, given their knowledge of and supervision over the rules of heraldic design.

Finally, the 'emblem' of Jones's west front of St. Paul's might be 'dissected', following Wotton, into 'elements' - portico, royal statues,


\(^{112}\) Quoted by Frederick Hard, Intro. to Wotton's *Elements* (1968 ed.), pp.xlv-xlvi.

\(^{113}\) In Jones's hand at the bottom of the illustration of the Corinthian Order, Lib. I, p.50: "A drawing of this Sr. He: Wotto. the first that he did for this booke Composito". See also p.36, Ionic, and p.30.


\(^{116}\) He came to head the second Cathedral restoration committee, see Calendar of State Papers, *Domestic* ,1634-1635, p. 16.

\(^{117}\) See Rykwert, J., *The First Moderns* (1980), p.127. Lord Keeper Williams reported that it was down to the Duke of Buckingham "to name the man" for Eton; Buckingham, one of the 1620 Cathedral commissioners, may therefore have also read Wotton's book. Quoted by Frederick Hard, Intro. to Wotton's *Elements* (1968 ed.), p.xliv.
obelisks - all with specific chivalrous associations rebuilding the ruined British 'House of Chivalry' quoted earlier. Both Bolton and Wotton presented statues as chivalrous 'elements' of architecture,\textsuperscript{118} exactly how Dugdale described the Corinthian portico as a whole. As such this 'royal' element, formed from the most noble of the Orders and, through its much vaunted size, the apotheosis in this country of architectural Order itself, became an extension of a Protestant iconography inaugurated by royal arms which had replaced images of the Saints in churches during the reformation.\textsuperscript{119} In its use of royal arms Farley's imaginary restoration formed part of this tradition. These arms had proclaimed the traditional concept of the 'King's Two Bodies', both human and divine, later equally represented through Jones's Orders at St. Paul's (discussed in chapter eight). This transfer was prefigured in an image, Elizabethan engravings which were seen to picture royal arms framed by Corinthian columns, an imperial symbol for the reformed Church with the monarch, and not the Pope, at its head. As the supreme symbol of this marriage between Church and State the House of God became refaced in Stuart imperial 'colours'.


Chapter Three

The 'restored' Empire of Great Britain and Church

"the goodliest Monument and most eminent Church of his whole Dominions...the imperiall seat of this his Realme".


In the sermon which announced James's intention to restore St Paul's the Cathedral was proclaimed "the Chamber of our British Empire" - Jones's work clearly intended as a direct celebration of the 'Empire of Great Britain' theme pictured ten years earlier in the Barriers. With Stuart London 'restored' in equal magnificence to Rome, the first part of this chapter examined part of the mythic history which justified such pretentions. The Stuart's saw themselves as restoring the virtues of an antique, mythic past, consisting of Trojan and later Roman occupation, ancestors of civilized, pre-popish Britons who became linked to the Golden Age of King Arthur and (despite their Catholic allegiance) the later Crusaders. Hence, with the hazy antiquity of Troy as support, a past equality with and independence from Rome bolstered equivalent imperial claims for the present and validated the otherwise 'new' Stuart Court and its 'imported' architecture. As a malleable allegory this mythic history could be temporarily fractured, in the anti-masque for example, as a warning against disunity or forces which might turn the state upside-down; Geoffrey's ancient British King Lear had been used by Shakespeare in much the same way. A restoration of this antiquity was to be achieved through Jones's use of the architectural Orders on the Cathedral, Orders which were understood, like heraldry, as emblems for this imperial British ancestry.

Further, with Stuart London as the new Jerusalem, the other half of this Stuart history was an ancient British Church prefiguring the Ecclesia Anglicana, a theme also implicit in the 'antique' restoration of St. Paul's. For

120 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church, March 26, 1620, p.43.


following its foundation as New Troy, Albion had also been the new Jerusalem.
CHAPTER FOUR
"Imperial seat" or "Church...Oecumenical"?
The Ancient British Church, Laudian Reform and St. Paul's.
The Church of England and Rome; Roman Orders and a Catholic past

"OH Domus Antiqua, a fit object for pity, for charity...Puritaines are blown out of the church with the loud voice of the organs, their zealous spirits cannot indure the musicke, nor the multitude of the surplices; because they are Relickes, (they say,) of Romes Superstitions...Well, there is some hope of Restoring this church to its former glory."


For all except Puritans in the Stuart Court and Church the mediaeval Cathedral became the metropolitan symbol for the reformed faith, forming as it had the battleground of the Reformation related by John Foxe. Many of the old Catholic icons had been sold off - the shrines, pictures and images were destroyed, and the famous Jesus bells were lost on a throw of the dice by Henry VIII to Sir Miles Partridge. In part the physical disrepair of the Cathedral was as a result of the removal of these shrines and chantries, the money from which had traditionally been used by the Dean and Chapter for such work. Images were briefly reintroduced to St. Paul's in a reduced form by Mary, only to be removed, once again, under Elizabeth. Along with royal arms, only the tables of the Decalogue and other texts were to be allowed. During the period of Protestant persecution under Mary the Church had stagnated, with preachers lamenting,

"our pathewayes to ye churches (beyng overgrowen with nettles, and weedes) cause us to mourne, bycause we do not resort unto our churches as oure forefathers have done before

1 See Milman, H.H., Annals (1868), pp.194-229.


3 Reported by Milman, H.H., Annals (1868), p.220; on p.230: "much of the rich architectural shrine-work, much of the splendid decorations of the churches...to the Reformers were...an inseparable part and portion of that vast system of debasing superstition, of religious tyranny...the intolerable yoke of which it was their mission to burst".

4 For the Church under Mary see Haller, W., Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation (1963), pp.19-48, pp.187-8. The persecutions formed the subject of Foxe's work.
us...the temples & churches of Englan...stande so naked, and
so bare".  

Although some churches were repaired, under Elizabeth this stagnation continued, induced in part by bankruptcy and the influence of the Calvinist doctrine of Predestination - the rejection of the notion of election by good works which naturally led to a disregard for architecture. At St. Paul's only the decayed fabric remained, with its stained glass windows which, despite their old Roman allegiance, to a large extent had escaped destruction. In A Discourse between a Protestant, a Glasier, and a Separatist (1641) - centred on the "windowes...within the Church of Paules" - a 'Glasier' defends his ancestors' art against the 'Separatist's' zeal,

"Me thinkes 'tis pitty ancient monuments
Because their popish; that's the harme they doe,
Should from the Churches thus be torne and rent,
Then pull downe Churches they are popish too;
For surely they were built in popish times,
And still are guilty of some popish signes.

The 'Protestant' agrees, "For sure our fathers lived in Popish daies, / (Long before we) that first things did raise".

In an effort to escape this Catholic past, under the Stuarts the Church of England embarked upon an unprecedented church building programme.


7 Elizabeth had succeeded to an exchequer burdened with heavy debt. The frugal Queen gave only 1,000 marks in gold and 1,000 marks in timber from her woods towards the repairs of 1561. See Addleshaw, G., Etchells, F., The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship (1948), p.34: "Austerity characterized the policy of the Elizabethan authorities on the adornment of churches".


9 Reproduced by Simpson, W.S., Gleanings (1889), pp.70-75. See in general ch.iv, "Stained glass windows in the Cathedral".
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James was praised at his funeral for his policy of erecting new colleges, repairing the old and the founding of new churches. During the course of his reign the Church acquired a greater sense of cohesion and at a general level, therefore, this building programme and the repair of St. Paul's was as a consequence and a celebration of this new, confident mood, in line with the more certain Royal succession. However, with this early rejection of Catholic symbolism and vacuum of Protestant representation greeting the 'new' faith under James, there was no obvious model for new churches, let alone a Cathedral, (a problem which, to a lesser extent, also later faced Wren). The answer, of course, was found in the Orders, but these, too, had their Catholic flavour.

The preface concluded that Jones's work on St. Paul's has traditionally been seen primarily as a question of architectural 'style', found in Italy and imported. Yet following the Reformation, for many Stuarts including James, Rome was the seat of the anti-Christ, Babylon, with a tradition of Christian persecution,

"the first three hundred yeeres the true Christians who worshipped one onely God...had been persecuted by Pagan Rome, even so the worshippers of this true adoration have beene cruelly persecuted during the three hundred years of the first period, by Rome disguised with a Christian maske".

According to Stuart apologists, it had been James's "Ilands and Kingdome" which God chose "as a refuge for the true Christians which fled from the saide persecutions". Indeed, to Stuart travellers Rome became in theory a 'forbidden' city, specifically excluded from the Englishmans' licence to travel. Surely an architecture which sought so deliberate an imitation of the Italy of pagan and Catholic worship, as tradition implies, would have been anathema to James? It was, after all, in the Rome of Jones's day that the

10 Williams, J., Great Britaines Solomon (1625), p.52.
11 Kerry Downes points out that this problem faced Wren, in Sir Christopher Wren (1982), p.74, without acknowledging the role played by Jones's Cathedral in 'legitimising' Wren's own Cathedral.
12 Gordon, J., The Union of Great Britaine (1604), pp.41-42.
Orders themselves were being employed so stridently in the cause of the counter-reformation. Both Charles and Laud were to deny the Puritan accusation of Roman favour. For it was the very sense of this 'Romanish' origin which the Cathedral refacing project itself sought to remove;\(^{15}\) in line with the destruction of Catholic icons, one Puritan suggested "that it was more agreeable to the rules of piety to demolish such old monuments of superstition and idolatry than keep them standing",\(^{16}\) another that he "would rather give ten shillings towards the pulling down of that church... than five shillings towards the repairing of it".\(^{17}\)

However, despite this, like the Orders many aspects of both ancient and modern Italy were certainly admired by leading members of the Stuart Court - witnessed, for example, by artefacts imported by Pembroke, Buckingham and Arundel. Paradoxically, a policy of Catholic union was pursued by James whilst sanctioning anti-Catholic propaganda, and the proud refacing of St. Paul's as a rival to St. Peter's was planned during negotiations for a Catholic match. It follows that any 'rediscovery' of antiquity, necessarily centred on Italy, not only hurt national pride in Stuart England but represented a problem of religious representation. These seeming contradictions in religious 'policy' and symbolism, and the history which 'resolved' them, in effecting Jones's Cathedral, will form the subject of this chapter.

\(^{15}\) See for example Bernard, G.W., 'The Church of England c.1529 - c.1642', *History*, 75, (1990), p.195, "the inherited church buildings, despite their whitewashed walls and new emptiness, spoke of the catholic past and offered a constant background threat of architectural seduction".


\(^{17}\) Quoted by Ibid.
Albion as Jerusalem; The imperial Cathedral of King James I

"Though [James]...detested the Presbyterian discipline of Scotland, and had fallen in love with the hierarchical episcopacy of England, and though he enjoyed the conversation of learned men, regardless of their churchmanship, he remained, intellectually, a Calvinist. He believed, and wrote, that the Pope was Antichrist, and he saw himself as a godly Christian Prince in the style of Queen Elizabeth as seen by John Foxe".


The broad body of opinion which constituted the Church of England under the Stuarts, Puritan, Calvinist, Arminian and Laudian, had stemmed from a flimsy unity found in the Elizabethan settlement, the foundation of the British Church inherited by James. This settlement at least, with minor variations, held a consistent Protestant view of British history, part of which was examined in the previous chapter. For like Jones's 'new' Court architecture and the very succession of James himself, a question of legitimacy also surrounded the Court Church - hence, there was by necessity a further aspect to Stuart history, an ancient British Church prefiguring and thereby justifying the Church of England. This 'pure' Church, only compromised on the arrival of the popish monk Augustine, animated everything written in defence of the Church of England in the 16th and 17th Centuries, Matthew Parker's De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae (1572), for example, or John Foxe's Actes and Monuments (1563). George Herbert's The British Church (1633) (part of The Temple), in its allusions to Solomon's temple, proclaimed a vision of a moderate Church free both of the "painted Shrines" of Rome and the 'nakedness' of Calvinism. Herbert's title implies a 'British' root for his Church, independent of Rome.

19 For a further discussion see Williams, G., 'Some Protestant views of Early British Church History', Welsh Reformation Essays (1967), ch.ix, pp.207-219.
22 For an interpretation see Parry, G., Golden Age Restor'd (1981), p.244.
from the beginning. And it is this Church, derived as it was once again from selected readings of Geoffrey and Bede, which suggests a further British imperial 'reading' of Jones's architectural Orders used at St. Paul's.

As children of John Foxe's chosen race, symbolised by the Elizabethan Church, James saw himself and his Church as possessing a Messianic role-compatible with London's status as the new Jerusalem. The Church of England under James was, as Trevor-Roper notes,

"a third force, competing with the international Church of Rome and international Calvinism. It attracted French Huguenots like Casaubon, Dutch Arminians like Grotius, dissident Italian Catholics like Paolo Sarpi and Marcantonio de Dominis, Greek patriarchs like Cyril Lucaris".

British Messianic pretensions gave courage to the original split with Rome, to imperial ambition and to the later ideas of theoretical reunification. From James's 'Calvinist' point of view Church history centred on the monarch himself, proclaimed as the saviour of his people through the tripartite roles of Jewish King, Pagan Emperor and Christian Prince. This outlined a Church subservient to the wishes of the Crown. Although Laud's Church was indeed to become subservient, Churchmen of the Laudian movement on some issues adopted a different 'reading' of such Protestant imperial mythology. Dispite his 'theoretical' Calvinism James in fact stressed certain religious toleration, a position which in some respects prefigured Laud. Laud's position in relation to the refacing will be discussed more fully later in this chapter. This section will concentrate on James's 'official' view of Church history, as outlined in sermons preached to the Court at the commencement of Stuart rule, by Protestant apologists such as John Gordon.


Gordon preached often at Court. James singled him out "with a speciall encomion, that he was a man well travailled in the auncients".27 Convinced of the historical justification for the Elizabethan settlement, Gordon's history became centred on James.28 In January 1604 he was presented at the Hampton Court conference as 'Deane of Sarum' and in the same year preached to James29 ENOTIKON OR A SERMON OF the Union of Great Britannie, in antiquite of language, name, religion and Kingdome. In this, the Act of Union under Stuart rule became a fulfilment of a prophecy "mystically" contained in the name 'Brit-an-iah', a word of Hebrew origin signifying the land of God's Covenant.30 It followed that James was seen to repeat Solomon's restoration and unification of the primitive faith31 - with the temple its physical symbol - after the building of which "was established the kingdome of God in earth, which was joyned with the united estate of the temporall and worldly kingdome".32 Here, in 1604, we have the animating ambition behind the later restoration of St. Paul's - for it was Gordon's British King James "by whom God hath builded his Temple in the Spirituall Jerusalem";33 echoing the concept of 'restoration', Gordon urged that James "should finish the full delivery and restorating of Israel, and of the Churches of your realmes".34 James's later translations of the Psalms of David were intended to assist this claimed descent from the House of David.

For Puritans, and Calvinists in particular, the primitive Church of the Apostles prophesied the British Church formed under the Elizabethan settlement. Primitive Christianity in Britain was even understood to have been established by the Apostles themselves. It was claimed that Joseph of

28 This was also to be found in the work of James Ussher, for example. See Trevor-Roper, H., Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans (1987), pp.135-6.
29 Gordon, J., "Preached...in presence of the Kings Majesty", part of the title of ENOTIKON (1604).
30 Ibid. p.24 and margin p.28. For this see Williamson, A.H., Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI (1979), pp.102-3.
31 Gordon, Ibid. p.33.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid, pp.34-35.
34 Gordon, J., England and Scotlands Happinesse (1604), p.44.
Arimathaea lay buried at Glastonbury, having preached long before the arrival of Augustine, and Arthur's Albion thereafter became the burial land of the Holy Grail,

"For we read in Theodoretus, Metaphrastes, and Nicephorus, that S. Paul, S. Peter, Joseph of Arimathaea, and Simon Zelotes did preach the Evangell of Christ in Britannie, that is, the new covenant between God and man: at which time this said Iland of great Britannie did beare the same name of Gods covenant as it doth now".35

Hence, through St. Paul, Gordon's Britain "before all nations first publikely receaved the Faith of Christ".36 The "three great Windowes newly glazed, in rich colours, with the story of Saint Paul",37 which James inspected after his 1620 'restoration' sermon, perhaps featured this British aspect. Certainly in a general sense the restored St. Paul's can be seen as a specific celebration of British Christianity founded by St. Paul himself. Bishop Corbet, whilst speaking of the restoration plans, exclaimed "one word in St. Paules beehalfe;..hee hath raysed our inward Temples, let us help to requit him in his outward".38 In his PARENTALIA, or memoirs of the family of the Wrens (1750), the first history of St. Paul's Cathedral after Dugdale, Stephen Wren also presented the early Christian Church in Britain as having been founded "very probably by St. Paul".39

According to official Stuart history, once again from Geoffrey, this primitive Christianity was first fully installed under the ancient British King Lucius,40 Lucius taking his place in line with Arthur and Brute in James's official ancestry. James Howell's LONDONOPOLIS (1657), reported that the parish church of St. Peter upon Cornhill carried a tablet recording that King Lucius had "founded the same church" and a faith which "continued the

36 Ibid.
40 See Williams, G., 'Some Protestant views of Early British Church History', Welsh Reformation Essays (1967), ch.ix, pp.214-5.
space of four hundred years, unto the coming of Augustine the Monk.\textsuperscript{41} This tablet also recorded London as the Archbishop's See, before its removal by Augustine to Canterbury. In this sense the restoration of St. Paul's was also a restoration, in spirit, of the metropolitan seat of the ancient British Church itself - echoed by Dugdale when including this legend in his Cathedral history.\textsuperscript{42}

Lucius's ancient Church also justified the position of the British Church in subservience to the wishes of the Crown, a view of the episcopate reinforced by Geoffrey's report of the birth of Constantine in Britain, son of a British Princess.\textsuperscript{43} For it was from a British base that, according to Geoffrey, Constantine had spread his Christian empire, first to Rome and then to the Orient, and thus, Gordon reports "by all these victories this Britaine King became Emperour, King, and Monarche of the whole world".\textsuperscript{44} Hence the ruins of antiquity which Jones viewed on his travels, by association with Constantine's rule, became centred on Britain, the birthplace of a 'christianised' antique empire. Since Constantine represented the archetype of the British Christian Prince,\textsuperscript{45} James became "our newe Constantinus",\textsuperscript{46} reinforcing his role as Protestant head of a reunited Holy Roman Empire in rivalry to the Pope and the Church of Rome.\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, through Constantine links were even traced by Gordon to Augustus, for the "beginning of the foundation of Christs kingdome was in the age of a generall peace established by Augustus".\textsuperscript{48} As "the person of a British Emperour", James was "borne the lawfull and undoubted heire of these three auncient Imperiall Crowns of the west"\textsuperscript{49} a claim which 'justified' and was proclaimed by the reference to

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{41} Howell, J., \textit{LONDONOPOLIS} (1657), p.79.
\bibitem{42} Dugdale, W., \textit{History} (1658), p.3.
\bibitem{43} Geoffrey's \textit{History} (1963 ed.), bk.v, ch.6, pp.94-5.
\bibitem{44} Gordon, J., \textit{ENOTIKON} (1604), p.46.
\bibitem{46} Gordon, J., \textit{ENOTIKON} (1604), p.46.
\bibitem{47} Echoed by Gordon, J., \textit{The Union of Great Britaine} (1604), p.7.
\bibitem{48} Gordon, J., \textit{ENOTIKON} (1604), p.43.
\bibitem{49} Gordon, J., \textit{The Union of Great Britaine} (1604), p.4.
\end{thebibliography}
Constantine's arch at Temple Bar and St. Paul's. In this physical 'restoration' James inherited the virtuous endeavours of Edward and Elizabeth, "the first which have built upon this foundation after Constantine".50 According to James Howell, much of Stuart London lay over an ancient city built by Constantine, "which took up in compasse, above three miles, so that it inclosed the Model of the City almost four-square".51 The general 'conversion' of pagan temples to Christian worship had possibly even occurred on the site of St. Paul's itself, for following common belief Dugdale reports a temple to Diana52 stood on the site in the days of Roman Britain, and the primitive Christians, according to Dugdale, were commanded "to destroy the Idolls, but to reserve the Temples wherein they were, for the service of the true God".53 Wren certainly understood the old Cathedral to have been constructed on the foundations of a church built by these early British Christians, as his grandson records in 1750,

"The Time of the Persecution was short, for under Constantine, the Church flourish'd again; the Churches in Rome, and other Parts of the Empire were soon rebuilt, and most likely ours among the first, after the Pattern of the Roman Basilica of St. Peter, and St. Paul, in the Vatican; and, as the Surveyor conceiv'd, upon the old Foundations left by the Persecutors".54

The memory of this 'christianised' antique temple would seem to lie at the foundations of the Cathedral, spiritually and physically restored to its primitive Christian virtue by the 'new Constantinus'. Hence, in succession to Constantine's supposed foundation of St. Peter's in Rome, James was, in this role, to refound Stuart St. Paul's to rival St. Peter's - a physical sign of the triumph of the Protestant monarchy. It is hardly surprising that the Puritans would come to push the captivity of the British Church back into the 4th Century, thus repudiating the Emperor Constantine and his 'imperial' successors.

50 Ibid, pp.42-43.
51 Howell, J., LONDONOPOLIS (1657), p.4.
52 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.3.
53 Ibid, p.4.
54 Wren, S., PARENTALIA (1750), p.271.
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50 Ibid, pp.42-43.
51 Howell, J., LONDONOPOLIS (1657), p.4.
52 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.3.
53 Ibid, p.4.
54 Wren, S., PARENTALIA (1750), p.271.
In this way Gordon's history contained three distinct periods of true Christianity - under the imperial rule of Solomon, Constantine and James, all naturally finding an origin in Britain. Sacred drama and Geoffrey's narrative became intertwined. Glanmor Williams notes,

"Nor could the Protestants abandon the classical Christian conception of human history as part of a mighty cosmic drama, in which the creation of the world and the incarnation of Christ were the most significant episodes, and final redemption the end to which all history was moving...The Reformation appeared to be vindicated as the highest fulfilment of the ancient prophecies that the glories of the earlier British Kingdom would, in the fullness of time, be restored".55

Stuart Britain formed part of, indeed as the new Jerusalem was seen to conclude, this 'orderly' scheme, a scheme in which Empire and Apocalypse were two aspects of one view.56 In representing this view John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* was reprinted, in light of the Gunpowder Treason, in 1610, and again in 1632. It followed that James's restored temple, in its place at the end of this vast religious process (and in embodying, as will be seen, the wisdom of the Cabala), was meant to usher in and physically express its triumphant conclusion, the restored kingdom of Christ on earth. For ultimately nothing of lesser significance could surely have justified such an ambitious, costly project to a frequently bankrupt Court. Indeed, the physical state of St. Paul's had traditionally represented a sign of God's favour. The Catholic apologist James Pilkington, for example, presented the burning of the steeple in 1561 as the end of a series of historical retributions evoked by the English defection from Catholic ranks.57

Such British associations with Solomon, Augustus and Constantine gave a direct, national sanction to the use of the 'sanctified' antique Orders on St. Paul's. Jones's own understanding of the links between the Orders and Stuart


57 See James Pilkington, *The Burnyng of Paules Church in London in the year of our Lord 1561* (1563).
notions of ancient Britain are recorded for at least one of the Orders, the Tuscan. The Tuscan was the most primitive of the Orders described by Vitruvius. With the idea of the Trojan foundation of Britain in mind, it is perhaps significant that the Tuscan Order was in general traced back, through 'Etruscan', to 'Trojan'. In the frontispiece to Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1613) Brute surmounts a column of the Tuscan Order - with Caesar on the other side. In this way the Tuscan Order spoke in general of the Trojan Golden Age, and Rome's foundation by Aeneas. Further, for Jones this Order spoke of the simple nature of ancient Britain, observing in a comment on the emblematic quality of the Order,

"the Romans for so notable a structure as Stone-Heng, made choice of the Tuscan, rather than any other Order, not only as best agreeing with the rude, plain, simple nature of those they intended to instruct, and use for which erected; but also...they might take occasion thereby, to magnify to those then living the virtue of their Auncestors for so noble an invention, and make themselves the more renowned to posterity, for erecting thereof, so well ordered a building".

Following Stonehenge, the Tuscan was the very Order used by Jones for the side walls to the Cathedral and Covent Garden church.

Royal permission for the scheme at Covent Garden stipulated that £2,000 be spent on a new church. In total this church can be seen as a reconstruction of a Tuscan Temple as described by Vitruvius (bk.iv, ch.vii). Indeed, Jones thought of this church as a 'plain, simple' structure, equivalent to a timber meeting house or the prototype of antique architecture in the primitive hut of Vitruvian narrative; for according to the famous rumour reported by Walpole, the Earl of Bedford commanded that "I would not have it much better than a barn." - 'Well then', replied Jones, You shall

---

58 Jones's notes to the Tuscan in his copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius' show his close study of the Order, bk.iv ch.vii p.192. Jones also studied the Tuscan in his 'Palladio' bk.i ch.xiii pp.17-18, pp.20-1.


60 Jones, I., *STONE-HENG* (1655 ed.), p.68.

61 Royal letter (draft) to the Attorney General, in the Earl of Bedford Papers, Y3, box 4 2/8, at Alnwick Castle.

have the handsomest barn in England". The completed design projected timber eaves and a 'barn-like' roof. Jones's use of the Tuscan is frequently presented as arising from economic constraint, but, as Arthur Channing Downs has observed, Covent Garden was not cheap; he concludes that there is little to support a theory that the Order was chosen primarily for economy (besides, the stone necessary for a Tuscan column would surely be no less - and the carving only marginally more involved - than, say, for a Doric). Other reasons must be sought for Jones's Tuscan. With the 'primitive hut' archetype in mind, Jones's deliberately primitive "barn" - formed from the architectural Order which he tells us was emblematic for the virtuous qualities of ancient Britain - could be seen to have physically expressed its primitive Christianity, all the more appropriate with St. Paul believed to have been one of its founders. St. Paul's, Covent Garden, was the first opportunity for such an expression of British purity, for it was the first church to be built in London under Stuart rule; indeed, with no churches built under Elizabeth, it represented nothing less than the first purpose built Protestant church. Further, it was also a 'model' for other reasons, for as a single room it was the first church to depart from the standard mediaeval church plan (with its screen dividing chancel from nave).

In the absence of any established Protestant mode of building, through this antiquity Jones's 'antique manner' - although taken from Catholic Italy - became transformed into the architecture of the Church of England. Indeed, when advising on a new Cathedral design after the fire Sir Roger Pratt, a late colleague of Jones, clearly saw Jones's work as such an archetype, in a manuscript entitled St. Paul's and the new way of Architecture for Churches (1672).

In this manner, through the ancient British origin of the Orders it


64 Channing Downs, A., 'Inigo Jones's Covent Garden: The First Seventy-Five Years', J.S.A.H., vol.xxvi, March 1967, pp.12-13: "The desire for economy expressed by his "economic challenge" would be understandable, if he actually did make it. The fact remains he approved the plans for a church which was almost as large as the church serving the entire parish of which Covent Garden was then a part, and which was to cost £4,886 5s. 8d.".


was hoped that Protestant churches would express their own origins free of Roman impurity whilst equal to Roman splendour; and hail the second coming, as Vitruvius's Orders had the birth of Christ in the days of Augustus. As a Stuart 'self-portrait', Rubens's ceiling to Jones's Banqueting House brought to visibility this aspect of Jones's new surface of St. Paul's - offered a 'key', in other words, to its meaning. For, as Strong notes, in the presence of Lucius and Constantine, "James pointing towards the infant is also here in his role as the nursing father of the newly reunited British Church".68

Gordon's sermons generally concluded by warning against those in the Court counselling marriage with the Catholic Church - the "great whore of Babilon".69 Following the Puritans of his day, Gordon's concept of the ancient British Church was of an austere, simple foundation, having "no Altars, no Images, nor any materiall crosse of golde, silver, wood or stone".70 Like the Court architecture, Gordon referred the rituals and signs of his Puritan worship back to the antique Church for validity; in this even the Greek Church provided a model.71 Dugdale also imagined an ancient Christian Church placed in parallel to the restored Cathedral. This, however, was a more opulent Church than that of Gordon, built as it was "by those our pious Ancestours, who stuck not at that charge for the adoration of his House".72 Dugdale cites this past Church in justification for the 'Laudian' opulence of St. Paul's, by then under Puritan attack, and the preservation of which formed the wider purpose of his History,

"Nay so much did the Primitive Christians strive to excell in such fabricks; that, in testimony of their cheerfull affections, thinking nothing too much nor too good for God's service".73

Dugdale's view of history glosses over the Cathedral's Catholic past, old St. Paul's representing instead a symbol of general Christian virtue. In this

72 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.18.
73 Ibid, p.3.
admiration for Laud's Cathedral Dugdale reflected the wider beliefs of the Laudian movement to which the archbishop gave his name, and, although by no means new, assumed control of the Church after 1630 when work on St. Paul's began. It is 'Laudianism', its view of history and the effect of this differing concept of the Church on Jones's Cathedral, which is examined next.

High Church reform; the Ecumenical Cathedral of Archbishop Laud

"And therefore I would heartily pray you to open your hand freely to this magnificent work, the re-edifying of St. Paul's Church, which God and the King have set me upon"

[Laud to Sir Arthur Ingram, June 19, 1638]

As 'Surveyor of the King's Works', Inigo Jones and his architecture were naturally bound up with the forces of 17th Century Protestant politics, ranging from pro-Catholic to Puritan. These contradictory desires can be seen contributing to, and even resolved in, both designs for St. Paul's. The first part of this chapter presented the Cathedral refacing project as a triumph of James's imperialism and as such part of Calvinist doctrine. But the Church of Archbishop Laud, in alliance with its most powerful patron, Charles I, was to have a different basis, differences which suggest an alternative 'reading' for the built scheme under Laud. For as chapter one noted little actual building work had been undertaken on the Cathedral under James, and it was not until Laud became Bishop of London in 1628 that sufficient enthusiasm was aroused to enable the work to proceed.

A number of commentators have presented Jones's work on the Cathedral in 'Laudian' terms, but without much detailed explanation. In 1973 Roy Strong cited the Cathedral as a "symbol...of High Church Laudian reform", Joseph Rykwert in 1980 commented that "the rusticoed and porticoed cathedral was the perfect Laudian microcosm", and Graham Parry in 1981 commented "for Laud, the work was...a pledge of the material renewal and beautification of the Church throughout England, done in conjunction with the King's will". In 1940 Hugh Trevor-Roper even entitled the west front 'according to Laud's design', with Jones merely "given charge of the repairs". Certainly Laud regarded the restoration as one of his life's projects, testified by the amount of his own money spent on

---

the design - some £1,200 by the end. Dugdale records Laud's personal involvement in the work after his removal to Canterbury, when "in all things shewed himself a pious and powerfull furtherer thereof". But what did the movement Laud championed represent, how did this differ from the Church under James and to what extent was this movement mirrored by Jones’s design?

As an aspect of their rejection of the doctrine of Predestination, the 'Arminian' movement under Laud came naturally to value good works as a means to salvation, one such being the physical repair of churches. The Laudian bishop Gyles Fleming was to advocate the Cathedral repair as an aspect of justification by works. St. Paul's became the centre of a national movement for such repair, with Laud demanding the repair of village churches everywhere in imitation of the Cathedral. George Henderson has pointed out the link between the restoration of St. Paul's and that of St. Andrews, "an idealistic venture as much disliked locally in Scotland as the restoration of Old St. Paul's was by the Puritans in London". Dugdale connected Laud's "promoting of this famous and necessary work" on St. Paul's to "that noble enlargement" of St. John's, Oxford. Jones's work had felt the influence of Laud's movement from the beginning; Lancelot Andrewes, the 'intellectual leader' of the Arminians, was on the 1620 restoration committee, along with the then Dean, High Churchman Valentine Cary. George Mountaigne, Bishop of London before Laud,

81 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.139.
86 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.137.
88 Reported by Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.135.
actively encouraged the erection and adoration of images in churches and from when he became Bishop in 1621 zealously promoted the Cathedral's restoration, preaching on the subject at St. Paul's Cross and giving a large sum of money towards the purchase of Portland stone. In contrast, certain Puritans parishes responded by contributing little towards the repair; in the Colchester district it was complained that, owing to the influence of Puritan preachers, contributions were small; one great parish gave only 6d., and some nothing at all. Under Laud, Jones's St. Paul's was to become the central symbol of the triumph of Arminianism over the Puritan faction and thereby increasingly of royal absolutism; ultimately the Puritans were to deface the Cathedral as a primary symbol of all they detested. However, initially the need to repair St. Paul's did serve to unite some elements, for Bishop Williams, Laud's 'great enemy' in the Church, approved of the work, and there were some notable Puritan contributions.

Dugdale reports that it was Laud who gained consent from Charles for the second commission of 1631, two years after which building work was at last to begin. Dugdale records what later became an important 'masonic' ceremony took place at St. Paul’s - the laying of four foundation stones, led by Laud,

"the said Bishop...layd the first stone at the East end thereof: The second stone being then layd by Sir Francis Windibank Knight, one of his Majesties principall Secretaries of State; the third by Sir Henry Martin, then judge of the Perogative Court; and the fourth by the before specified Inigo Jones, Surveyor generall of this work".

---

93 Sir James Cambell (1570-1642), for example, contributed £1,000. Puritans also contributed through the City Companies or, after 1631, sat on the restoration committee. See Pearl, V., *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution* (1961), p.79, p.91, p.94, p.295.
One stone may have been laid at each of the Cathedral's corners (explaining the participation of four people), thus demarcating the complete 'refounding' to be achieved by the future work. The prayer which, by report, was repeated on such occasions stressed the blessing of a corner stone, cut with a cross, directly after which "the workemen begin the building".\(^{95}\) Chapter one noted that since the Cathedral restoration was in the sphere of royal piety it was executed through the Office of Works. However, restoration fell jointly within the 'royal' and 'civic' area of Jones's work, quite unlike that due to direct royal sponsorship alone, such as the Queen's House or at St. James's for example. Hence, performed by officials from Court and Church, the foundation ceremony celebrated the joint involvement of both. These ceremonies were expressly linked back by Laud to the re-edification of pagan temples under Constantine and to Solomon's foundation of his temple (I Kings ch.viii)\(^{96}\) (Laud even justified consecration in reference to its "ancient use in the Greek Church");\(^{97}\) hence, here would seem a direct celebration not only of the physical restoration of the British Church, but more specifically the Cathedral's refoundation or inauguration at the centre of Laudian reform. After the Civil War Dugdale was to lament that "the very Foundation" of the Cathedral was "utterly shaken in pieces".\(^{98}\)

Elias Ashmole, astrologer and alchemist, records in his diary for 16 September, 1633, "Dr: Laud Archbishop of Cant: layd the first Stone of St: Paules Church London".\(^{99}\) It has been suggested that this was in reference to Jones's church in Covent Garden,\(^{100}\) but this cannot be so, for work on this church was begun in 1631, as Howes edition of Stow's Annales for that year records,\(^{101}\) and was almost finished by the end of 1633.\(^{102}\) Ashmole, who

\(^{95}\) Prynne, W., History of the Tryall and Condemnation of William Laud (1646), p.126.

\(^{96}\) Ibid, p.126, pp.497-499.

\(^{97}\) Reported in Ibid, (margin notes 'Sir The. Ridlye's View of the Civill and Ecclesiasticall Law').

\(^{98}\) Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.172.


\(^{100}\) Ibid, n.7.

\(^{101}\) Stow, J., Annales ((Howes ed., 1631), p.1049: "In the fore-named Covent Garden there is a particular parcell of ground layd out, in which they intend to build a Church, or a Chappell of ease". 
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later became a Freemason, had a lifelong involvement in the casting of horoscopes to determine building foundation, and although only sixteen in 1633, must nevertheless have witnessed or heard of this ceremony at St. Paul's. Later he would supply a plate to aid Dugdale's attempt to preserve the Cathedral and live to see the laying of the foundation stone of the new Cathedral (or 'Church' as he again refers to it) by Wren, at the curious time of 6.30 AM.

Chapter three pointed out the importance of coloured glass as an architectural element capable of conveying the richness of Laud's ceremonial. The windows in Herbert's The Temple (1633) showed "Doctrine and life, colours and light, in one / When they combine and mingle, bring / A strong regard and awe". A letter from one Thomas Langton to the Warden of Wadham College dated July, 1621 reports his intention of installing new stained glass for St. Paul's. Langton, evidently a 'Merchant Adventurer' who imported coloured glass, had been in treaty with the glass painter Bernard van Linge, for "I have set your Colledge before St. Paule's Church for if you doe not entertayne him presently then will I set him In worke in Paules". The van Linge brothers, members of a family of glass-painters from Emden, were to become important artists in Laud's movement towards visible signs, both Bernard and Abraham being encouraged by Laud to settle in England.

Internally, as chapter one noted, Jones would seem to have limited himself to repair, including the repainting of the old glass. However,
Dugdale gives a passing reference to the embellishment of the Choir screen and to new hangings,

"Sir Paul Pinder...at his own charge, first repaired the decays of that goodly partition, made at the West end of the Quire; adorning the front thereof, outwards, with fair Pillars of black Marble, and Statues of those Saxon Kings, which had been Founders, or Benefactors to the Church; beautified the inner part thereof, with figures of Angells; and all the wainscote work of the Quire, with excellent carving; viz. of Cherubins and other Imagery, richly gilded; adding costly suits of Hangings for the upper end thereof".109

Hence, like the Cathedral itself, this screen provided an existing framework upon which to proclaim the Stuart view of British history, represented through new columns and statues. More specifically, in stressing a general Christian inheritance and common origin with the Church of Rome - symbolised by the statues of Saxon Kings (the internal counterpart to those intended for the portico) - these additions brought to visibility the basis of Laudian reform, and its consequent acceptance of the Cathedral's Catholic foundation (which will be discussed later). Following the mediaeval roods, the Laudian period was, in particular, one of screen building (Jones's new screen for Winchester is one example). They were thought important in sanctifying the chancel and formed a gateway to what became, effectively, a 'church within a church', with the nave becoming an enormous narthex often utilised as a special place for sermons;110 steps up to the chancel at St. Paul's (on Wren's 'Pre-Fire' section) further distinguished the chancel from the nave. The 1633 edition of Stow's Survey, in reporting that the choir was "painted with rich colours in Oyle",111 reveals that much of this internal work was finished before the start of the external refacing (begun in 1633).

which carpenters were paid). In February 1636 the great window at the East end was repaired.

109 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.140.
111 Stow, J., Survey (1633 ed.), p.767. This work evidently continued, for Guildhall MS. 25, 471 W.A.5 notes payment of painters in oil in October 1635.
In Laudian services the altar was to replace the Calvinist pulpit as the focal point of worship. The actual location of the altar in the 17th Century was the subject of much controversy. Hollar's plan records the Cathedral altar against the east wall of the chancel, altar-wise and raised up four steps. Whilst against the east wall was the favoured position of the Laudian party, the Cathedral altar was not always in this location. In 1550 it had been pulled down and a table set up in its place, later removed to the midst of the upper choir with its ends running east-west - the position favoured by Puritans. In arguing for the sanctity of the altar and its position in the east, Laud once again appealed to ancient history and tradition - practices maintained, significantly for Laud, by the members of the Garter Order who still bowed towards the altar at services. Church music was also encouraged by Laud, as Lupton's "loud voice of the organs" and "musicke" (quoted above) indicates; a poem written after the Civil War reports "The carved wood and stone all down did goe, / The crosses, painted glass, and organs too".

Jones used an IHS monogram at the apex of his first Cathedral design, (Fig.55). St. Bernardine of Siena had a great love of this monogram and urged his people to inscribe it on churches and public buildings in place of arms and other military emblems. If 1620 is the correct date for Jones's unbuilt facade design (thereby forming part of his work for the first Cathedral commission), this is probably the first instance of the proposed use of the monogram on the face of a church in this country (the monogram had appeared on the Elizabethan Catholic, Thomas Tresham's Triangular Lodge at Rushton, built in 1593). An early use, emphasised by George Henderson's date of 1628 as "early" for the widespread appearance of the symbol in London. Henderson has identified the use of this sign on St. Paul's as bringing us "close" to Laud, pointing out that Laud owned bible illustrations with the IHS sunburst, ultimately grounds for Puritan attack. The


114 Addleshaw, Ibid, p.140.

115 Boghurst, W., (1666), quoted by Lethaby in The Builder, Dec.26 1930


Arminian settlement of Little Gidding prominently displayed an IHS in their parlour and their correspondence was headed by the monogram; Charles visited Little Gidding, saw their illustrated books and received three, which he deposited in the Royal Library. These have been linked to a style termed 'High Anglican Baroque', at Peterhouse, Cambridge, but which might equally describe Jones's first Cathedral facade - seen as an early experiment in this 'style', flamboyant when compared to the contemporary Banqueting House, the Queen's House or even the later Cathedral design. Together with the IHS, the two statues (possibly of St. Peter and St. Paul) and cherubim on this elevation were also early signs of Laudian reform, frequently used, as Harris and Higgott have noted, by the Jesuits.

Laud's St. Paul's was based on such 'models' of High Church reform as Peterhouse Chapel and Durham Cathedral, in which, according to Trevor-Roper, "they sought...to outbid the papists in the external apparatus of worship". William Prynne found the IHS "but an undoubted Badge, and Character of a Popish, and Jesuiticall Booke; of an Idolatrous, and Romish Devotion". What was Laud's intention behind the open celebration of such 'popish' signs? Archbishop Laud desired to rival the splendour of Rome and in doing so restore dignity and beauty to the Church of England. Whilst his aims of 'beauty of holiness' found favour at Charles's Court, they were validated through a 'reading' of the history of British Christianity paradoxically at variance with that adopted by James and officially inherited by Charles as an imperial monarch. This view of history was more conciliatory, stressing as it did the common Christian inheritance

119 Ibid.
124 Prynne, W., A Briefe Survey and Censure of Mr Cozens His Couzening Devotions (1628), p.4.
125 For this concept in relation to Cathedral restoration see Fleming, G., Magnificence Exemplified: And The Repaire of Saint Paul's exhorted unto (1634), pp.42-44.
with the Church of Rome - past the mediaeval Crusades to Primitive Christianity itself, still visible for Laud in the Greek Church; a general past Christian virtue on which, by implication, both ceremony and Jones's architecture for Laud were based. Indeed, the ancient dignity of the Cathedral itself spoke of this common past for Laud. This equality was obviously at variance with the Calvinist view which stressed the past opposition to the Church of Rome and a future of imperial domination. As such the Church of England under Laud became for some, including Richard Montagu, the focus for a united Church (an ambition shared by the 'papist' Windebank, for example, who it has been seen laid one of the Cathedral foundation stones). Central to Montagu's vision was an appeal to a British antiquity, describing Charles in 1636 as 'renewing', 'restoring' and 'repairing' ancient rites.

On the conflict between these two movements - the old school of Archbishop Ussher patronised by James, versus the emerging 'Arminian', High Church of Archbishop Laud under the rule of Charles - Trevor-Roper comments,

"Each was defending a distinct concept of the Church. Ussher, the heir of Jewel and Foxe, traced the true Church through the medieval heretics, the Albigensians and the Waldensians. To him the Papacy was Antichrist, absolute evil, and the modern 'Arminians' were papists in disguise. Laud was the heir of Hooker and Andrewes, though he went beyond them in his high view of episcopacy by divine right. He saw the Christian Church as a continuous institution, vindicated by tradition and reason, of which the Roman Church, though at present


129 See Tyacke, Ibid, p.239.
corrupted, was a true part. He had no use for Waldensians or Albigensians, and not much for Jewel and Foxe".\(^{130}\)

Hence though anti-papist, Laudians did not believe the Pope to be Antichrist, and though royalist, they did not believe in the priestly authority of the Christian Prince.\(^{131}\) Anti-Popery, which worked as a cohesive force while James ruled, divided the Church under his son. Given Jones's St. Paul's physically signified what the British Church represented to James and later Charles and Laud (as the main protagonists in its restoration), at various stages Jones had to resolve and represent both conflicting views. In presenting the restoration as an 'imposition' of "Catholic culture" by Charles and Laud, Trevor-Roper further notes,

"The motives which inspired them were not identical, - for Laud looked upon the arts in a more utilitarian spirit, as the external forms by which men were drawn to the support of a given system, - but they operated in the same direction".\(^{132}\)

As the main symbol of the 'political' alliance between Laud's Church and the Stuart Court, aspects of both can be 'unraveled' at St. Paul's - a 'tension' embodied in Jones's Cathedral itself. For the Calvinist notion of the Christian Prince can be seen reflected in the imperially statued and inscribed portico paid for by the crown, whilst the Arminian tendency towards an ecumenical recognition of Rome might be detected in the 'IHS' sunburst in the apex of Jones's first design, representing as it did a popular Jesuit sign.

This chapter began by suggesting a contradiction: an imperial, Protestant St. Paul's resurfaced with Orders borrowed from a Pagan, and later Catholic, Rome. Contemporaries were well aware of the Catholic origin of Court art and artists and many regarded both critically. They added to resentment felt by keen Protestants against their ruler who seemed so willing to tolerate Catholicism in the Court and city and to seek favours of the Vatican itself for such vanities as pictures and busts.\(^{133}\) Prynne protested that works of art

---


were being used as a 'bribe' to bring Charles closer to the faith of Rome. The consignment of paintings presented by Rome in 1635, the efforts of Cardinal Barberini to gain Guido Reni's services for Henrietta Maria at about the same time, the granting of permission to Bernini to accept the commission to carve a bust of Charles, were all part of a papal plan to bring Charles into sympathy with the Roman faith. As such they became tokens of ecumenism, of which Jones's Orders can be seen to have formed a part. A further justification for this union was found in the search for the secrets of nature.
The Ancient British Church and Magic; a Cathedral in Paradise

"Deane Gordon, preaching before the kinge, is come so farre about in matter of ceremonies, that out of Ezechiel and other places of the prophets, and by certain hebrue characters, and other cabalisticall collections, he hath founde out and approved the use of the crosse cap surplis et ct".

[Pulpit-Occurrents, 28 April, 1605, (D.N.B. entry for Gordon)]

In line with Renaissance neoplatonism, John Gordon's *The Peace of the Communion of the Church of England* (1612) fused Christian teaching with the Egypt of Hermes. As a further aspect of this, Gordon equated the language of God with Hebrew, spoken before the building of Babel and the confusion of tongues. As 'children' of Solomon and land of the Covenant the early British Christians of Gordon's imagination spoke this language, for "wee must seeke the Etymologie of Britannia, out of the Hebrew language", and "we must search the derivation of Anglia, out of the originall language". In searching for this primitive language, John Webb noted "great Mysteries are involved, as nothing hitherto in all the Learning of the World can either excel or equal" (Jones's assistant also looked to the Hebrew "for the mysterious significations of the proper names of men, in which Prophetical predictions were contained").

Hence, in line with its status as the new Jerusalem, the Elizabethan and Stuart 'Garden of England' became the location of paradise before the Fall. Mediaeval manuscripts had frequently depicted Arthur and St. George, together with David, Caesar and Charlemagne, set in Arcadia. As

134 Gordon, J., *EIPHNOKOINQNIA THE PEACE OF THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND* (1612), 'The First Thesis': "in a Colome or Pillar...was written these words, 'I am Isis, the Queen of Egypt, taugh by Mercurius'...Wee observe by the way, that the name of Isis, in Hebrew is Iesch, Iesch, est, est, which signifies, always existant, not subject to the course of time; which is the essential name of GOD".


136 Ibid, p.25.

137 Webb, J., *AN HISTORICAL ESSAY...the Primitive LANGUAGE* (1669), in Dedication to Charles II.

138 Ibid, p.204.

inheritors of this pantheon and original language, the ancient Britons of the primitive Church were understood to have been initiated in the secrets and truth of nature - secrets held by neoplatonic philosophy to be represented through the christianised, Renaissance version of the Hebrew 'Cabala' and its 'hieroglyphs'. Chapter three pointed out that in recording the "wonders of nature", Egyptian hieroglyphs also became centred on Britain. These secrets were thus brought within the framework of the primitive British Church and its 'House of Chivalry', the heroes of which were Geoffrey's past race of magic Kings and the benevolent magus, Merlin. Such 'white' magic was practised whilst Jonson's antique "truth of architecture" reigned.

With the 'neoplatonic Renaissance' thus nationally centred, for Gordon such divinely inspired knowledge became the inheritance of the British Church in its supreme, independent position. For was it not Moses himself who had forbidden the images now so popular in Rome.\textsuperscript{140} In such imperial propaganda London, as the Protestant 'new Jerusalem', would lie at the centre of any reunited world. But for others 'Cabalism' was the language of ecumenism, holding the power to heal the rift and even evoke the second coming itself. Such irenic 'hermeticism' (albeit in differing forms) had prompted the 'Protestant' John Dee\textsuperscript{141} and the 'heretical Catholic' Giordano Bruno\textsuperscript{142} to travel on missions of union between 1584-1586, and later motivated Lord Herbert of Cherbury to publish \textit{De Veritate} (Paris, 1624, London, 1645).\textsuperscript{143} The influence of Herbert on Laud has been studied;\textsuperscript{144} through their stressing of a common past the 'Laudians' might naturally have been more sympathetic to such ecumenical hermeticism. In short Cabalism, as a record of a past British wisdom, could justify either religious independence or union and the ceremonial which expressed these desires (ceremonies "approved", in Gordon's case, by reference to this magic world). This hermetic, or Christian Cabalist, aspect to the Stuart presentation


\textsuperscript{141} See Clulee, N., \textit{John Dee's Natural Philosophy} (1988), on the unity of religions and Dee's European travels see pp.221-2, on Dee's vision of a British Empire and British 'Cabala' see pp.182-3 p.190.


\textsuperscript{144} See Walker, D.P., \textit{The Ancient Theology} (1972), ch.v.
of the ancient British Church and its influence on Jones's design for St. Paul's will be examined in the second part of this thesis.
Imperial Seat or Ecumenical Temple?

"he hath contributed more...to build the Temple of God...then all the Kings together have done...and by the same Divinity of Our King, which is his cheefest practise, his owne advise, in assaying to restore the little wandering flocke to the folde of the Church, by a National counsel, or one Oecumenical or Universall, it cannot but bee hoped...In breefe, It is the Land of Promise, which God reserved to himselfe in Christendome, where he hath so long time kept the Booke open, and the Revelation of his Prophetick and Evangelicall Mysteries. God himselfe Husbanded the Garden of that Country".


The first part of this chapter suggested the Orders were understood by James as emblems not of Rome, but of the ancient, primitive Church of Great Britain which was its rival; that it was the spiritual restoration of this lost purity which was signified in the Court's physical 'restoration' of St. Paul's. The second part has suggested that for Laud, Jones's architecture was to become an aspect of the restored dignity of the British Church based on the common past with Rome, a past of equality. One view was to tend towards imperial separation, with the King at the head and the Pope cast as Antichrist, the other theoretical union, with Rome in an equal position as a 'true Church'.145 As far as Jones's work on the Cathedral under Charles came to express both domestic absolutism and international Catholic toleration it would inevitably come to form the symbolic focus for Puritan attack.

Hence the Orders, in their past and present use by both London and Rome, became the 'language' of both imperial isolation and ecumenical ambition. On certain occasions the pageantry of chivalry was used in this way to bridge religious gaps - in 1585 English Knights of the Garter combined in the streets of Paris with the Knights of the Order of the Holy Spirit on the occasion of the investiture of Henri III with the Order of the Garter. It has been pointed out that Elizabethan chivalry was not only a vehicle for patriotic devotion to the monarch and the Protestant cause, but also to the continuity of

its ceremonial and mystique with pre-Reformation times.146 This would seem very similar to the ambiguities identified in the iconography to Jones's Cathedral; the same contradictions will become apparent in a geometric scheme for the Cathedral formed by the Orders, examined shortly.

This sense of Jones's Cathedral bridging religious divides might also account for the support, during the 1630's, of Puritans for the restoration, beyond approval for mere repair. Kevin Sharpe has pointed out that there is no actual record of any horrified reactions to the restoration during Charles's reign - despite the common argument that Jones's architecture was seen as foreign, popish and alien.147 Jones was, after all, castigated not for architectural style but for the clearance of ordinary houses around St. Paul's, and, despite the war-time hostility towards the Cathedral, Edmund Carter (Jones's deputy during the restoration) effectively became the director of the parliamentary 'Office of Works'.148 Hence, following such 'theological' projects as the production of the Authorized Version of the Bible,149 Jones's architecture might be seen at least initially to have bridged national, as well as international, religious gaps.

At the same time as designing the Protestant Cathedral Jones was required to work on a series of Catholic chapels to greet the visit of the Spanish Infanta and for the later Queen, Henrietta Maria. Curiously enough, by report, we find this 'tension' in Jones himself. For in 1636 the papal agent, Gregorio Panzani, reported him a "fierce Puritan",150 whilst tradition also records Jones a Roman Catholic.151 Commentators have chosen to believe

149 See Bernard, G.W., 'The Church of England c.1529-c.1642', Ibid, p.189, "the translators left the Authorized Version open to a range of meanings...capable of embracing differing, even apparently incompatible, interpretations - partly one assumes because there were many puritan and catholic critics only too ready to accuse it of partiality. A translation which could admit ambiguity was nearly always to be preferred to a narrowly interpretative one".
151 Horace Walpole and most of the later biographers of Jones have stated that he was a Roman Catholic. Walpole's authority was probably a note in one of George Vertue's note-books: "Dr Harwood from Sr. Christ. Wren, says that Inigo Dy'd at Somersett House in the Strand, a
either, but the above suggests a sense in which both might be true. This would explain the comment by the Superior of the Queen's Capuchins, the Catholic Jean-Marie de Trelon, that Jones appeared "one of those...people without religion".  

Jones's own views on a chivalrous Albion and a past pure faith, so important in justifying the concept of a 'restored' St. Paul's, are contained in The MOST NOTABLE ANTIQUITY OF GREAT BRITAIN - as Jones entitles his 'Tuscan' temple, Stonehenge.

---

Roman Catholick, that he was put apprentice to a joiner in Pauls church yard". See Walpole Soc. vol.xviii; Vertue, vol.i, (1930), p.105. [See also Notes and Queries, (1940), vol.clxxviii, p.292].

CHAPTER FIVE

"a shew...of that first face of *Antiquity*

Jones's emblem for Britain's Vitruvian past.
Inigo Jones, the 'Vitruvius Britannicus'

"a strange memorial to two heroic pasts: that of England's greatest architect, with his vision of a nation civilized and harmonized through classical order and proportion; and that of England's greatest monument, rescued from barbarous oblivion by the power of reason and insight".

The preface discussed the traditional approach towards Jones's study of Stonehenge - an approach echoing in Yates's comment in 1969 that "Inigo Jones's Stonehenge theory is valueless as history", that he was "quite wrong in thinking it a Roman monument, and mistaken in the observations on which he based his views". However, more recently his study has been 'rehabilitated'. Following the observation quoted in the epigraph, in 1971 Stephen Orgel presented *STONE-HENG Restored* as Jones's "most imaginative work of architecture". For the first time Jones's Stonehenge and architecture became fused within a common British antiquity. In 1978 Tait observed that Jones and Webb elevated "to classical status what seemed to their contemporaries little more than a pile of stones and at the same time assess[ed] their Roman discovery in an extra-ordinary classical vocabulary"; in 1985 the link between "una tradizione romana 'nazionale'", chivalry and Stonehenge was noted by Annarosa Cerutti Fusco,

"As the revival of the chivalrous tradition...drew upon the glorious history of England, analogously the 'restoration of the antique had to assume the significance of a recovery of a 'Britanic' past...it was necessary to demonstrate the existence of clear, tangible evidence of an antiquity (which Jones wanted to find in the ruins of Stonehenge) at the same time both Roman and naturalised in England. In this sense the two revivals were...mutually complementary; the one founded on a Christian basis, the other Pagan, both grafted onto the same 'Anglo Saxon' root and constituted models of golden ages in which the

---


ambitious political and 'religious' aspirations of the Stuart monarchy were reflected".4

In 1981 Graham Parry observed in passing,

"Behind the speculations about Stonehenge lies a clear vision of an orderly classical civilisation flourishing in Britain...It was this world that Inigo Jones would evoke when designing scenery for masques set in ancient Britain,...and that he was helping to re-establish by means of his own architectural practice, for his classical buildings were reviving a rightful heritage which had been forgotten beneath the long centuries of gothic domination".5

Indeed, it is the specific purpose of this thesis to examine in detail the implications of just such a link between Jones's Stonehenge and his other "classical buildings".

On Stonehenge Walpole observed, quite correctly, that "it is remarkable that whoever has treated of that monument, has bestowed it on whatever class of antiquity he was peculiarly fond of".6 It was, of course, quite usual to find in enigmatic archaeology the values of, and justifications for, the present. Geoffrey had presented Stonehenge as a monument to Merlin’s magic and a Celtic nobility. Aubrey reports that in 1634 Dr Meric Casaubon,

"Sayeth, that antiquaries are so taken with the sight of old things; not as doting upon the bare form or matter...but because those visible superviving evidences of antiquities represent unto their minds former times, with as strong an impression, as if they were actually present, and in sight as it were: even as old men look gladly upon those things, that they were wont to see,

---

4 Cerutti Fusco, A., Inigo Jones Vitruvius Britannicus (1985), p.227: "Come il revival della tradizione cavalleresca auspicato dal principe ereditario Enrico Stuart, propagato dalla Nonsuch Court e raccolto da Jonson e Jones, attingeva alla storia gloriosa dell’Inghilterra, analogamente la 'restaurazione dell'antico' doveva assumere il significato di recupero di un passato 'britannico'. A tal fine era necessario dimostrare l’esistenza di segni manifesti, tangibili, di una antichità, che Jones volle interpretare nelle rovine di StoneHenge, al tempo stesso romana e 'naturalizzata' in Inghilterra. In questo senso i due revivals non erano in contraddizione, anzi si completavano reciprocamente: l’uno fondato su una matrice cristiana, l’altro su una pagana, estrambi si innestavano nella comune radice 'anglosassone' e contribuivano modelli di periodi aurei nei quali si riflettevano le ambiziose aspirazioni politiche e 'religiose' della corona Stuart".


or have been...in their younger years, as enjoying those years again". 7

During his discourse Jones himself reviews many of these previous 'explanations' of Stonehenge's origins. Hence *STONE-HENG Restored* reveals something of Jones's own views of British history.

---

"by report of the British story"; British history according to Inigo Jones

"we Romans and these Britons be of one ancestry, for we also do come of Trojan stock...But, and if I mistake not, they be sore degenerate from us".

[Julius Caesar, Geoffrey's History (1963 ed.), Book iv, ch.1, p.66].

Previously Jones was quoted asserting "the Romans for so notable a structure as Stone-Heng, made choice of the Tuscan". Further, it was noted that, with an etymological leap through 'Etruscan', the Tuscan Order could be traced back to the 'Trojan'. In this way Stonehenge became implicated in the general Stuart projection of a Roman and Trojan antiquity. In line with this national Roman tradition, Jones's Stonehenge came to embody such virtue by a reasoned process; he first disposes of the non-classical theories about the origins of Stonehenge.

Jones begins by rejecting the popular theory of the pre-Roman Druids as having built Stonehenge, arguing,

"Stone-Heng could not be builded by them, in regard, I find no mention, they were at any Time either studious in Architecture...Academies of Design were unknown unto them: publique Lectures in the Mathematiques not read amongst them: nothing of their Painting, not one Word of their Sculpture is to be found, or scarce of any Science (Philosophy and Astronomy excepted) proper to informe the judgement of an Architect". 8

Uninitiated as they were in the Vitruvian subjects, Jones's Druids could not possibly have built Stonehenge. However, here Jones's attitude is ambiguous, for the Druids were also held in "great esteeme"9 in ancient times as "the Bishops and Clergy of that Age".10 Thus it was that these native Britons, understood to have been a fierce race at first resistant to Roman force,
became a people of rich potential for the overlay of Roman virtue\textsuperscript{11} (no doubt as Jones viewed Stuart Britain itself). As simple natives, the Druids,

"esteeming it, questionlesse, the highest secret of their mystery, rather to command in caves and cottages, then live like Kings, in Palaces, and stately houses. They were too wise, knew too well, 'twas their humility, integrity, retired manner of life, and pretended sanctity possesst the people with an awfully reverend esteem of them".\textsuperscript{12}

The sequence of events in Jones's British history was subject to the general development of man outlined by Vitruvius, a promotion from primitive, noble savages, to citizens capable of ordered reason, a development replicated in an architectural progression from timber buildings to those of stone. Hence Jones's early Britons lived in the primitive huts of Vitruvian narrative, for

"their idolatrous places being naturally adorned, only with wild, and over-grown shades, designed and brought to perfection by Dame Nature her self, she being Architect generall to all their Deities".\textsuperscript{13}

This was Jones's "first Age of the world";\textsuperscript{14} it was a later, civilised "middle Age"\textsuperscript{15} of Roman occupation which built in stone the antique Britain of which the only remains were Stonehenge. Not surprisingly, the Romans made the Britons "skilfull in erecting sumptuous Palaces, stately Portico's, and publick places",\textsuperscript{16} for "our Britans, in ancient time possessed, together with the Roman civility, all good Arts".\textsuperscript{17} In this way, as Stephen Orgel has

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item A number of books in Jones's library attest to his interest in the spread of the Roman Empire: Caesar's \textit{I commentari di C. Giulio Cesare, con le figure in rame...Fatte da Andrea Palladio}, Venice, (1598), Polybius's \textit{Les cinq premiers livres des Histoires de Polybe Megalopolitein}, trans. by Louis Maigret, Lyons, (1558).
\item Jones, I., \textit{STONE-HENG} (1655 ed.), p.4.
\item Ibid, p.10.
\item Ibid, p.11.
\item Ibid, p.15.
\item Ibid, p.14.
\item Ibid, p.40.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
pointed out, "England becomes heroic through the imposition of Roman order on British nature".  

To Elizabethan poets the idea of a Roman Britain had held obvious romantic appeal, conferring as it did a second overlay of antique culture on Britain's past. In Edmund Spencer's *Ruins of Time* a mournful woman represents the Genius of a lost Roman London, a world built in the image of Rome herself,

"I was that citie, which the garland wore  
Of Britaines pride, delivered unto me  
By Romane Victors, which it wonne of yore;  
Though nought at all but ruines now I bee...  
To tell the beawtie of my buildings fayre,  
Adorned with purest golde, and precious stone;  
To tell my riches, and endowments rare...  
High towers, faire temples, goodly theaters,  
Strong walls, rich porches, princelie pallaces,  
Large streetes, brave houses, sacred sepulchers,  
Sure gates, sweete gardens, stately galleries,  
Wrought with faire pillours, and fine imageries,  
All those (O pitie) now are turnd to dust" (Ins.36-39, 85-97).

Even the "elder sister" of Spencer's Roman London, 'New Troy', was no match for this splendour. The ghost of Spencer's palaces were Jones's native inheritance. John Fowles has seen a reference to Stonehenge in Spencer's following lines praising Camden and his view of a proud Britannic past,

"Camden the nourice of antiquitie,  
And lanterne unto late succeeding age,  
To see the light of simple vertie,  
Buried in ruines, through the great outrage  
of her owne people, led with warlike rage" (Ins.169-173).

18 Orgel, S., 'Inigo Jones on Stonehenge', *Prose III*, (1971), pp.120-1, adding: "innocence yields to experience, ignorance to knowledge. So Jones imagined classical palaces for British rulers, and Jonson celebrated British aristocrats in the guise of Greek and Roman heroes".


pointed out, "England becomes heroic through the imposition of Roman order on British nature".\(^{18}\)

To Elizabethan poets the idea of a Roman Britain had held obvious romantic appeal, conferring as it did a second overlay of antique culture on Britain's past. In Edmund Spencer's *Ruins of Time*\(^{19}\) a mournful woman represents the Genius of a lost Roman London, a world built in the image of Rome herself,

"I was that citie, which the garland wore
Of Britaines pride, delivered unto me
By Romane Victors, which it wonne of yore;
Though nought at all but ruines now I bee...
To tell the beawtie of my buildings fayre,
Adornd with purest golde, and precious stone;
To tell my riches, and endowments rare...
High towers, faire temples, goodly theaters,
Strong walls, rich porches, princelie pallaces,
Large streetes, brave houses, sacred sepulchers,
Sure gates, sweete gardens, stately galleries,
Wrought with faire pillours, and fine imageries,
All those (O pitie) now are turnd to dust" (Ins.36-39, 85-97).

Even the "elder sister" of Spencer's Roman London, 'New Troy', was no match for this splendour. The ghost of Spencer's palaces were Jones's native inheritance. John Fowles has seen a reference to Stonehenge\(^{20}\) in Spencer's following lines praising Camden and his view of a proud Britannic past,

"Cambden the nourice of antiquitie,
And lanterne unto late succeeding age,
To see the light of simple vertie,
Buried in ruines, through the great outraged
of her owne people, led with warlike rage" (Ins.169-173).

---

18 Orgel, S., 'Inigo Jones on Stonehenge', *Prose III*, (1971), pp.120-1, adding: "innocence yields to experience, ignorance to knowledge. So Jones imagined classical palaces for British rulers, and Jonson celebrated British aristocrats in the guise of Greek and Roman heroes".


The virtues of Britain's Roman antiquity occupy much of Camden and Stow.21 The emblematic frontispiece to Camden's *Britannia* (1610 ed.) represents an idyllic Britain, complete with Roman baths and 'Stonehenge-like' ruins in front of a burning sun (Fig. 76). Further, this vision is pictured alongside a Cathedral curiously similar to St. Paul's, when compared to Farley's contemporary illustration (Fig. 74) - both Stonehenge and old St. Paul's would here seem part of the same antique Britain for Camden. Jones himself quoted Camden on Roman Britain in saying,

"It was the Brightnesse of that most glorious Empire, which chased away all savage Barbarism from the Britains minds, like as from other Nations, whom it had subdued".22

Ephraim Pagitt went as far as to regard the Roman empire in Britain as semi-Christian,

"I read also of Pomponia Grecina a Christian, wife of Aulus Plantius, the first Lieutenant of Brittaine: yea, some of the Roman Deputies here were converted, even in the day spring of Christianity, as Trebellius Pertina,...more publickly to maintain the Gospel".23

For Jones Stonehenge became an emblem for the Roman empire itself, built as it was in,

"such a flourishing Age, as when Architecture in rare perfection, and such People lookt upon, as by continuall successse, attaining unto the sole power over Arts, as well as Empires, commanded all".24

It was a customary humanist view that the Romans reached the height of empire and architecture at the same moment,25 mirroring Stuart imperialism and its claims to a renewed Golden Age.

---

22 Jones, I., *STONE-HENG* (1655 ed.), p.15.
24 Jones, I., *STONE-HENG* (1655 ed.), p.43.
Following this opening rejection of the Druids and claim for a Roman pedigree, Jones expresses a faith in the British chronicles of Bede, William of Malmesbury and Roger of Hoveden. Since none makes reference to Stonehenge, Jones finds nothing to contradict in these, "the most ancient and authentick British Historians".\(^\text{26}\) He points out that the only chronicler to mention Stonehenge was Geoffrey of Monmouth - whose claim for Merlin's magic he rejects. Jones also discounts the further tradition that Stonehenge was a monument to Britons massacred in battle, repeated by the "modern Historians"\(^\text{27}\) Speed and Stow. He does not dispute the existence of such a monument, for at the "Monastery of Ambresbury" (Amesbury Abbey, Wiltshire) Jones reports a tomb to have been discovered with the inscription 'R.G. A.C. 600',

"Concerning which...why might it not be the Sepulchre of Queen Guinever, wife of King Arthur; especially the Letters R.G. as much to say, Regina Guinevera, declaring her title and name; and the date An. Chr. 600 (if truly copied) agreeing (possibly well enough) with the time of her death? Besides, Leyland affirms, several Writers make mention, she took upon her a Nuns veil at Ambresbury, died, and was buried there...he will by no means allow...her body to be...buried by her husband King Arthur at Glastenbury.\(^\text{28}\)

With Arthur later reported as having received his "death's wound" in Cornwall,\(^\text{29}\) this story represents one of the few asides in Jones's argument. It reveals not only the vitality of the Arthurian legend for the architect, but also the West Country area around Stonehenge constituted as its 'christianised' domain. Further, if this area represented the 'spiritual home' of Jones's work, it is perhaps significant that, as Aubrey reports, Jones "bought the Mannour of Burley neer Glastonbury (once belonging to it...)"\(^\text{30}\). Jones thus moved to the very place where Joseph of Aramathea had established his centre of devotion. Incidentally, on a visit to this house, "in a

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textbf{26} Jones, I., \textit{STONE-HENG} (1655 ed.), p.16.
  \item \textbf{27} Ibid, p.38.
  \item \textbf{28} Ibid, p.25
  \item \textbf{29} Ibid, p.39.
\end{enumerate}
large Parlour" Aubrey discovered studies of British history in the form of draughts of "stately Castles".

Jones next dismisses the account of Stonehenge related by Polydore Virgil, who had claimed the monument for Ambrosius, King of the Britons. For Jones this was "grounded (as I conceive) upon no great likelihood". Instead, Jones accepted Geoffrey's account of Ambrosius buried, once again, at Amesbury Abbey; the town itself, according to Jones, was named after Ambrosius. This Abbey was understood by Jones as a general resting place for the noble British past, for quoting Camden here "certain ancient King's, by report of the British Story, lay interred." Jones goes on to criticise the way of thinking which he himself was subject to, for,

"Historians in succeeding Ages, finding so notable an Antiquity as Stone-Henge,...and not apprehending for what use it was first built, suppos'd no other thing worthy A.Ambrosius, or those Britans, than such an extraordinary Structure".

Last to be rejected by Jones was a theory of Stonehenge as the tomb of Boadicea, found in what the architect presented as an "anonymous" translation of Nero Caesar, but in fact by Bolton. Jones seems curiously reluctant to name Bolton, even though "known in being Translator of Lucius Florus". Not surprisingly, we find Jones dismissing this claim with some vigour, for it had been Boadicea who was understood to have "pulled down and demolished...[Roman] royall Ensigns, Trophies, Statues, Temples". Jones here also placing ensigns at the head of a list of antique structures. In rejecting Camden's claims as to Stonehenge's extraordinary size, Jones compared the monument to the famous remains of ancient Rome, Diocletian's Baths, Theatre Marcellus, Vespasian's Temple of Peace, "and other prodigious works of the Romans". Hence the British monument is placed

32 Ibid
33 Ibid, p.29.
34 Ibid.
35 Ibid, p.44.
36 Ibid, p.52.
37 Ibid, p.33.
amongst the remains of antiquity on which Renaissance architects generally considered their work to be based.

Finally, following his general claim for Roman authorship, Jones specified Stonehenge's use - a temple, dedicated to a god named Coelus. But Coelus is a peculiar choice, a largely Renaissance invention who barely makes it into the classical Pantheon. As Stephen Orgel points out, there was no Roman cult of Coelus and no antique temple was ever dedicated to him - for, in fact, he was not a god at all, but merely a personification of the heavens. The importance of Coelus lies in his mythological position at the head of a theological hierarchy. Natalis Comes, one of Jones's sources, presents Coelus at the top, God the Father, the heavenly spirit and great cosmic force. Orgel notes that "if we look closely, it becomes apparent that the myth is in fact a direct translation of the Christian scheme into classical terms", hence Jones

"is directly Christianizing...[Stonehenge]. We may go even further and say that he is Protestantizing it. Catholic churches are dedicated to particular figures in a large hagiology; it is reformed churches that are dedicated to God the Father. Indeed, Jones's Coelus was directly responsible for "reducing...[men] from wild and savage to the conversation of civill life". Hence, instead of specifying a Roman god who was unambiguously pagan, in choosing Coelus Jones deliberately went out of his way to make Stonehenge partake of Christian virtue, and a Protestant virtue at that.

This distortion hints at the central importance of the British monument to the meaning of Jones's own work - an 'emblem' for 'Albion and Jerusalem'. As "a shew (as it were) of that first face of Antiquity" Stonehenge became the only remaining physical evidence for the past of which official mythology spoke. For it follows that Stonehenge to Jones had to be understood as evidence of a Romano-British past, to legitimise his own work and the 'history' justifying Stuart monarchy. This might confirm the suggestion made

40 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.104.
41 Ibid, p.102.
in chapter four that Stonehenge's Tuscan Order physically represented the "plain, simple" ancient British Church. As such, Stonehenge no doubt helped reconcile in the architect's own mind what, as Summerson points out, was "the stark novelty of Jones's work [for]...to put up a pure Italian building in...[mediaeval London] was sensational".42

Stonehenge as Emblem

"And here let us now consecrate to al eternitie the ancient name of famous great Brittaine, as a Pantheon of al blessings in peace, prosperitie, and honour...round, and like to the capacitie of heaven...even perfection of beautie in Sion."

[John Thornborough, Bishop of Bristol, (1604)]

In the famous engraving of Jones by Robert van Voerst for Van Dyck's Iconographiae (1640), the British architect holds an image of a circular temple. The circular form was to have special significance for King James, with round temples frequently presented as embodying the virtues of a restored antique Great Britain in both masque and sermon. Indeed, on the Banqueting House ceiling the enactment of this pantheon of British imperial mythology is framed within a circular temple of the Tuscan Order (Fig.6).

Following his rejection of past opinion as to Stonehenge's origins, and having advocated Romano-British authorship, in the middle of his study Jones presented a geometric overlay or "Scheme" by which, as the title promises, "STONE-HENG Restored". In this emblematic state, Jones's stones on Salisbury Plain became elevated to the status of Idea.

43 Thornborough, J., The Joeful and Blessed Reuniting of the two mighty and famous kingdomes, England and Scotland into their ancient name of great Brittaine (1604), pp.25-6.
CHAPTER SIX
"an equilateral Triangle in the Conformation of St. Paul's"
Jones's "Architectonick Scheame"; Stonehenge as Idea

"For the greatness and beauty of created things give us a corresponding idea of their Creator".

[Wisdom of Solomon, ch.xiii, v.5]

The two famous treatises by Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, Idea del Tempio della Pittura (1590) and Trattato dell' Arte della Pittura, Scultura et Architettura (1584) - a copy of which Jones annotated - both proclaimed the notion of the artist as the purveyor in action of the inner vision, or Idea. Part of the latter was translated into English by Richard Haydock in 1598. Erwin Panofsky has discussed at length the importance of this concept of the Idea in the Renaissance, and, following this, Rene Taylor has speculated on the Idea of the Escorial. This notion was well understood in the England of Jones's day. Wotton makes the Idea the prerogative of the architect, "the Architect, whose glory doth more consist, in the Designement and Idea of the whole Wooke", and chapter three noted Bolton making passing reference to the "Idea of a building". In discussing the status of geometry, Dee's 'Mathematical Preface' had outlined the "Immaterialitie of perfect Architecture" (see epilogue).

A year before building work on the Cathedral began Jones made this distinction between architectural theory and practice explicit, for both were personified in the masque Albion's Triumph (1632); John Bold has noted that Jones was the first architect to promote the Platonic conception of Idea. However, little is generally understood about Jones's 'theory' or Idea of architecture, in part resulting from the 'stylistic' approach to his work examined in the preface. However, in 1978 Tait noted that the Jones-Webb study of Stonehenge was "interesting for what it revealed of both architects'..."
attitudes to classical composition" and in 1980 Roy Strong claimed that Jones's "study of Stonehenge is the only document we have which shows how his mind worked in relation to the concept or idea of a building". Chapter five concluded that Stonehenge represented an 'emblem' to Jones - in other words that it was indeed one such Idea building. Following Jones's antiquarian arguments in favour of Roman authorship, this emblematic status is further emphasised by a physical 'restoration' - taking the form of an ideal, geometric scheme overlayed onto the real, crumbling stones. Jones's first critic, Dr Charleton, implied this ideal status when describing Stonehenge as "cast in the Mould of architectonical Principles, ..adjusted by the Maxims of Geometry". In other words in Jones's imaginary restoration of Stonehenge we have preserved a record of what he considered perfect architecture.

For in the geometry of Stonehenge Jones saw a shining example of antiquity,

"betwixt this Island of great Britain, and Rome it self, there's no one structure to be seen, wherein more clearly shines those harmoniacall proportions, of which only the best times could vaunt, than in this of Stone-Heng".

As has been suggested, in making Stonehenge Romano-British at a general level Jones found for his outwardly Italian architecture a national 'past'. More specifically, surely these "harmoniacall proportions", with which Jones makes Stonehenge comply, were proportions to which he would equally have wanted his own 'Romano-British' work to conform - for surely the "best times" were also to be his own? Jones continues,

"Besides, the Order is not only Roman, but the Scheam also (consisting of four equilaterall triangles, inscribed within the circumference of a Circle) by which this Work Stone-Heng formed, was an Architectonical Scheam used by the Romans".

---

8 Charleton, W., CHOREA GIGANTUM (1725 ed.), p.10.
9 Jones, I, STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.33.
10 Ibid, p.68.
Here Jones alludes to the Roman theatre, the plan of which was identical to Jones's "Architectonical Scheme"; the ideal status of the theatre will be discussed in chapter eight.

In Jonson's *An Expostulation w[i]th Inigo Jones* (1631), the architect had "Drawn Aristotle on us: and thence shown / How much architectonike is your own!";11 Aristotle used 'Architettonica' (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.i. VI.vii) to denote the ultimate end to which all knowledge was directed and subordinated, that is virtuous action.12 In book vi, chapter vii of Jones's 1551 copy of *L'ethica d'Aristotile* we find this term in the text underlined, and in the margin Jones's note "Architectonical or Universall".13 Given his evident awareness of this term, this note might provide evidence that Jones at least wrote the sections of *STONE-HENG Restored* where this term reappears.

At Stonehenge Jones searched for an invisible order, found in this Roman "Architectonical Scheam" - a 'Scheme' forming the geometry, or groundplot, of an antique Albion and Jerusalem. Such an understanding prompts an investigation of his later buildings for the presence of this *Idea*, or geometric scheme - possibly 'married', as it were, to the British monument through embodying its geometry. The discovery of this would, in turn, serve as confirmation of the central status of Jones's Stonehenge study, positioned as it was, if 1620 is to be believed, at the beginning of Jones's actual Court building work (starting with the Banqueting House of 1620). The 1757 edition of *Biographica Britannica* notes that at Whitehall palace "there is seen a noble circular portico, the first hint whereof might perhaps be suggested by the circular portico in Stone Henge".14 *STONE-HENG Restored* speaks of the power not so much of the Orders themselves, but instead of geometry, and of one "Scheme" in particular, to 'restore' a building for Jones. Of course, Jones's other great 'restoration' of an existing building was of "that antient and venerable Church", as Evelyn's diary describes St. Paul's.15 The Tuscan used on the side walls to the Cathedral

---

13 Jones's copy of the *Ethics*, p.188.

155
might be seen as a clue to a possible connection with Stonehenge. Whilst discussing Stonehenge, Orgel connects the monument to Jones’s west front through native chivalry,

"We normally think of Jones as the first great British Palladian, the architect who domesticated classical architecture in England. But this is only half the truth, because he was equally interested in the native medieval tradition, which exemplified a world of high romantic chivalry. There are few places in Jones’s architecture itself where this double vision can be observed, but the facade of old Saint Paul’s might be a case in point".16

However, this association is made on the basis of style, Orgel describing the west front as "a baroque fantasy on Gothic themes, a Corinthian colonnade surmounted by spires and assorted Gothickry". As with Stonehenge, at St. Paul’s Jones considered himself to be restoring a Britannic monument to its Romano-British original, for he thought of both as 'temples' founded by Rome.

---

"inscribed in a circoll"; Geometry, fortifications and the 'technical' mind of Inigo Jones

"how to trauce part on[e] designe to another and inscribe ye angoll of any figure in a circle given. first opon your instrument to ye number of the bacio of the angle required to be inscribed...take the same diametor of the cirkoll given and setting on[e] poyn of ye compas in ye poyn...".

[Jones's annotations to Lorini, B., Le fortificationi (1609 ed.), p.18].

In the course of his Romano-British Stonehenge defence, whilst referring to the "Arts Mathematical, or Design", Webb cites Jones as "a great Geometrician".17 Jones's close study of geometry is attested by books in his library, including an edition of Euclid.18 Indeed, his annotations to 'Palladio' show his close study of Euclid,19 whilst the annotations on the geometric construction of the Orders themselves,20 or to books on fortifications,21 show his interest in the application of geometry to architecture.

---

18 Euclid, *De gli elementi d'Euclide libri quindici*, trans. F. Commandino, Urbino, (1575) (unannotated); Scala, G., *Geometria prattica...sopra le tauole dell'Eccle Mathematico Giovanni Pomodoro*, Rome, (1603) (unannotated, this contains survey methods for land and architecture); Ubaldo, G., *Le mechaniche*, trans. F. Pigafetta, Venice, (1581) (annotated, this contains hydraulics, mechanics and geometry); Viola Zanini, G., *Delle architettura*, Padua, (1629) (annotated, pp.7-28 illustrate geometric constructions including the triangle within a circle, p.15. The final page to bk.i includes 'Solomon's seal' as a pattern.
19 Jones's copy of 'Palladio' bk.i ch.xxiii p.53 'of the height of rooms', ln.18, against diagram, "how to find this heyg[ht] geometrically / Euclid the 6 Book propo: 13".
20 Vignola, G., *Regola delle cinque ordini d'architettura*, Rome, (1607), on p.30 Jones notes how to construct mouldings. Viola Zanini, G., *Delle architettura*, Padua, (1629) pp.399-400 - on how to construct a Corinthian detail, p.400, Jones notes "To make ye corners and breadth of the Abbaccus first mak a squar of a diamiter and 1/2 of ye collom. the[n] draw ye diagonall line. sett on point of the compas in ye midel and sett out on diamiter towards the corners and from that draw a line that art in ye angoll C that is ye breadth C".
In the margin to 'Lorini' Jones proposes a geometric method of construction to almost every bastion illustrated. These provide an insight into the 'technical' side of his mind at work, and, in that most of the fortifications are inscribed within geometry (frequently circular), they resemble Jones's geometric scheme for Stonehenge. In Busca's *L'architettura militare* (1619 ed.) for example, Jones notes "The new sides are inscribed in a circoll".22 Jones's preoccupation with such 'all consuming' geometry echoes in Jonson's satire of the architect in *Neptune's Triumph* (1624), for disguised as a Vitruvian Cook Jones 'fortifies',

"Makes Citadels of curious foule and fish,
Some he dry-ditches, some motes round with broths;
Mounts marrow-bones; cuts fifty-angled custards;
Reares bulwarke pies; and for his outer workes,
He raiseth ramparts of immortal crust;...
The whole *Art Militarie!*" (Ins.68-78).

This would date his interest in such 'geometric' architecture to well before the necessities of the Civil War.23 Indeed, the idea of Jones as a 'great Geometrician' might prompt further investigation of his architecture itself for geometric forms.

---


"putt ye poynt of the Compas", "X the centor"; Geometry and Jones's unbuilt design for the west front.

"Now the exact Circle is in truth a Figure, which for our purpose hath many fit and eminent properties; as fitnesse, for Commodity and Receit, being the most capable; fitnesse for strength and duration, being the most united in his parts; Fitnesse for beautie and delight, as imitating the celestall Orbes, and the universall Forme. And it seemes, besides, to have the approbation of Nature...For birds doe build their nests Spherically".


Chapter three observed that Jonson's Barriers, in defining the "truth of architecture" as antique, carried an anti-Gothic air - summed up in the phrase "ignorant Goths". Such an attitude indicates that one of the purposes of 'refacing' a Gothic St. Paul's was to remove the sense of this 'rude', necessarily Catholic past. Writing on St. Paul's in 1672, Sir Roger Pratt noted that if the Cathedral had been merely repaired "it would have been too great an abuse to so vast an Expense to have only produced a thing so Gothic and ungraceful".24 And in 1624 Wotton echoed Vasari when commenting that the pointed arch "ought to bee exiled from judicious eyes, and left to their first inventors, the Gothes or Lumbards, amongst other Reliques of that barbarous Age".25 This would suggest that the most obvious problem Jones was faced with when 'masking' or 'ordering' the Gothic Cathedral was its pointed section, which formed the west front.26 That he literally masked the old Gothic section is shown in a sketch made after the fire of London, where the imprint of an old central pointed window is revealed on the reverse of Jones's front (Fig.73). This was much like the overlay of a new order on the mediaeval city itself. Webb tells us that Jones "reduced the Body of it, from the Steeple to the West End, into that Order and Uniformity we now

26 Something of this section is hinted at in the Work's accounts Guildhall MS 21,471 W.A.15 September 1641, "two great Arches that abutteth against the westend on each side of the midle isle, the same Arch being taken downe".
Chapter Six

The old Gothic windows were remodelled, although these were Norman with the main, lower nave windows circular headed, not pointed, as Hollar's view of the Gothic Cathedral records (Fig.67) and Stephen Wren confirms, whilst discussing the original nave,

"They had not as yet fallen into the Gothick pointed-arch, as was follow'd in the Quire of a later Date, but kept to the circular Arch; so much they retain'd of the Roman Manner, but nothing else".

The upper clerestory windows, recorded by Hollar with pointed heads, were recast with circular profiles.

Unlike Jones's work on the main body of the Cathedral, his new (or remodelled) towers were not restricted by existing width or height; chapter one noted the masons' work on these. With the old Cathedral understood as a "confused heap" (ie Gothic), as one contemporary put it, these towers formed part of Jones's new ordered section for the west front. It follows, I suggest, that one reason for the inclusion of side towers was that by extending the Cathedral width they helped mask the old Cathedral's 'pointed' profile, formed by the 'body' of the Cathedral. Further, a coherent scheme would surely have been necessary to determine the otherwise arbitrary height and width of these new towers and thus the overall width of the new facade. This chapter will outline a way in which such an ordered section was to be achieved, a geometric idea which followed the iconography in establishing St. Paul's in succession to Solomon's temple and British antiquity centred on Salisbury Plain.

At Stonehenge each triangular point dictates the location and spacing of Jones's 'Tuscan' columns. Further, the triangles are split into two sets, distinguished by virtue of one set of double triangles being labelled 'H' on plan. Either single pair of interlocking triangles constitutes a 'seal of Solomon'. It is with three points of this 'seal', a single triangle, that the entrances to the outer embankment are positioned (Fig.53). Also, it is the hexagon formed from only one pair of triangles which constitutes Jones's

27 Webb, J., VINDICATION(1725 ed.), p.27.
29 Edmund Waller, see chapter eight, part two.
"Architectonical Scheme" in his woodcut illustrations (Fig.52 & 54). As was pointed out, Jones's interest in Stonehenge's proportions, which this scheme 'restores', dated from 1620 - the same year as one of his Cathedral surveys. If 1620 is the correct date for the first Cathedral facade drawing, it would mean that Jones drew it in the same year as his Stonehenge survey. Chapter one noted the interest of Buckingham and Pembroke in the stones in 1620; both served on St. Paul's committee of that year.

Examining this first design for the west front, executed on thin, semi-transparent paper, pencil or scored construction marks comprising compass sweeps (forming an 'X') can clearly be seen between two cherubim with palm (Fig.56); Jones used such a mark (formed from freehand curves) in annotation to signify 'centre' on an elevational drawing in his 1560 edition of 'Serlio', noting to the side "X the centor...".30 These are the only such compass marks on the Cathedral drawing - a possible hint of a hidden, ruled regular order underneath the freehand lines? Jones's technique of tracing or pinpricking an underlying, outlined design has been detected by Roy Strong when discussing masque sets,31 and whilst commenting on Jones's geometric theatre designs, John Orrell has detected pencil under-drawings hidden by inked lines over, "the preparatory work...roughed in on another sheet".32 Against the temple of La Galluce in his 'Palladio' (bk.iv) Jones notes "The greatest Round building next ye Pantheon...formed all out of Circles as you see by the prickes". Hence this pencil 'X' could well be all that remains of an erased order, which we might now attempt to reconstruct.

Using this compass crossing point as a 'centre' and extending compasses to one of the outer corners at either tower's base, a circle can be drawn enclosing the front which circumscribes the apex of both towers (the left ball exactly, the right slightly out), candelabra and the Cathedral 'body' in the design, the point on the underside of the parapet from which faintly visible pencil lines can be seen to radiate (discussed below) (Fig.56). Taking this point as the 'apex' of the facade, an upright equilateral triangle drawn within the circle coincides exactly with the Cathedral base, or ground-line.

30 In Serlio's drawing of a Tuscan gate, bk.iv ch.v fol.9, to the side of the curved, freehand 'X' Jones notes "X the centor of ye [c]oins". Indeed Serlio's coins radiate from Jones's point.
Furthermore, a second, inverted equilateral triangle also drawn within the circle, suggested by Jones's Stonehenge "Scheme", coincides with the 'top' of the upper Order, whilst the central crossing point of the two triangles (the centre of the circle and Vitruvius's important central line in the theatre 'scheme') coincides with what appears to be the same point on the 'top' of the base Order - that this horizontal line was important to Jones is evidenced by a deep score-line in the drawing itself. In addition, the whole scheme of pilasters can be seen to be set out horizontally using the triangle crossing points - much as with Jones's Stonehenge plan. Although these pilasters are Corinthian, not Tuscan, as has been seen Jones did use the Tuscan on the side walls to the Cathedral. And at Stonehenge "the narrowsnesse of the spaces betwixt the stones, visibly discovers therein, the delicacy of the Corinthian Order". Incidentally, the centre would seem of some importance to this geometric construction, for the plates in Jones's first edition of STONE-HENG Restored marks the centre with a letter 'C' in one woodcut, and 'S' in the other.

It should be pointed out that Jones's drawing lacks the accuracy of a 'ruled' drawing; the lines are in freehand, and in places rough. The sides are not quite identical, nor are certain of the parts. However, the 'match' between the (freehand) elevation and (exacting) geometric overlay is in no place less exact than Jones's drawing itself. In other words the 'error' (where it occurs) lies within the degree of inconsistency between the two 'halves' of Jones's drawing - indeed, small inconsistencies which this overlay reveals. I suggest that any small, local misfits result from these inconsistencies in the symmetry, arising as the design was sketched over this underlying geometry. The chances of so close a match existing accidentally must be remote.

It might be further objected that at Stonehenge Jones used his "Architectonical Scheme" in plan and here its use in elevation is suggested. But if what would seem intended as a generalised geometric scheme represented an Idea embodying true and universal proportions, "harmonical Proportions of which only the best times could vaunt" as Jones himself contends, it would seem not unreasonable to find such geometry ordering the most important part of Jones's Cathedral alterations - the west face. Traditionally, the plan took precedence over the elevation, for in being first to be set out the 'groundplot' or plan became the generator of the building as

---

33 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.76.
Chapter Six

a whole, its elevations and overall geometry. Jones's geometric scheme at Stonehenge obviously dictated its 'elevation', as the same scheme had the walls of the ancient theatre. Examining Palladio's theatre plan in Barbaro's 'Vitruvius', Venice, (1556) (the edition which Jones owned) (Fig.37), it is the base of the central triangle which dictates the position of the frons Scænae. On the stage-set wall itself, half illustrated in the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', the triangle crossing points dictate the horizontal positions of the Orders and three main doorways, including the central 'King's doorway - as on the 'stage-set' of St. Paul's. On the plan Jones himself numbers the seven triangle points which lay-out the seating, and notes "...and directe the goinges upp ar[e] 7 in nu[m]ber. the other 5 direct the Scean".34 In the theatre scheme the circle's centre is once again marked. In this way the theatre elevation was deduced from the plan, as here Jones's Stonehenge forms the 'plan' for the 'face' of his Cathedral.

As Jones indicates in his Barbaro 'Vitruvius' when noting "the boddie of man well proporsioned is the patern for proportion in buildings...the round figure forms the Bodi of man",35 what lay behind the circle was the virtue of human proportion outlined in Vitruvius and elaborated by Renaissance commentators into the famous illustrations of man and geometry. Such geometric anthropomorphism always linked plans to elevations - George Hersey imagines,

"the same colosus, first lying down like Vitruvius' man to procreate the plan, and then standing up like Leonardo's or better still Cesare's to procreate the facade. But there are other connections, in Pythagorean anthropomorphism, between plans and facades...Even the facades in Serlio's book are highly "planimetric"".36

Further tentative evidence for the presence of such invisible geometry is provided by other, visible marks on the drawing itself. Of the several very faint pencil lines which radiate from the point on the facade determined as the

34 Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', bk.v ch.vi against diagram p.249, against Vitruvius ln.20 p.248.
'apex', lines suggested by some as the ghost of the Gothic roof line, the clearest are two within the left-hand side. One of these, if extrapolated, lines through with the bottom corner exactly - thereby obviously coinciding with one side of our equilateral triangle. Whilst these lines would seem to represent further evidence of an erased pencil 'guide', they may, however, merely form localised construction marks around the I.H.S.. Further, the 'generating' compass sweeps themselves would appear to be segments of circles equivalent in radii to our invisible 'outer' circle (although this cannot be exactly determined). Certainly three circular windows form a triangle on the facade.

The clearly inscribed, central 'X' would seem to have gone unnoticed by commentators. The most recent detailed analysis, Inigo Jones, Complete Architectural Drawings (1989) by John Harris and Gordon Higgott, does not point it out. At the very least, these sweeps indicate without doubt that Jones was using a compass when designing this elevation, following the mediaeval masonry practice where Gothic proportions were derived from geometric figures formed with the dividers (such as ad triangulum, examined in chapter eight). Jones's annotations to his books on fortifications and the Orders show him frequently using the compass, noting in his 'Scamozzi', for example, "putt yeo poynt of the compas in C". This scheme would explain the presence of compass marks, generators of circles and equilateral triangles. Indeed, if not as the centre of a circle the central point would otherwise seem meaningless. This 'overlay' is offered as a speculation, a geometric experiment suggested by a theory. But given traditional stonework practice (and the influence of neoplatonic philosophy examined in part II) what more satisfactory scheme could Jones adopt to 'order' his west front than one which inevitably evoked the triangle of the Trinity and the circle of God and a harmonic cosmos? Certainly, as has been seen, this geometry was adopted by Jones to 'restore' Stonehenge, using a scheme which had received such obvious sanction from Palladio through his famous theatre illustrations.


38 Jones's copy of Scamozzi, V., L'idea della architettura universale, Venice, (1615), pt.ii bk.vii, ch.34 p.163. In his copy of Lorini, B., Le fortificazioni, Venice, (1609), Jones notes p.10 "Take with your compas 30 passi from the scale and potting on[e] poynt in L mark H and G which is the broodth", p.16 "Devide this half circoll in to three parte and that is the equilator triangoll marked 3", p.17 "this donn by mathematicall instrumente", p.28 "measure the length of your paper so as 8 openings of ye compas is ye length".
Palladio's theatre was published on detachable, light-weight paper - presumably for tracing purposes.

From this we can conclude a 'programme' for the new towers - transforming the existing Cathedral front to conform to a triangle and the silhouette into a circle, thus removing the old 'pointed' section. When passing through the central door the King would be placed at the centre of a geometrically ordered 'setting', as in masque - a centrality later emphasised by the statues of the two Stuart Kings either side of the axis on the royally funded portico. The prominent cherubim with palm framing the 'X' are revealed at the 'spiritual' centre of 'Solomon's seal', placed just over this central, 'sacred' doorway at which the British Solomon knelt before entry. Indeed, in prescribing the meaning of the same geometry at Stonehenge, following Ezekiel, Jones specifically cites cherubim as emblems of Solomon's temple (quoted in chapter eight), in line with the Orders which this geometry relates. Hence these cherubim become a further visible clue to this invisible 'Solomonic' geometry.

In drawing the lines in this sequence we follow Vitruvius's description of how to construct the theatre plan (bk.v, ch.vi, i), which also relies on a predetermined centre as its starting point, followed by the circle and then triangles. In Jones's Barbaro 'Vitruvius', under the heading "Romain Theater" the architect notes "first see how much the circumference of ye plant must bee", 39 and under the title "Demonstrasion",

"make first a circle as bige as you will the temple shall be whose diamiter is hear a 6 This diamiter devid into thre parts marked 123 then open your compas as much as on of the parts is and placinge on foote in ye center draw a Circl within the first...". 40

Jones is discussing 'round temples', and in plan only. Even so, in this 'demonstration' we have a rare glimpse of the architect with paper and compass in hand actually designing a temple - determining a centre, opening his compass and drawing a circle within which the Renaissance ideal temple, like Stonehenge, conformed.

39 Jones's co;opy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', against Vitruvius bk.v ch.vi ln.1 p.247.
40 Ibid, bk.iv ch.vii against diagram p.197. On p.198 an equilateral triangle is illustrated 'ordering' the dome of a circular temple in elevation.
I am not alone in suggesting the hidden presence of such geometry ordering key elements of a building of this period, for in discussing the Escorial's *Idea* Rene Taylor has overlayed the Roman theatre geometry on the palace plan (Fig.46),

"The role of the circle and the triangle...are perhaps...[not] readily evident. Yet, as may be seen, a circle convincingly circumscribes the whole structure. Then too the apex of an equilateral triangle constructed on the line of the west front marks the position of the most hallowed part of the church...Just as the Roman had used the base of his upright equilateral triangle to establish the all-important line of the *scena* of his theater and the apex to mark the upper limit of the semicircle enclosing the auditorium, so it may be surmised that the designer of the Escorial used them to determine the line of the main front and the position of the Sagrario, the perimeter of the *quadro* or main block being found by joining up the appropriate points in accordance with the accompanying diagrams".41

Taylor finds it "hardly suprising" that the palace plan embodied such a geometric construction "with all its Solomonic and mystical associations". Earlier, in chapter two, Summerson was quoted comparing Jones's Whitehall with the Escorial. Roy Strong has also suggested connections between the Escorial and Whitehall, "centring on the Solomonic idea". This is based, following Taylor, on an experimental overlay of circle and triangle (Fig.47),

"The palace itself is almost a square and can be embraced within a circle whose radius stems from the centre point of the central courtyard. An equilateral triangle superimposed upon the ground-plan finds its apex in the chancel of the Chapel Royal in exactly the same way as at the Escorial".42

Any influence of the ancient theatre plan at St. Paul's serves as further evidence to substantiate Strong's argument for circle and triangle at Whitehall. Jones's knowledge of the design of the Escorial will be discussed in chapter eight, in which a detailed study of the symbolism of this geometry will be undertaken. However, there exists an alternative source for the


Chapter Six

geometry of Stonehenge - one which advocated the same scheme applied to order an existing Gothic Cathedral within Vitruvian principles.

Summerson has suggested that Jones used an illustration from Cesare Cesariano's edition of 'Vitruvius', Como, (1521) when designing Albion's Triumph.\(^{43}\) In discussing STONE-HENG Restored, A.A. Tait has pointed out that although the 'Como Vitruvius' was the one less frequently met with in English libraries of the 17th Century, "it was not unknown and Jones could have had access to it fairly readily''.\(^{44}\) For example, a copy was to be found in the library of Robert Cecil, first Earl of Salisbury (1563?-1612);\(^{45}\) it also became further known through a sub-edition by Caporali (1536), and, as the first to comment on Vitruvius in Italian, had a widespread influence in Europe.\(^{46}\) In Cesariano's 'Vitruvius' a seal of Solomon is pictured within the opening emblem containing the first letter, 'Q', of Vitruvius's dedication to Augustus (Fig.36). But of much more significance, the Gothic Cathedral of Milan is illustrated composed by geometry in which 'Solomon's seal' can be traced (Fig.35). Here the columns themselves are positioned - in their height and base relationship - within the triangle crossing points, exactly as those in Jones's scheme for St. Paul's seem to have been. Indeed, Cesariano's plates are often cited as the spiritual father of all modern complicated nets of 'magic' proportions.\(^{47}\) In his discussion of the debate surrounding the new facade to Milan Cathedral, Rudolf Wittkower points out that Cesariano also employed triangles to re-order the plan (Fig.38).\(^{48}\) This is much like Jones's geometry at Stonehenge, as Tait has noted when commenting on the study by Jones of Palladio's temple of Le Galluçe,

"The relationship of the circles and their diameters...led him to the Barbaro's and Cesariano's explanation by circles and triangles of the classical theatre...Closer perhaps to Jones's

---

47 See, for example, Ghyka, M., The Geometry of Art and Life (1977).
48 See Wittkower, R., Gothic versus Classic (1974), plate 26. Triangles are not actually shown on Cesariano's plan, but mentioned in the text.
geometric analyses of Stonehenge was the chapter that Cesariano devoted to a similar attempt to find Eurythmia by circles and triangles in Milan Cathedral. He can hardly have failed either to have seen it or to have escaped its relevance to his problem. For at Stonehenge Jones's circles and triangles made much the same empty but ingenious pattern.49

Chapter eight will illustrate that Jones's geometry was more than Tait's empty pattern. Incidentally, the explanation and diagram of the Latin theatre were better in Cesariano than in Barbaro; with the three main doorways in the fons scaena drawn in elevation on Cesariano's plan (Fig.37), Cesariano's theatre itself illustrated the 'bond' between plan and elevation.

Cesariano's plates illustrated no minor point within the Roman's narrative. They refer to the second chapter in Vitruvius's first book, entitled 'Of What Things Architecture Consists',50 comprising taxis (Order), diathesis (Arrangement or ideae) and oeconomia (Proportion, Symmetry). Milan composed by ad quadratum, ad triangulum and ad circulum specifically illustrated diathesis, represented by 'Ichnography', 'Orthography', 'Scenography'. Hence, following his study of Stonehenge, perhaps Jones saw the chance to apply Cesariano's triangular ideal at St. Paul's, an almost identical transformation from Gothic Cathedral to Vitruvian Idea of a church.

Finally, Wittkower in Palladio and English Palladianism (1974) has analysed this drawing in part. He observes that "all the orders used in the design are interrelated";51 this he determines was governed by a column 'module'. However, this modular analysis remains suspect, for Jones's columns vary slightly in size, and although Wittkower states that "vertical lines fixed the position of the main orders", he fails to give horizontal modular divisions to relate these (only the width of the tower is given as five modules). Further, no overall vertical relationship is proposed. Hence, nothing Wittkower has said contradicts the overall idea of interlocked triangles used to order the front; the modular system might easily be adopted

50 'Vitruvius', (trans. F. Granger, 1931).
within the 'seal', for as with Stonehenge in dictating column centre points this says nothing of column width, or 'module'.

Wittkower’s analysis has, in any case, been recently questioned by Harris and Higgott, who observe that,

"a closer inspection of the proportioning of this elevation reveals, however, that abstract modular patterning was not Jones’s chief concern. His main preoccupation was visual harmony through coordination of levels".52

I suggest that a division of thirds, dictated by equilateral triangles, generates this "coordination of levels", the three levels, in fact, which comprise the facade. Harris and Higgott proceed by offering an alternative modular analysis, a speculation which in part 'discovers' "three-part divisions". Wittkower’s general "metrical approach" attempts to fit Jones's work within Italian, rather than British antiquity; the specific consequence of this approach led Wittkower in the same work to note Jones's "unintelligable verdict...his blunder about Stonehenge".53


The 'Ideal' and the 'Real'? Two designs compared

"We may start by bringing together two designs for the west front... The earlier design has an arrangement of applied orders in two storeys with rustication suggested rather casually as infilling. In the executed design the only order is that of the portico; the front itself is a mass of accurately rusticated masonry uncommitted to any one of the orders... In the executed design... the primitive gable shape is frankly accepted... The difference between the two designs is this. In the first Jones is thinking of a pretty architectural frontispiece to hang, as it were, on the old fabric. In the second he is thinking himself into the fabric, converting the fabric itself into a powerful new design".


Jones's design for the west front built from 1633, as recorded in Hollar's contemporary perspectives (Fig.70) and Flitcroft's later 'idealised' scale elevation (Fig.55), is very different from the earlier, undated design. The general method employed by historians such as Gotch and Summerson to assess Jones's two designs is by comparison on 'stylistic' grounds, a method which leads both to find the earlier design 'unsuccessful'. But the analysis so far suggests that Jones's first design is considerably more than Summerson's "pretty architectural frontispiece". Annarosa Cerutti Fusco also finds this early scheme unsatisfactory on stylistic grounds, but notes "the clarity of the 'geometrical-proportional' establishment of the composition".

If we apply the same geometric analysis to Flitcroft's drawing, the two base points, tower balls, obelisks (which replaced the candelabra) and apex also 'fit' (exactly) within a circle (Fig.57). However, no sense can now be made of equilateral triangles in relation to the front on the second design, the triangular apex falling well below any meaningful point at the top of the facade (Fig.58). Here it should be pointed out that Flitcroft may not be accurate in recording the proportions of Jones's work.

---

54 Gotch, J.A., Inigo Jones (1928), p.175: "in several respects it falls below the standard that we are accustomed to associate with his name". Wittkower also finds it unsatisfactory.

From Hollar's plan (Fig.60) and south and north views (Fig.62) we know that the central section of Jones's facade only just masked the existing Cathedral 'body' in terms of width and height, with the towers abutting each side; indeed, Allan Cunningham presented the west end as "a screen to the end of the main roof of the building".56 As an example of Jones's subtlety, the three windows on his new front fit exactly within, yet disguise, the pointed Gothic window of the old facade, a fact revealed internally after the fire (Fig.73). It follows from this correspondence that Flitcroft's drawing might be checked for accuracy against the records of the Cathedral's vertical and horizontal dimensions. It would seem that this has not been attempted before;57 nor have Flitcroft's outline or proportions been compared with Jones's earlier design.

In examining the available dimensional records of the old Cathedral a contradictory picture emerges. Dugdale, in copying a tablet which he tells us recorded a survey of the Cathedral carried out in 1312, reports the breadth at 130 feet and "height of the roof of the west part, from the floore CII. foot".58 This puts the roof much lower than Flitcroft's apex (which scales off at 146 feet), but the roof was altered after the lightning strike of 156159 and Dugdale may here record an internal height to the underside of the vault. However, Dugdale's breadth of 130 feet contradicts Hollar's accompanying plan. If we examine Wren's 'Pre-Fire' section, the height of the nave roof externally scales off at 115 feet, again much lower than 'Flitcroft'. However, according to Dugdale much of the roof had collapsed during the Civil War, for

---


58 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.15. Calendar of State Papers (Domestic), 1634, p.427, n.33. records the "height of the western roof from the altar was 120 feet". This notes the Abbey Book of St. Andrew's, Northampton, (belonging to the Cathedral at York) as source.

"by taking away the inner Scaffolds, which supported the arched vaults, in order to their late intended repair; the whole roof of the South Cross is already tumbled down".\textsuperscript{60}

Wren, perhaps, took this opportunity to restore the roof at a more convenient height for his new dome, with which the roof neatly aligns. Certainly the roofs to both the Romanesque nave and later Gothic choir were not built to the same height, as Wren has them, so at least one side is incorrect. Therefore this, too, cannot be relied upon as an accurate record of the old roof height. Having pointed out this lack of accurate information, one Victorian commentator even managed to arrive at a height of 130 feet by means of a structural calculation from Hollar's plan!\textsuperscript{61} Without this information, there is no way of checking the accuracy of 'Flitcroft' as a vertical record of Jones's work. However, horizontally thing are clearer. The drawings by Wren and Hollar agree with Flitcroft on a Cathedral 'body' width of 100 feet (in Flitcroft's case 'revealed' at second storey level), and Flitcroft and Hollar both agree on the same overall front dimension of 161 feet (Fig.61). This correspondence might lead us to accept the accuracy of Flitcroft's proportions. In which case, why were triangles abandoned?

As Summerson observes, the Orders play differing roles in the two designs. Removed from the face in the built design, in Jones's famous portico they become an 'applied' element (Walpole suggests that Jones "added a Roman portico...which had no affinity with the ancient parts that remained").\textsuperscript{62} Indeed, the inscription on the portico itself, recorded by Hollar but more clearly read in 'Flitcroft', described this element in separate terms: CHARLES GRACE OF GOD, KING OF BRITAIN FRANCE AND IRELAND, DEF. OF FAITH, RESTORED THE CHURCH OF ST. PAUL, CONSUMED WITH AGE, AND HE MADE A PORTICO FOR IT.\textsuperscript{63} Since 'Solomon's seal' dictates the composition of the Orders as tiered pilasters, to such free standing columns triangles would seem redundant, as indeed Flitcroft indicates. However, the towers remain - and lie within a circle, consistent with the first and, I would suggest, through its geometry less

\textsuperscript{60} Dugdale, W., \textit{History} (1658), p.174.
\textsuperscript{61} Longman, W., \textit{The Three Cathedrals dedicated to St. Paul} (1873), pp.31-32, ch.iii attempts a reconstruction of the old Cathedral.
\textsuperscript{63} See chapter two for latin.
compromised design. In fact the removal of the Orders from the facade was directly due to a compromise. For it is known that one reason the portico was added to the Cathedral design was to rehouse the famous rabble of 'Paul's walk' from inside the west end\textsuperscript{64} - a mob even noted by visitors such as Giordano Bruno (discussed in chapter seven), with Bishop Earle in 1628 likening St. Paul's to the Tower of Babel.\textsuperscript{65}

Further practical obstacles Jones had to overcome were the existing Cathedral dimensions. In this, once again, the portico was compromised,\textsuperscript{66} according to Webb "the Pillars...being constrain'd to observe the Breadth of the old Work".\textsuperscript{67} Hence, despite the 'freedom' offered by side towers, the existing silhouette would not necessarily have been compatible with the geometric exactness of the 'pre-built', undated scheme, relating as it does width to height. However, this incompatibility is difficult to establish without any accurate record of the Cathedral's height. The following is therefore only offered as a tentative analysis. If we continue, as we have so far, to accept the accuracy of 'Flitcroft', then by using this scale drawing the earlier, scaleless drawing by Jones can be related to the existing Cathedral reflected behind Flitcroft's facade (Fig.59). In making equivalent either the bases (Drawing 2) or 'body' widths (Drawing 3), the first design fails to mask Flitcroft's height and therefore that of the existing Cathedral. It follows that if the heights are made equivalent (Drawing 1) the central body, and thus the towers, no longer neatly align with the width of Flitcroft's 'existing' fabric. The aisle doors of the first design also fail to relate to the existing aisles behind.

Thus, in accepting the accuracy of 'Flitcroft', this analysis would seem to confirm the view that the first design, with its geometric exactness, failed to relate to the existing Cathedral - a 'fit' obviously achieved in the later, built design, the proportions of which Flitcroft claims to record. Summerson

\textsuperscript{64} See Dugdale, W., \textit{History} (1658), p.140. Summerson, 'Lecture on a Master Mind', \textit{P.B.A.}, vol.1, (1964), p.189: "This famous portico had a material if rather mean application to practical requirements; it was intended to harbour the mob of loiterers, touts, and hucksters, who made the Cathedral nave their habitual rendezvous and had created the standing blasphemy of 'Paul's walk'".

\textsuperscript{65} Bishop Earle, in \textit{Microcosmography} (1628), quoted by Longman, p.45.

\textsuperscript{66} This is sometimes missed. Fraser, for example, comments "Jones had no need to compromise with the old structure", \textit{Drawings in the Burlington-Devonshire Collection} (1960), p.96.

would seem right in supposing Jones "thinking himself into the fabric" of the old Cathedral in the built scheme. However, I suggest the design as built represents a compromised version of the first scheme, resulting from the recognition of the restrictions of existing proportions and use; only Jones's own side additions, the towers, still allowed him to express the circular 'profile' of his first design, which could therefore be retained as independent from such restrictions. Less building work would also seem necessary to the Cathedral face in the second design, with its simpler details and 'frank acceptance' of the old mediaeval gable profile. If this is correct, Jones's 'idealised', triangular 'pre-built' design would represent the same relationship to the actual as Cesariano's design for Milan, for, as Paul Frankl observed, the famous woodcut,

"does not show the real proportions of this building. Nor does it show the numerical adjustment of the equilateral triangle to the necessities of execution by masons who had no yardstick. On the contrary, it elongates the proportions so that we have the ideal proportion of the exact equilateral triangle". 68

Whilst discussing Jones's theatre designs, Orrell has observed such modifications from ideal to real, "to the point where the ordering of the original design was lost". 69 This ideal geometry had obviously also failed to 'fit' the existing conditions of Stonehenge; Aubrey might equally have been talking of St. Paul's when he noted that at Stonehenge Jones "framed the monument to his own Hypothesis" (quoted in the opening section). Certainly, the 'pre-built' design was not forgotten, for elements reappeared internally, and later in Jones's new screen for Winchester Cathedral. 70

Finally, of course, Flitcroft may well be incorrect in his dimensional record of Jones's work, either vertically or (along with Hollar/Wren) horizontally. Indeed he would seem wrong in showing the portico overriding the joint between the old structure and tower, thereby disagreeing with both Hollar's plan and Webb's report. Obviously, the horizontal or vertical

---

70 Harris, J., The Kings Arcadia (1973), p.144; Summerson notes in Inigo Jones (1966), p.126: "It is closely related to elements in the St. Paul's west front design of just thirty years before - so closely that Jones must have been conscious of executing, as it were, a critique of that product of his architectural adolescence".
distortion of 'Flitcroft' to fit with an equilateral triangle is here also revealed. All that can be said for certain about Flitcroft's drawing is the absence of any meaningful use of equilateral triangles, in contrast to the first drawing in Jones's own hand - but that, following this, the points on the outline conform to a circle. Perhaps even this was not actually achieved, and Flitcroft merely records the memory of Jones's circular ideal, or of a second unbuilt geometry. In one of Wren's 'Pre-Fire' sketches, which incorporated Jones's Cathedral, circles seem once again to haunt this section (Fig.78).

Of course, the other church built at the same time by Jones requiring no such compromise was the church at Covent Garden, also St. Paul's. With no new church built in London since the Reformation, upon which surviving 'Protestantised' Romano-British temple might the 'Vitruvius Britannicus' base this first Reformed church? Here we have a simple temple built of the Tuscan Order, like Stonehenge. Indeed, through the Tuscan Summerson "is reminded of his equally astonishing but, in its way, logical attitude to Stonehenge".71 Christopher Chippindale has noted that,

"the Jones restoration of Stonehenge is not only a theory ...[Covent Garden's] proportions follow Vitruvius to the letter, just as Jones believed Stonehenge did...Jones's church...[used] the same Tuscan order and proportions he found in Stonehenge...His...[Stonehenge] shows that same faith in the ancient masters, and a special pleasure in finding in England the classical form so precisely carried out".72

Although a much restored church still stands, in common with the Cathedral there is little accurate evidence to indicate Covent Garden's original proportions. No original drawings by Jones remain, but a drawing by J. Hiort entitled 'Measurements taken before the Restorations in 1788', records the elevation conforming to an equilateral triangle (Fig.64). In this way the church's section is revealed as an equilateral triangle. The earliest scale drawing of the church, Campbell's elevation in Vitruvius Britannicus (1717), although small, is also compatible with an equilateral triangle (Fig.65). Following the logic of the Cathedral, the use of either a circle (in demarcating tower heights - which in this case do not exist) or an inverted triangle (in demarcating the top of an upper Order - which also does not

71 Ibid, p.89.
exist) are meaningless, and indeed cannot be traced. Both porticoes were identical in possessing a wider central intercolumnation, common in ancient temples; Webb reports,

"Search was made in the Royal Quarries of Portland, for to find out an Architrave for the middle intercolumn of the Portico at the Cathedral of St. Paul, which is in Length not fully twelve Foot".  

Unlike Flitcroft and Wren, Hollar's cruder plan and perspective fail to register this wider bay; with the Royal statues to either side, this further stressed the central doorway and altar 'axis', as had the geometric scheme on the earlier design.

In chapter two it was pointed out that Covent Garden became linked to the idea of the Cathedral refacing through constituting a royal processional route. With the Tuscan Order - comprising little St. Paul's - used over the majority of big St. Paul's, in chapter four Jones's 'timber barn' was seen as a 'model' - finished in the same year as building work on the Cathedral began, 1633. This is reinforced by the possibility of both churches embodying a triangular section. And both point to Stonehenge as forming Jones's Idea of a national temple.

From the note in Webb's hand quoted in chapter one we know that Jones's assistant, as 'Clerk engrosser', detailed much of the Cathedral, work which obviously included the new west front. The experiments of this chapter might explain a passing comment by Webb on this Cathedral work in the course of his VINDICATION of Jones's Stonehenge. For in dismissing Dr Charleton's criticisms of Jones's 'scheme' as "but one Doctor's Opinion; for neither Mr. Camden, nor any his so many Gentlemen, it seems, will witness for him any longer", Webb here somewhat sarcastically implies the Doctor's reliance on authors long dead, authors who, he continues, were therefore no more familiar with Jones's triangular scheme at Stonehenge "...than an equilateral Triangle in the Conformation of St. Paul's Cathedral".

---

73  Webb, J., VINDICATION(1725 ed.), p.44.
74  Ibid, p.57.
Chapter Six

The geometry of Albion and Jerusalem; circles, triangles and Cabala

"Six-thousand years was often given as the terminus of historical development in [Dee's]...schemes, so this dating may indicate that Dee associated the realization of a British Empire under Elizabeth's rule with a new age in European history, with himself as the prophetic guide in the fulfilment of providence."

[Clulee, N., John Dee's Natural Philosophy (1988), p.222].

The first part of this thesis has examined the recurring ambition in the 17th Century to restore Jerusalem to Albion through architecture - a common theme in the literature of this period.\(^{75}\) Evidence for this antiquity was discovered at Stonehenge, restored through geometry as the emblem, or groundplot, of 'Albion and Jerusalem'. By embodying this geometry Jones's new Cathedral front might be seen to have become verifiably British in origin.

Further, the notion of the *Idea* was an aspect of Platonic theory, and the British monument's circles and triangles were themselves the universal forms of neoplatonism. For, as chapter four concluded, ancient Britons of Stuart imagination were initiated in the language of Cabala, and, as part of this, Stuart emblems and heraldry found their origin in Egyptian hieroglyphs, understood to signify divine mysteries. In this way Stonehenge conformed to the neoplatonic view of ancient Britain promoted in general in Stuart sermon and masque. Displays of Elizabethan chivalry invariably had a hermetic content, in part through the influence of Raymond Lull's *Book of the Ordre of Chyvalrty*, which had been translated into English by Caxton in 1484.\(^{76}\) At a general level the 'heraldic' Orders, with their Solomonic birth in hermetic lore, might be seen to have expressed this neoplatonic chivalry. This neoplatonism in Jones's work at St. Paul's, as a further element of an antique Britain, will form the subject of part II.

The music which had emanated from the triumphal arches erected to celebrate the inauguration of Stuart rule in 1604 was seen as 'incantatory', conjuring up natural forces that were expected to influence the British King

---


in expressing the wisdom of monarchy.\textsuperscript{77} The final celebration of Stuart rule, Davenant's \textit{Salmacida Spolia} (1640), once again focused on the power of such secret wisdom, a "Tuscan wisdom" (ln.323) unappreciated by the populace but understood by the noble minds of the initiated.\textsuperscript{78} Jones's scene formed "magnificent buildings composed of several selected pieces of architecture, ...the suburbs of a great city" (Ins.452-57), in front of which 'Heavenly Wisdom' performed a dance which echoed nothing less than "the music of the spheres" (ln.468). With such illusions dancing before us, it will become clear that only by invisibly embodying a geometric scheme of such heavenly magic, could Jones's St. Paul's secretly radiate the virtues of such a monarch's wisdom.


PART II:
ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL AND THE CHRISTIAN CABALA
CHAPTER SEVEN

"who is not safe under that shield?"
Neoplatonism and the Cathedral commissioners.
"learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians"; Cabala, ancient Britain and the Stuart Court

"the nymphs of Blackness...include in their revels the world of hermetic philosophy and secret knowledge expressed in hieroglyphs and symbolic names, and thereby relate the King and the court to the most profound sources of Renaissance wisdom".


Chapter four concluded with the picture of Dean Gordon "preaching before the Kinge" from "Cabalisticall collections" - part of his vision of James's Church "approved" by a Church of ancient Britain. The influence of Cabala and Neoplatonism in Elizabethan England, over and above popular magic, has been recognised. Whilst there was never a coherent occult philosophy in the Renaissance, various forms of Cabala in certain hands came to represent the foundations of a religious movement believed compatible with Christianity. For it was thought the 'intelectual magic' outlined by such as Pico della Mirandola, Marsilio Ficino, and later Cornelius Agrippa and Giordano Bruno, recorded the very secrets of nature; indeed, it was hoped that through such divinely inspired knowledge the conditions on earth for nothing less than the second coming would be created.

It was held in popular tradition that the great biblical heroes had themselves been magicians. Adam's knowledge of all the natural elements, although lost at the time of the Fall, had been passed on through Noah to Solomon and ultimately to Moses, "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (*Acts*, ch.vii, v.22). Equated with or taught by Hermes, Moses thus inherited an oral tradition of Hebrew Cabala, or 'Ancient Theology'. The Cabalistic quest traditionally sought this secret knowledge, and instruments with which the recorded miracles of scripture had been performed - Moses's rod, Elisha's ring, David's or Solomon's shield.

---


Following the influences of mediaeval platonism on the fabric, St. Paul's was itself the 'birthplace' in this country of Renaissance neoplatonism and reform. For John Colet, Cathedral Dean from 1504 and builder of the schoolhouse, had a 'sympathetic intimacy' with the writings of Ficino and Mirandola, perhaps meeting both whilst in Florence. When Agrippa visited England in 1510 he was the Dean's guest at St. Paul's; possibly the link was Cabala. A frequent vehicle for Colet's neoplatonism were his sermons within St. Paul's itself. Later both Ficino and Mirandola came to be employed by Elizabethan theologians as support for imperial reform, neoplatonism used to stress the illegitimacy of Rome. However, following Colet, as chapter four concluded such philosophy could also underlie projects for union.

It was this neoplatonic tradition which, according to Dee and Gordon, became centred on Britain, for as has been seen the magical Holy Grail was thought to have found a home in Albion and the British race were considered a chosen people, inheritors of the language of God, or Cabala. Stuart institutions claiming descent from Solomon's Jerusalem, the Garter Knights with their mystic quest, the City Companies with their Solomonic forbears, and the Court and Church itself all, in part, cultivated this hermetic mythology. This was implicit in the rituals of these institutions - a form of 'ceremonial magic', in certain instances with a neoplatonic flavour, for

---


5 See *D.N.B.*, (1937-8 ed.) entry for Colet.

6 Ibid.


8 Colet's lectures on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, begun at Oxford in 1497 and continued at St. Paul's, frequently referred to both Facino and Pico della Mirandola (the *Heptaplus* (1489), for example). These lectures were to have an enormous influence on both Church and King. The old Cathedral housed his monument up to the fire in 1666, Dugdale's *History* (1658), pp.64-65.


which Jones's Cathedral formed a backdrop.11 The annual Lord Mayor's pageant, for example, frequently displayed a neoplatonic strain. The alchemical Elements, Salamander, an Egyptian pyramid and Mercury all featured in the procession of 162012 presenting the 'manifesto' of Sir Francis Jones, the Lord Mayor to serve on the Cathedral restoration committee of that year. Hermetic arts were also studied in the short-lived Court of James's heir, Prince Henry,13 to whom Jones was Surveyor.

However, with the exception of a period entitled the 'Elizabethan Revival in the Jacobean Age', coinciding with Henry's Court, Yates suggested in 1979 that hermetic influences were curtailed by the 'witch scare' which she claims spread through Europe at the end of the 16th Century.14 In 1987 Hugh Trevor-Roper pinpointed a later period, around 1620, as the beginning of the "'mechanical philosophy' which would ultimately eclipse the Hermeticism of the Renaissance".15 In fact, members of the Stuart Court frequently displayed contradictory signs as to their personal enthusiasm or otherwise for the 'occult' sciences.16 James was himself part of this contradictory picture,17

---

11 In generally employing outwardly Catholic symbolism to Puritans Laud's High Church ceremonial naturally carried the flavour of ritual magic. Sir John Eliot thought that Parliament should stand firm against Laudian innovations, "by restricting their ceremonies, by abolishing their sorceries", see Thomas, K., Decline of Magic (1971), p.79. Trevor Davies has given an account of how Laudian ceremonies were mistaken for ritual magic, in Four Centuries of Witch Beliefs (1947), pp.122-4.


16 Yates has pointed out this contradiction, commenting in respect of Jonson's Alchemist that it represented "a most strange phenomenon. [for]...Jonson had himself written the masques in honour of Prince Henry", The Occult Philosophy (1979), p.161.

17 See Yates, F., Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition (1964), p.403: "It was in 1614 that Casaubon's volume containing his critique of the Hermetica was published in England and with a dedication to James I. Three years later the Englishman, Robert Fludd, dedicated to the same monarch the first volume, published in Germany, of his Utriusque cosmi...historia. A more total contrast than that exhibited by these two works, published within a few years of one another and both dedicated to the King of England could hardly be imagined. Casaubon, using humanistic tools on Greek scholarship, had convincingly demolished the early dating of the
fearing the magic of Agrippa\textsuperscript{18} whilst patronising the magic drama of masque. However, perhaps this ambiguity is less surprising if we remember that the Stuarts presided over a key phase in the mathematization of physical concepts - the replacement of the influence of the \textit{Corpus Hermeticum} by a more rationalistic science - with the idea of Bacon's 'Salomon's House' finding physical form in the Royal Society.

When discussing the Royal Society in 1972 Yates had herself accepted the influence of neoplatonism well into the 17th Century.\textsuperscript{19} Keith Thomas has discussed the influence of practical magical in parallel with religion in Britain throughout the 17th Century.\textsuperscript{20} Platonic Christianity - based on the 'Ancient Theology' shorn of some, but not all, of its magical content - flourished in the Stuart period amongst one group of theologians in particular, the Cambridge Platonists.\textsuperscript{21} Indeed, the Elizabethan magic Albion inherited by the Stuart Court was employed to justify the whole period of Stuart rule, not merely one part. This was expressed in the Arthurian fairy legend woven around Prince Henry, and, as has been seen, as late as 1637 in \textit{Britannia Triumphans} the return of "The great devourer of mysterious books", Merlin, was still forecast. With Cabalism thus understood by the Elizabethan and Stuart Courts as a further sign of Albion's status as Jerusalem, the work of each of the main Court members responsible for the Cathedral 'restoration' - the two Stuart Kings, Laud, Buckingham, Bacon and Jones himself - proclaimed to varying degrees the virtues of magic as a 'white' art. What this suggests is that the Stuart 'restoration' of St. Paul's might also have reflected Cabalistic influences - or, at the very least, that those involved might not have been hostile to an architectural scheme reflecting aspects of the so-called 'Ancient Theology'. Jones's work on the Cathedral might thus be seen as

\textit{Hermetica}...Fludd, totally ignoring the new dating...lives in a world in which Casaubon might never have been born...We have, therefore, at about the same time under James I, [1] Casaubon critically exposing Hermes Trismegistus, [2] a survivor from the Elizabethan age, Raleigh, still deeply under the spell, [3] the young Fludd preparing to carry the cause of Hermetism into the new age*.

\textsuperscript{18} Evident in James's \textit{Daemonologie} (1597) in which Agrippa is cited twice, in the Preface and on pp.13-14 (1966 repro., ed. G.B. Harrison).

\textsuperscript{19} Yates, F., \textit{The Rosicrucian Enlightenment} (1972), ch.xiii.


compatible with his longest running interest, work on the neoplatonic drama of masque.22

22 In 1969 Yates’s picture of "Inigo Jones in a New Perspective" was based on hermetic philosophy (Theatre of the World (1969), ch.v, pp.80-91); in 1973 Roy Strong claimed "Jones’s most serious theoretical assumptions about architecture appear in the texts of his masques... neo-Platonic court drama for which his dramatic stage was devised" (Theatre of the Stuart Court (1973), preface); in 1980 Joseph Rykwert associated Jones with Dee (The First Moderns (1980), ch.vi, pp.121-261); in 1981 Graham Parry claimed "ultimately Charles relied on magic...[Jones’s] masque was a beautifully adapted vehicle for [this]" (Golden Age Restor’d (1981), p.202); and, most recently, in 1989 John Bold noted Jones’s "involvement in neo-Platonic doctrine" (John Webb (1989), p.34).
"the ruins of some great city of the ancient Romans or civilised Britons": St. Paul's restoration committee and Cabala

"His perfection likewise is seen in this, that he hath the name of James the sith of Scotland. Sixe being the signe of accomplishment [he is]...called and chosen of God (without any doubt) the sith of Scotland, to be the first, not onely of Great Britaine, but also everie where. Because in this Unitie, the Veritie is founde, who is but Onely One, and as Mercurias Trismegistus saith, The beginning and the roote of All". [Marcelline, G., The Triumphs of King James the First (1610), p.60, p.62]

An aura of 'practical' magic had traditionally surrounded the person of the monarch, for since Edward the Confessor it was supposed that the King possessed a magical power to heal by his sacred touch. Some thought that this miraculous power sprang from the monarch's consecration with holy oil at his coronation, but most regarded the power to cure the 'King's Evil' as an intrinsic quality pertaining to the sacred person of the monarch. Both James and Charles were understood to possess such supernatural powers, and both took part in 'magical' healing ceremonies, performed in Jones's Banqueting House.23 However, the harnessing of natural forces through seemingly magical transformations was most effectively displayed in the masque.

1 The Neoplatonic Court masque and Giordano Bruno. It is now widely recognised that within the Court, neoplatonic philosophy was central to the most important manifestation of Stuart art, the masque24 - as Strong's comment on Blackness forming the epigraph of this chapter indicates. Graham Parry notes that Charles's role in the masque was nothing less that of a "hermetic magus".25 Blackness inaugurated James's rule and a series of masqued presentations of the British Court as a symbol of platonic harmony and concord. Here, together with the plays and poems of the Caroline Court in particular, neoplatonism as a unifying philosophy created a cult of platonic

love centred on the King and Queen. The world of the masque was that of platonic ideals - pure forms which sought to idealise the King, placed as he was at the centre in Jones's stage designs. In this way the Court itself was elevated to the realms of Idea. Against the powers of masque even 'black' magic was useless; in Jonson's *Masque of Queens*, presented before James in 1609, a coven of hags is easily vanquished by 'Virtue'. In the masque Jones presented architecture as the means by which man could be elevated to the knowledge of platonic forms and harmonies realized through perfect proportions. The universal form for this in masque was the circular temple.

Thomas Carew's *Coelum Britannicum* was performed one year after building work on St. Paul's began and, with stage architecture by Jones, was heavily based on Giordano Bruno's *Lo Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante* (1584). Indeed, it is evident that Carew must have had a copy of Bruno's work before him as he wrote. This, as D.P. Walker points out, "at the very least indicates that Bruno was still being read in England in the 1630's". Yates has suggested that Shakespeare's *Loves Labours Lost* may owe a specific debt to Bruno and the identity of the King as heroic lover in *Love's Triumph through Callipolis* suggested to Graham Parry a particular source in Bruno's *Degli Eroici Furori*. In *Coelum Britannicum* Charles was cast as one of the masquers and in this way Bruno came to be directly employed in presenting the King's own view of his place in the Commonwealth. Further, Bruno's work was given a specifically British context, the masque closing on Windsor Castle as chapter three noted and opening with,

**Chapter Seven**

---


27 See Ibid, p.183. Jonson's stage directions in *Love's Triumph Through Callipolis* (1631) make it clear that the king was "the middle person...placed in the centre" (Ins.103-4).


29 The adaptations from Bruno are indicated in detail in the notes to Rhodes Dunlop's edition of the masque, in *The Poems of Thomas Carew* (1948), pp.275-6.


32 Parry, G., *Golden Age Restor'd* (1981), p.186: "This work had been dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney, and so must have had some currency in English circles interested in the platonic philosophy of Love. Jonson himself shows signs of having been influenced by Bruno's comedy *Il Candelaio* in the course of his own career as a comic dramatist".

187
"old arches, old palaces, decayed walls, parts of temples, theatres, basilicas and thermae, with confused heaps of broken columns, bases, cornices and statues, lying as underground, and altogether resembling the ruins of some great city of the ancient Romans or civilised Britons. This strange prospect detained the eyes of the spectators some time, when to a loud music Mercury descends." (Ins.33-39)

James Lees-Milne entitled this scene "a cluster of prehistoric stones obviously suggested by Stonehenge". However, these Romano-British temples and theatres 'of some great city' might equally echo Stuart London, superseded as this view was by a revelation of antique architecture restored. Indeed, it has been seen that, like Stonehenge, Jones's St. Paul's was itself a temple to 'Coelum Britannicum'.

Bruno had visited England between 1584 and 1586. In attempting to forge links with the English Court, his visit influenced a number of prominent Elizabethan Courtiers, including Sir Fulke Greville and Sir Philip Sidney to whom Bruno dedicated his books published in England during this brief stay (the Spaccio is dedicated to Sidney). The dialogues of one of these, the Cena de le Ceneri (1584), purport to describe a supper at Greville's house with Sidney in attendance, at which Bruno disputed with two Oxford doctors concerning a 'Copernican-Hermetic' philosophy. The metaphor of unity is expressed again and again; in the fifth dialogue what has been dry, becomes moist, land becomes sea and sea, land (the alchemical union of opposing elements symbolised by interlocked triangles, Fig.28, Fig.30). Sidney and Greville were liberal and probably receptive to debates on magical and astronomical reform, familiar as both were with Dee. However, Bruno


Bruno's De gli eroici furori (1585) was also published in England and dedicated to Sidney.

Greville's house is the 'spiritual' home for this, for it appears the actual debate took place in the French embassy. See intro. notes to Bruno's The Ash Wednesday Supper (trans. E. Gosselin, L. Lerner, 1977), p.56 n.43.


See intro. notes to Bruno's The Ash Wednesday Supper (trans. E. Gosselin, L. Lerner, 1977), p.40: "Sidney and others mentioned in the dialogue...either were students or friends of Dee, or employed Dee to tutor their children...[all] were familiar with the writings of Hermes". See also Clulee, N., John Dee's Natural Philosophy (1988), p.192.
abhors the effects of the Reformation upon English society in general. Allusions to, and direct condemnation of, contemporary English corruption appear throughout Bruno's 'symbolic' supper, but especially in the second dialogue where old St. Paul's becomes a focus for national decay,

"a miscellany of desperadoes who have fallen into disgrace with their masters,..or those recently escaped from prison, or those who aim to cheat whomever comes to pick them up where they hang out, that is, the columns of the Exchange and the portals of St. Paul's".38

However, Bruno does not leave the Cathedral in this state. When, in the fourth dialogue, one of the disputing Oxford doctors asks where the apogee of the sun lies, Bruno replies that it is anywhere it pleases the doctor to imagine, continuing by asking rhetorically,

"How many are the sacraments of the Church?..[the sun] is about the twentieth degree of Cancer, and the opposition is about the one-hundred-tenth degree of Capricorn, or above the bell-tower of St. Paul's".39

For Yates Bruno's reply becomes the 'key' to his whole message,

"this...indicates, quite openly at last, the real subject of the dispute,...The sun is in Cancer in summer, in Capricorn in winter. Is it summer over the steeple of St. Paul's or winter? Are we in the warmth and light of summer or in the darkness and cold of winter?"40

This would seem to confer a symbolic importance to St. Paul's, the Cathedral becoming for Bruno a national symbol for his neoplatonic mission of unity.

Greville was to have a lifelong involvement with old St. Paul's; a year after Bruno left he organised Sidney's burial at the Cathedral and in 1615 he planned to build a magnificent tomb to contain both Sidney's body and his own. Further, in Dugdale's record of the members of the first commission
we find Greville listed, in his capacity as 'under-Treasurer'. At a time of similar sympathies towards peace and Catholic union, the Court in which Greville now served was at last planning to transform the decayed Cathedral which had formed a symbol for Bruno’s mission forty years before; given the influence of Bruno on Greville and the Stuart Court, perhaps when working with Jones in 1620 he remembered Bruno’s words dedicated to him and involving a golden dawn and a Cathedral in darkness. Greville certainly influenced Jones’s design of the Banqueting House, and had employed Jones to build a house, before 1620. In this the poet would have found natural support from the group which, like himself, most embodied the chivalric-hermetic tradition, the Garter Knights.

2 Neoplatonism and Bacon, Buckingham, Donne, Laud, Jones and Webb. James’s ambiguous feelings towards the virtues of practical magic evident in such as his Daemonologie (1597) were shared by Francis Bacon, who as Lord Chancellor advised in 1620 on refacing St. Paul’s. However, aspects of neoplatonism have been identified in Bacon’s work. In an attempt to gain royal support for his projects, his dedication in The Advancement of Learning (1605) addressed James in hermetic terms,

"your Majesty standeth invested of that triplicity which in great veneration was ascribed to ancient Hermes; the power and

41 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.135.
43 Palme, P., Triumph of Peace (1957), p.54 noted that Greville was "the living embodiment of Elizabethan Humanism…chosen by virtue of [his]…offices at Court,…stressed because it gives us the key to the functional programme of the building".
44 Certain branches of magic are considered 'white', see for example p.13 on 'Astronomy' "not onelie lawful, but most necessarie and commendable", and 'Astrology' referred to as “not unlawful” (1966 repro., ed. G.B. Harrison). For a discussion of this work see Clark, S., 'King James's Daemonologie: Witchcraft and Kingship', in Anglo, S., (ed.), The Damned Art (1977).
45 See Fisch, H., Jerusalem and Albion (1964), pp.84-85.
fortune of a King, the knowledge and illumination of a Priest, and the learning and universality of a Philosopher".47

James's cultivation of the role of 'Philosopher King'48 itself originated in platonic doctrine. Behind Bacon's mythic 'House of Solomon' was Solomon's temple, and hence a Solomon initiated in the 'secret motions of things' might be seen as central to the work of a leading member involved with Jones's Cathedral work.49

Bacon had a full knowledge of what became an occult art involving architecture, artificial memory.50 Aubrey's life of Bacon records one of the few evidences of the actual design of a building for use in artificial memory, Aubrey relating that in Bacon's house, Gorhambury, there were windows "with several figures of beast, bird and flower: perhaps his Lordship might use them as Topiques for Local memorie".51 Bacon's essay Of Building, a description of a perfect palace, was written with reference to Cicero's De Oratore52 - in which buildings used as memory places were described. This may have some importance when considering Bacon's influence on Jones's design for St. Paul's, revealing as it does how he saw one of the occult 'uses' of architecture.

Amongst the most important members of the 1620 committee was the Duke of Buckingham. Buckingham was cast as Mercury-Hermes53 in Gerrit van Honthorst's emblematic painting Apollo and Diana (Fig.81).54 In this

49 Bacon had a personal interest in St. Paul's, for it housed the tomb of his father, Sir Nicholas, Dugdale, W., History (1658), pp.70-71.
53 Buckingham was frequently associated with Mercury-Hermes, see Parry, G., Golden Age Restor'd (1981), p.144. In Rubens's 'The Duke of Buckingham Conducted to the Temple of Virtus' (1625-7) Buckingham is borne heavenwards by Mercury.
54 For a discussion of this picture see Miller, O., 'Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck', Burlington Magazine (1954), pp.36-41.
official composition, suggestive of a masque, Mercury introduces the Liberal Arts to Apollo and Diana (the King and Queen). Honthorst presents Buckingham at the head of a train of allegorical figures, each carrying the instruments of their magic art - globes, armillary spheres, compasses, navigational devices and musical instruments, the first figure holding a book with the original alphabet which Mercury-Hermes was thought to have composed. One reading of this picture is as a celebration of the Stuart Court's mastery of the knowledge of which Mercury was by tradition the patron, neoplatonism. This was indeed how one contemporary poem interpreted the scene; for *Felton Commended*, in celebrating the Duke's assassin, presented Honthorst's picture bound up with a conspiracy of magic frequently levelled at Buckingham.\(^55\)

"IMMORTALL man of glorie, whose brave hand,
Hath once begun to disinchaunt our land
From magique thraldome...
The cunning Houndhurst must transported bee,
To make him the restorer Mercurie
In an heroick painting".\(^56\)

Honthorst's painting was linked to Jones's architecture, intended as it was for above the dais to his Banqueting House.\(^57\)

The work of certain leading members of the Church reflected neoplatonic influences. One such was John Donne, Dean from 1621 and close friend of Jones.\(^58\) As Dugdale records, the Dean traditionally had responsibility for the maintenance of part of the fabric (sharing with the Chapter responsibility for the choir) whilst the Bishop of London had care of "the whole body" of the church.\(^59\) Through his sermons, St. Paul's became the 'setting' for Donne's

\(^{55}\) Buckingham was frequently identified during his life with the practice of magic. About the time of the formation of the Cathedral commission, for example, he resorted to magic in an attempt to cure the mental disease of his brother, Lord Purbeck. See Davies, R.T., *Four Centuries of Witch Beliefs* (1947), p.92.


\(^{57}\) Reported as intended for the Banqueting House by Honthorst's assistant, Joachim von Sandrart; see Palme, *Triumph of Peace* (1957), p.263.

\(^{58}\) See Bald, R.C., *John Donne, a life* (1970), pp.191-198. Both appear to have been members of the same 'club'.

'New Philosophy', involving what has been identified as the use of imagery derived from neoplatonism, Copernican astronomy and Paracelsian and Hippocratean medicine.\(^6^0\) During 1618 he was closely involved with Jones's design for a new chapel at Lincoln's Inn, similarly conceived as a 'setting' for his sermons,\(^6^1\) and, as a "gate of Heaven", an offering equivalent to that made by Solomon in building his temple.\(^6^2\) Indeed, a constant theme of Donne's sermons around 1620 was the idea of the British Solomon re- edifying the temple in his new Jerusalem.\(^6^3\)

As chapter four concluded, in stressing a shared past with Rome the 'Laudian' movement might naturally have found sympathetic hermetic ecumenism stemming from such as Dee and Bruno. Walker has pointed out that the irenic intentions of the 'Christian Platonist' Herbert of Cherbury were orchestrated through a brand of the 'Ancient Theology' stemming from Campanella and Bruno,\(^6^4\) and the influence of Herbert on Laud has been noted. Whilst William Laud was in no sense a 'magician', he has been shown to have held beliefs stemming from the practical 'magical' traditions of his day.\(^6^5\) In Astrology prayer could, according to Laud, overcome even the dire effects of a conjunction of Saturn and Mars, since God could hinder malign aspects and overrule conjunctions.\(^6^6\) Astrology was, of course, a popular subject of the time - that Jones was also influenced by astrology is attested by the last annotation in his 'Palladio'.\(^6^7\) During the early 17th

---


\(^{64}\) See Walker, D.P., *The Ancient Theology* (1972), ch.v.


\(^{67}\) "Out of Hipocrates his fisitious ffeare from the 25 of September unto ye 13 of May, but his comenter saith to the 24 of Junne, to youse Venus". Astrology featured in Vitruvius, bk.ix ch.vi and in his copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', against Barbaro bk.i ch.i ln.1, p.21 Jones notes "what youse Astrology guditiary may have in architecture". The third book of Jones's 1575 edition of Piccolomini's *Della institution morale* discussed astrology, ch.xviii p.166. Astrology was, however, not necessarily neoplatonic, see Clulee, N., *John Dee's Natural Philosophy* (1988), pp.71-72.
Century the Bible and Psalter continued to play an important part in popular divination, with both Charles and Laud consulting passages - often at random - as a source of divine message. Laud's diary for 25th January, 1623, notes,

"It was Sunday...I took into my hands the Greek Testament...I lighted upon the xiii. chapter to the Hebrews; wherein that of David, Psal. lvi., occurred to me then grieving and fearing: 'The Lord is my helper: I will not fear what man can do unto me'. I thought an example was set to me; and who is not safe under that shield?"

The 'shield of David' was interpreted not just as arms but was widely held to provide magic protection. Indeed, it is this very 'shield' - the geometric scheme of chapter six - which possibly 'protected' Laud's Cathedral, resting place for David's Ark of the true faith (thought as it was to contain the secrets of nature) which James as the 'new David' now 'Defended'.

With its origins in Catholicism, the Cathedral fabric itself inevitably became implicated in the general contemporary branding of Catholicism as "meere Magique". The refacing was often dismissed by Puritans as folly on the grounds of superstition - a popular song of 1620 noted "The purelinges of the Citty... / Doe hould it for a great offence, / To repaye a church with such expence / That hath beene superstitious all her youth". Following Solomon's foundation of his temple (I Kings ch.viii), the fabric is celebrated embodying a form of 'magic' in the consecration ceremony itself; with the time of enactment dictated by astrology, these ceremonies frequently evoked notions of ritual magic. The Elizabethan separatist, Henry Barrow, observed that the consecration consisted of "certaine magical praiers, and holy


water, . . . within also all the holy armie of saintes and angels in their windowes and walles, to keep it". 74 Prynne quoted Foxe when presenting such ceremonies as "Superstitious, Jewish, Popish . . . rather a conjuration then a consecration", 75 continuing that Laud "needs must introduce this Popish Innovation, not onely at Hammersmith, but even at the Cathedrall of Pauls it self". 76 Such a 'Jewish conjuration' consecrating Jones's work might further hint at a geometry of interlocked triangles.

In his Barbaro 'Vitruvius' Inigo Jones notes "what an Architect is according to Plato". 77 Implied in chapter two was the notion that Jones inherited the understanding prevalent in neoplatonic lore of Solomon's temple as the birthplace of Masonry and the Orders. Following John Dee's inclusion of architecture within his famous 'Mathematical preface' to Henry Billingsley's Euclid (1570), the influence of neoplatonism on architecture can be easily traced in Wotton's Elements 78 - reflecting as it does what Rykwert has termed Wotton's "Vitruvian Neoplatonism". 79 Through employing mathematics many 'technical' aspects of architecture naturally had an 'occult' content, as Dee implied, for mathematics and geometry were widely utilised in mechanics as a form of practical magic 80 - found, for example, in Wilkins's Mathematicall MAGICK, Or The Wonders that may be performed by Mechanicall Geometry (1648). Compatible with hermetic mythology in which Euclid was initiated in the secrets of the Egyptian geometry, circles and triangles as platonic norms were frequently represented in alchemical and neoplatonic texts (Figs. 27-33). Following the Florentine intermezzi and


76 Ibid, p.126.

77 Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', against Barbaro bk.i ch.i p.6.

78 Wotton acknowledges the origin of hermetic arts, "the auncient Hebrewes and Phenicians (whence all knowledge did flow)" p.75, and the "schoole of Pythagoras, (where it was a fundamentall Maxime, that the images of all things are latent in Numbers)" p.53. Wotton refers to "Albert Durers Geometry" p.50, p.95, p.105, and to Tycho Brahe, finding strange gardens "where the starres might be observed even at noone" p.113.


French Ballet, it seems likely that geometric figures of magic import were themselves the 'groundplot' of the English masque; and "The figure icosahedron of crystal" (ln.55) was used to form one of the magic emblems within Blackness.

Jonson’s presentation of the alchemist in 1610 as an 'illusionary trickster' echoes through his famous later mockery of Jones, both bound up in his general attack on Renaissance magic. For example, in the disguise of the military Cook in Neptune's Triumph (1624) Jonson continues by making Jones know,

"The influence of the stars upon his meats;
And all their seasons, tempers, qualities,...
He 'as nature in a pot! 'bove all the chemists,
Or bare-breeched brethren of the Rosy-Cross!
He is an architect" (Ins.78-83).

Here Jonson would seem to present Jones in descent from Dee on the Vitruvian subjects.

In the end the sponsorship of such 'illusory', 'white' magic as perspective and automatia led to the triumph of masque and its setting, the proscenium arch derived from Serlio, over the ancient form of actors' theatre. This represented a triumph of Jones over Jonson and was the sense, perhaps, of Shakespeare's silence in his final years after The Tempest (1612) and Prospero's inexplicable final despondency in lamenting "the baseless fabric of this vision". It follows that the argument between Jonson and Jones, focussed as it was on a battle between word and picture, ancient and modern theatre, was a direct product of the Dee version of the Vitruvian subjects which formed the architect's - and not the poet's - native inheritance. Jonson saw himself as an inheritor of the ancient theatre, an image of which headed the frontispiece to the 1616 edition of his plays. A symptom perhaps of this Renaissance shift in emphasis from word to picture is the relative 'relegation' of the ancient theatre plan to the exclusive realms of imagination.

---

81 See, for example, Strong, R., Art and Power (1984), plates 44-49.
used, for example, in silent mnemonic systems and by Jones at Stonehenge. Thus removed from its original context, this general application of Vitruvius's theatre plan implies a consequent loss of original meaning, allowing Jones to imagine Stonehenge's theatre plan as a general "Architectonicall Scheme" suggestive of a temple, without explicitly acknowledging its theatrical source - and its general application, perhaps, elsewhere in his work. This further hints at a level of inauthenticity, or superficiality, in line with the 'theatrical' Orders and 'stage-sets' of chapter two.

The last of Jonson's entertainments for royalty, *Love's Welcome at Bolsover* (1634), formed the last of his attacks on Jones - characterised in 'Cornell Vitruvius', or, more obviously still, 'Iniguo Vitruvius'. In this, the architect entertained the King and Queen with the "Dance of Mechanickes" (In.36),

They begun to Dance "Well done, my Musickall, Arithmetical, Geometricall Gamesters! or rather my true Mathematicall Boyes! It is carried, in number, weight, and measure, as if the Aires were all Haramonie, and the Figures a well-tim'd Proportion!" (Ins.67-70)

Indeed, chapter six outlined just such an all-consuming "Geometricall" design, an emblem of Solomon in which "the Figures a well-tim'd Proportion"; "number, weight, and measure", in echoing standard platonic doctrine, found origin in Solomon's comment that God had "ordered all things by measure and number and weight" (*Wisdom* ch.xi, v.12). In this 'dance' Jonson implicates Jones in the general trend of the Renaissance whereby the mystical and numerological grounds for the use of number and geometry in building gave way to the more functional, dictatorial role of geometry. 85 This might be seen reflected in the scheme at Stonehenge and St. Paul's, based not on the module derived from an individual column, following Vitruvius, but on an overall geometry (much like the fortification designs Jones studied). Here, in common with later 'scientific buildings', the column becomes subserviant to an all-consuming geometry, rather than the column itself being the 'module' generating the whole. Incidentally, later in the century and in Italy 'Solomon's seal' was itself used as a structural

system in the presbitery dome to San Lorenzo (1668) in Turin, by Guarino Guarini (Fig. 39).

As a parody of the Renaissance form of mechanical theatre, the basis of antique theatre design, Pythagorean harmony, was now used to construct a temple to a new, mechanical music,

"O Captaine Smith! our Hammer-armed Vulcan! with your three Sledges, you are our Musique, you come a little too tardie; but wee remit that, to your polt-foot, we know you are lame" (Ins. 49-52).

Jonson pictures the architect's modern Pythagoras as a disabled shadow of his former self. This is reminiscent of Robert Fludd's contemporary 'Temple of Music', an emblem within his artificial memory, which pictured the discovery by Pythagoras of universal harmony beat out through the hammer of the smith. Now pictured on a silent stage, Fludd's Pythagoras can be seen as a mirror image of what Jonson attacked; the work of both Jones and Fludd is an outcome of the death of Pythagorean harmony which reverberated within the poet's ancient theatre. Jones is presented by Jonson organising the modern building team, a parody of his position as King's 'Surveyor' and head of building work on such as St. Paul's, work on which had begun the year before,

"Master Maul, our Free-Mason; Squire Summer, our Carpenter, and Twybil his Man; stand you foure, there, i' the second ranke, worke upon that ground...in the name of your Iniquo Vitruvius. Hay for the Lilly, for, and the blended Rose" (Ins. 56-76).

The rose and lily obviously refer to the King and Queen, rose of England, lily of France - but given the object of satire and Jonson's dislike of magic, a further pun may also have been intended against Jones's "name". For the lily in combination with the rose was a traditional emblem for the magician, especially in the Tarot pack. 86

Certainly one member of Jones's Cathedral building team, John Webb, was well versed in, and sympathetic towards, hermetic philosophy. Following his reference to an equilateral triangle in the design, or

---

86 Discussed by John Fowles in The Magus (1977), p. 477: "The magician...conjuror. Two of his traditional symbols are the lily and the rose"; see also traditional Tarot illustrations.
'Conformation' of St. Paul's, Webb made a further reference to triangles, this time in his only other work to that on Stonehenge, entitled *An HISTORICAL ESSAY Endeavoring a Probability that the LANGUAGE of the Empire of CHINA is the Primitive LANGUAGE* (1669),

"Among these sort of Books is extant one called *Yeking* of great Antiquity, and of as great esteem for the *Arcana* it contains. This Book seems much to confirm the opinion of those, that would have the Inscription at *Persepolis* more antient than the Flood. For, as *This* in *Persia* consists only in Triangles several ways transversed: So *That* in *China* consists only of streight lines several ways interrupted. It treats especially of Judicial Astrology, Politique Government, and occult Philosophy". 87

Here linked triangles become expressly connected to an "occult Philosophy". Webb even traced the origins of "*Mercurius Tres-Megistus*, whom the Greeks called *Hermies*..."

"Two of them were famous in *Ægypt*, and there worshipped as Gods. The One...was the son of *Hylus*, whose name saith *Boccase*, the *Ægyptian* feared to utter, as the *Jews* did their *Tetragrammaton*, the other was the son of this *Tres-Megistus*, and for his wisdom by his father called *Cath". 88

Webb tells us the Egyptians made use of hieroglyphics - including "points, circles" - "to keep their Arcana *Theologiae & Imperii* sealed up", 89 secrets held only by the priests and ministers of state. It has been seen that this search for the 'primitive language' and study of Egyptian hieroglyphs and Chinese characters formed an essential subject of Cabalism. In this Jones's assistant constantly consulted the work of the great hermetic philosopher Anthanasius Kircher, for whom interlocked triangles also held magic powers. 90

---


89 Ibid, p.152.

A Pythagorean temple; from background Cabala to Ordered Scheme

"one could - and I hope this will happen - go on to apply the ensuing ideas to other types of buildings besides palaces".

[Hersey, G.L., *Pythagorean Palaces* (1976), Preface]

Despite the recognition of Jones as heir to the 'Dee' tradition in his work on masque, little attempt has been made to trace neoplatonism in Jones's buildings themselves, following the general ignorance of an 'ancient British' theme in architecture. These buildings embodied, perhaps, some of the ideas of G.L. Hersey's Italian 'Pythagorean Palaces'; Jones would have seen the Pythagorean proportional scheme outlined in his copy of 'Alberti' (bk.ix, ch.v), for example, and in his 'Scamozzi' Jones notes the network of lines proportioning the palace plans. Indeed, the influence of aspects of Cabalism itself, as a contemporary religious philosophy, might be expected on ecclesiastical buildings such as St. Paul's. In a general study of Jones's architecture in 1967, Gordon Toplis claimed that Platonic-Pythagorean cosmology was "to characterise the philosophy of the first, and perhaps the last, of the English architects to practise in this tradition". Toplis asserted that mediaeval platonism inevitably influenced Jones's work, evidenced by the marginalia to his books and harmonic 'modular' ratios in the Banqueting House and Queen's House, Greenwich. Following Wittkower, in 1973 Toplis further suggested ratios existed "in general...[at] St Paul's Cathedral, St Paul's, Covent Garden". However, whilst acknowledging sources outside the work of Palladio, Toplis's thesis remains somewhat inconclusive.

Following Agrippa's stay at the Cathedral in 1510, with St. Paul's placed at the centre of Bruno's vision in 1584 hermetic interests have been detected in the main promoters of the later Cathedral 'restoration' and in the Stuart Court in general - neoplatonism central to Stuart art forms such as the

---


94 Although Palladio himself, like Alberti, was naturally influenced by the Pythagorean-Platonic philosophy.
masque and identifiable in pictures such as that by Honthorst. This provides a background to an interpretation of the main evidence of this preliminary Cathedral work, the undated drawing of chapter six, and its ordering geometry constituting Laud's 'protective' shield and Jones's "Architectonical Scheme".

As chapter five pointed out, this geometry is to be found in the middle of Jones's *STONE-HENG Restored*, following arguments rejecting all but a national Vitruvian ancestry for the stones. Jones concludes by offering an interpretation of his scheme, physically restoring this Romano-British honour. Following the order of presentation adopted by Jones himself, the next chapter will illustrate that Jones's geometry and subsequent interpretation drew, like Carew, from the Dee and Bruno tradition, neoplatonism informing what Jones thought he had found at Stonehenge and what he attempted to refound at St. Paul’s. Jones’s 'Ordered' Stonehenge and St. Paul's, in both embodying the geometric scheme of Albion and Jerusalem, become further linked, as joint emblems of Solomon's 'Christian' magic.
CHAPTER EIGHT

"Dee in his Mathematicall Preface...the West end of S. Pauls"
Stonehenge, St. Paul's and the magic of Solomon.
Inigo Jones's Stonehenge and 'Christian' Cabala

"That he is the Common Father of all his people, ordering all his affections in an equall partage, like unto the Geometricall point, which beholdeth all his circumference in one & the same proportion. Answerable to the Sun, which shineth equally upon all...Or like unto the Palme-tree, which distributeth his nourishment to his leaves and branches, even as if it were by just weight & measure...wee may collect the marvailous effects of Musick by Instruments, ful of high and hidden mysteries, if we may give credit to the Hebrewes Cabala, and the very leanest Rabines. For this Harpe of MY KING is made in a triangle, having ten strings, which being touched above, doe resound beneath, and deliver such an acceptable mellody, as it pierceth all the Celestiall Spheares, even by sanctified desires, conceived to the honour of God, and it traverseth all Countries of the whole world, for the defence and support of all Kings, Princes, and Commonweales of Christendome. Such are the accents of this misticall symphony, and the lofty tunes of the Diapenthes, Diatessarous, and Diapasons of our Royall Harpe".


Chapter six brought to visibility just such a possible 'hidden' circle and triangle in Jones's first design for the Cathedral's new west front, an order which constituted an emblem of Solomon and a link with Stonehenge. Since this experimental, geometric overlay sprang from Jones's own geometric overlay at Stonehenge, his explanation of this Idea might also suggest a reading of his designs for the facade to St. Paul's; STONE-HENG Restored, in other words, might provide an explanation of Jones's Idea of a 'restored' St. Paul's Cathedral.¹

The second half of STONE-HENG Restored echoes much that was standard hermetic teaching, Jones observing that it was "the Egyptian Antiquities, or those Eastern Nations from whom the Grecians deduced their learning".² This chapter traces the influence of this hermetic philosophy, or


² Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.65.
Cabala, on Jones's Stonehenge and Cathedral - an influence further linking both. With the ancient Britons initiated in Cabala, the more specific object is to illustrate that Jones's geometric 'scheme' became an emblem for this British Cabalism, as Mercelline implies, thus further uniting Jones's restored St. Paul's with the restored magic Albion prophesied in sermon and masque and found at Stonehenge.
From 'Gothic' to 'Renaissance'; Inigo Jones, the Cathedral mason

"But Solomon his son it was, who having received a pattern from his Father David...began and perfected that glorious work (a spectacle of admiration to all the world) in which were imployed thirty thousand Carpenters (Sc. ten thousand every month by course), eighty thousand Masons in the mountain, and seventy thousand labourers that bore burthens, besides three thousand three hundred Masters of his work".

It is with these words that William Dugdale introduced his record of the work on the Cathedral, The History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London (1658), the building of Solomon's temple presented as a triumph of masonic workmanship. Following the 'masonic' foundation (quoted in chapter four), Dugdale further reports,

"a great part of the Church-yard paled in, for Masons to work in;...an order was signed...to Inigo Jones Esquire...to cause the Inclosures and Scaffoldings to be set in hand".3

The Works accounts for April, 1633 note the payment of carpenters "for making of a Lodge for the Masons" (a structure 92 foot by 10 foot intended as night storage for tools).4 In chapter three Henry Farley was quoted presenting the task of the Cathedral workforce as nothing less than a restoration of the Jewish temple. Jones's masons5 were thus linked to a legend which had become a vital part of the neoplatonic quest, in succession to mediaeval craft legend. For with Solomon's temple the 'birthplace' of architectural Order, the rules of antique architecture and those of stonemasonry became part of the Divine secrets given to Solomon which had been 'rediscovered'. The geometry of the temple was itself thought to embody this ancient wisdom. Commentators have noted that there may have been links between masons and 'Rosicrucian' alchemists, the lore of both

3 Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.139.
4 Guildhall MS. 25, 471 W.A.1.
5 For lists of names of Masons employed at various stages see Ibid, W.A 1-15. Edmund Kinsman was the mason principally employed. In recasting the nave, the chief masons were Thomas Style, William Mason, Thomas Steevens, John Moore. See Colvin, H., (ed), History of the King's Works (1963), vol.iii, pp.150-1. See also Knoop, D., Jones, G., The Genesis of Freemasonry (1947), p.114, p.125.
claiming Solomon and Hermes as patrons;\textsuperscript{6} chapter seven quoted Jonson presenting Jones as in charge of both "Master Maul, our Free-Mason" and the "bare-breeched breathren of the Rosy-Cross". Indeed, to Jones's workforce the old Cathedral itself would have represented a triumph of mediaeval masonry and its craft mysteries; according to Lethaby, the most distinguished mason working in the middle of the 14th Century, the King's Mason William de Ramsey, worked on the Cathedral.\textsuperscript{7} In the light of this, and with the old Cathedral equally a monument of mediaeval chivalry, it may have been more than just expense which prevented demolition and the building of a new Cathedral.

Jones's refacing, with its Solomonic purpose and large, settled workforce may have been instrumental in encouraging the London development of masonry as an institution, after a period of building decline, and hence, perhaps, a step towards Freemasonry. Craft rituals might easily have been encouraged by association with those of the church, as indeed the foundation ceremony suggests; although Freemasonry probably originated in Scotland,\textsuperscript{8} Ashmole joined an English Lodge of 'speculative' masons as early as 1646.\textsuperscript{9} In any case, when placing Jones's refacing at the centre of a masonic workforce, Dugdale and Farley suggest a further 'Solomonic' context for an interpretation of the west front ordered by 'Solomon's seal'

Stonemasonry and geometry were equated in the craft legend of the masons.\textsuperscript{10} In representing one of the basic propositions of Euclid (Fig.34), the use of the equilateral triangle in the 'conformation', as Webb put it, of Cathedral proportions was hardly new. As chapter six pointed out, the mediaeval mason frequently used \textit{ad quadratum} - formed by the circle and square - or \textit{ad triangulum} - formed by the equilateral triangle when setting out and measuring buildings. Both were established practices of masons of

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{7} Lethaby, W., \textit{The Builder}, Sept.5.
\end{thebibliography}
which Jones must have had knowledge and in which his building workforce had been trained.11 Such geometry served both a functional basis for setting out and a symbolic purpose. George Lesser, in Gothic Cathedrals and Sacred Geometry (1957), observed that Gothic churches were "an embodiment of abstract geometric formations which are identifiable with mythic buildings - the temple of Solomon, the Holy Sepulchre, the Heavenly Jerusalem".12 Lesser illustrates 'Solomon's seal' ordering the Temple Church, London, Santa Costanza, Rome, the Round Temple, Tivoli and the Philippeon, Olympia (Fig.40). Paul Frankl has traced the equilateral triangle in the plan and elevations of the Cathedrals of Chartres, Reims, Amiens, Cologne and Beauvais.13

The figure can also be found in mediaeval iconography at Bury St. Edmund's, Westminster Abbey14 and Siena Cathedral, for example (Fig.39). Equilateral triangles form tracery in Hollar's views of old St. Paul's, although the hazy dimensional record makes it impossible to determine whether the mediaeval Cathedral itself was governed by ad triangulum. However, like the workforce, triangular geometry would seem at least 'compatible' with the mediaeval Cathedral. Moreover, since the existing facade provided the underlying structure for the unbuilt design, when tracing the upright triangle the 'imprint' of the old facade may also be revealed, as an obligation the existing foundations and height imposed on Jones's new work - although the 'ideal' proportions of the earlier design differ from the record of Jones's built design, as chapter six discussed. With little public building work having been undertaken during Elizabeth's reign, the traditions surrounding country house construction formed Jones's most immediate architectural 'inheritance' - domestic buildings15 (Fig.42) which, like their gardens, were frequently ordered

---

11 On the relationship between Jones and his masons see Knoop and Jones, Ibid, p.126.
14 In a pavement, see Malcolm, J.P., Londinium Redivivum (1802), vol.i, p.89.
15 The Triangular Lodge at Rushton (1597) forms an equilateral triangle, 'Solomon's seal' ordered a house plan by John Thorpe, and the plan of Chilham Castle, built by the hermeticist Sir Dudley Digges in 1616, consists of three main blocks whose central axes form the sides of an equilateral triangle.
around geometric schemes, or 'devices'. Common amongst these was the circle containing triangles. In this spirit Thomas Browne, in *The Garden of Cyrus* (1658), claimed to have discovered a 'net-work' comprised of circles and equilateral triangles in the garden of Eden. These devices were often concealed, as Geoffrey Whinney in *A Choice of Emblems* (1586) noted when defining an emblem as

"having some wittie device expressed with cunning woorkemanship, something obscure to be perceived at the first, whereby, when with further consideration it is understood, it maie the greater delighte the behoulder".  

After the building of the Queen's House Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton, "yt is said to be some curious device of Inigo Jones".

The 'Shield of David' - as a shield - was frequently represented as a heraldic device; its use in heraldry (signifying the tribes of Israel) spreading from Prague to the Jewish communities of Eastern Europe. Implied in this study is the notion that the 'Shield of David' became such a heraldic sign, like the Orders, proclaiming James's royal 'hebrew' ancestry. Such a shield would have reinforced, as it had for David, James's title as 'Defender of the Faith' (which the portico inscription itself later proclaimed). As heraldry this geometry expressed James's title - a hexagon James's 'six', a circle the 'unity' of Scotland with England and a triangle the 'triple' British crowns. Gordon, in 1604, had urged that

---


19 Quoted by Ibid, p.28.


Indeed, the heraldic composition resulting from James's Union was presented by Marcelline in terms of a triumph of Pythagorean numerology and 'mystical' geometry, including a pentagon.\(^{23}\) 'Solomon's seal' (in this case a pentagon)\(^{24}\) was used as a heraldic device in the anonymous *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (C.1400). Opening in Trojan and Arthurian Britain, Gawain's five knightly virtues were symbolised by the five pointed star painted on a shield,

"Then they schewed him the schelde, that was of schyre goules
With the pentangel depaynt of pure gold hewes;...
Hit is a syngne that Salamon set sumwhyle
In bytoknyng of trauthe by tytle that hit habbes" (Ins.620-625)

With 'Solomon's seal' used as a common mediaeval mason's mark\(^{25}\) and with the mediaeval Masons' Company emblem (interlocked square and compass) echoing 'Solomon's seal',\(^{26}\) in this geometry might be found further support for the statement made in chapter three that 'through the Orders St. Paul's can be seen dressed in the Masons' own heraldry'. For in combination the Orders themselves form this geometry. Certainly, as has been seen, the mythology of these 'new' Orders came to assume the Solomonic ancestry claimed by mediaeval stonemasons and traditionally expressed through this

---


23 Marcelline, G., *Triumphs* (1610), pp.31-33, p.52: "Eight, composed of this Royall unity of *Our Lyon*, and of the *English Septeuyery*, doth make up the Armories perfect in all their measures: also by this fair mixture of numbers, that sweet harmony is made, which entertaineth and preserveth the whole kingdom in good peace and quietnesse...That verily, and in effect, by all the periods and paralelles of his life, this is *Jacob*, according to the Hebrewes, and *James* in *Scottish*, the *Pentaphyllon*, or the name of five Letters, bearing the worde uyEix. The *Pentagon*, in former time Mysteriously revealed to king *Antiochus*, sur-named the Saviour, for the saving and conservation of his people".


sign. Bacon has been linked to an early use of this emblem in the context of Freemasonry at Canonbury Manor,\textsuperscript{27} of significance, perhaps, to his involvement in the 1620 restoration committee.

As we picture Jones tracing the Orders over the 'device' formed by our geometric lines - constructed lines which guide the freehand we see he used - a working method of this 'mason-architect' might be revealed. For what emerges is the suggestion that Jones was using Gothic geometry as a way of setting out the new stonework, a method of triangulation familiar to the mediaeval trained masons and the traditions of the Masons' lodge within which Jones must have worked. For in his early role as Surveyor to Prince Henry Jones would have inherited many of the methods of a mediaeval 'Surveyor' - of Elizabethan builders such as Robert Adams, John Symonds and Robert Stickells,\textsuperscript{28} Jones's setting out of the ancient stone monument on Salisbury plain certainly embodied \textit{ad triangulum}.\textsuperscript{29} That geometry was erased (or 'hidden', as elsewhere in Jones's work) at St. Paul's would be compatible with the secretive, oral working traditions of the mediaeval Masons' lodges.\textsuperscript{30} Hence, whilst the triangular scheme embodied Renaissance neoplatonic theory to the initiated, on a practical level it would have been naturally understood as a mediaeval working method - as the Renaissance modular system of proportions would not have been. In this way the Orders might be seen overlaid onto mediaeval masonry practice (and mythology), as pattern book iconography\textsuperscript{31} tied together by earlier methods. This echoes in the title to Serlio's fourth book, 'Rules for Masonry, or Building with Stone or Bricke, made after the five maners or orders of Building...and some devices of the Author' (one of which is 'Solomon's seal' (Fig.41)); indeed the modular system is not explained by Serlio. Following the work of Yates and Orrell, it would seem certain that it was these

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid, ch.52.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Allan Cunningham in 1831 noted that Jones's "attempt to penetrate into the mystery of Stonehenge" was by virtue of his mastery of "the secrets of ancient masonry", \textit{The Lives of the most Eminent British Painters, Sculptors and Architects} (1831), vol.iv, p.106.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Rykwert notes that up until Jones the "new learning" which the Orders represented "was externally applied, out of books, by virtuosi or 'architects'', \textit{The First Moderns} (1980), p.137.
\end{itemize}
traditional masons' practices which governed the setting out of the first 'Roman' buildings in London, the public theatres; Serlio adapted ad quadratum to his theatre illustrations.  

Whilst discussing Jones's theatre designs Orrell has observed that "for all the gothicism of its roots and its ubiquity in medieval design, Inigo Jones employed...[ad quadratum]." In line with the influence of existing building techniques on Brunelleschi and Alberti, what emerges is a picture of Jones as the mediaeval mason, not just the 'British Vitruvius'.

This ambiguity might be seen to echo in Jonson's rebuke of Jones - as a parody of the craftsman of old. Jones's workforce seem traditional, but as chapter seven pointed out, in Love's Welcome at Bolsover now dance to a new tune. Here Jones's all consuming geometrical designs might be seen presented as a corruption of the traditional work of the 'Surveyor' - and in so doing, perhaps, heralding the more rationalistic age.

Jones's lifetime spanned the transition in this country from a Gothic to a Renaissance architectural vocabulary, a change dramatically expressed in the act of Cathedral refacing itself. To outward appearances Gothic and Renaissance iconography would seem as opposites. However, concealed resolutions can be detected through an emblematic, working geometry the vitality of which spanned both traditions. Such geometry had, after all, been proposed by Cesariano at Milan Cathedral whilst attempting just such a harmonising of 'antique' Order with Gothic parts; as Frankl points out, "in emphasizing the equilateral triangle,...[Cesariano] taught an antique heritage in the disguise of Gothic tradition, as an architect of the High Renaissance", and Wittkower notes Cesariano's plates "demonstrated the validity of Late Gothic geometry...within a classical Vitruvian system". In

---


linking St. Paul's to the Banqueting House and Covent Garden, Rykwert comments that Jones was

"the agent through whom the old craft-mysteries were translated into the new Scamozzian and Neoplatonic terms...shared with Wotton and with Dee's heirs. It is at this time that speculative masonry appeared in the lodges...The monument in which some of these ideas and events were summed up was Inigo Jones' heroic refacing of old St. Paul's". 37

Chapter two examined the medieavale attempts to reconstitute the temple of Solomon. This geometry might represent one of the means by which the theme of the 'Renaissance Solomon' and the Orders which came to form his temple were overlaid, like the stonework itself, or "translated", as Rykwert suggests, onto these medieavale Solomonic traditions and Craft mysteries. In line with the ecumenical ambition of some in Laud's Church, the seemingly opposed elements of the original Catholic Cathedral and later Protestant skin might also be seen as 'alchemically' resolved by interlocked triangles, the emblem for the union of elements (Fig.30). Such a scheme would also mirror traditional royal powers, Carew noting that Stuart "chaste beams" could put the jarring elements in order, "So shalt thou with thy pregnant fire / The water, earth, and ayre, inspire". 38 Following the themes of Bruno's mission, the union of opposites - Religious and Natural - frequently featured in later Stuart art, 39 expressed through circular imagery. 40 According to Jones Stonehenge was itself made in 'imitation' of fire and air. 41

39 See Parry, G., Golden Age Restor'd (1981), p.220: "Henrietta Maria was the daughter of the martial Henri IV, Charles the son of James the Peacemaker. From the resolution of these opposing qualities in marriage (a reflection of the Carlo-Maria theme common in the masques) springs the higher power of triumphant peace that guides the destiny of the nation".
40 In Loves Welcome at Bolsover (1634), Jonson plays with the imagery of circles as a metaphor for the endless movement of love between the royal pair, between the crown and the people, and between heaven and earth, "The king, and Queenses Court, which is circular, / And perfect. The pure schoole that we live in, / And is of pure Love, the Discipline", Ins.136-8. On the poems of Joshua Sylvester, Parry, Golden Age Restor'd (1981), p.25 notes: "As the world lies spell-bound by James's glory, Sylvester busies himself with erecting a colonnade of twelve emblem poems, each in the shape of a pillar, in honour of the immortal qualities of the King. By means of the repetition...the sequence is given a circular shape, and thus these poetic pillars form a temple consecrated to James.
41 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.106.
Hence, we should qualify any view maintaining that the Stuarts completely rejected Gothic, implied by their hostility towards the pointed arch discussed in chapter six. Indeed, this view is further tempered by recognition of the fact that certain of the features of old St. Paul's were frankly accepted, even celebrated: the structural bays to the nave were highlighted by new piers, the Gothic choir and its windows was repaired, and existing proportions were highlighted by a portico which aligned in height and width with the outer aisle walls. Jones's early, 1608 design for the Cathedral tower displayed 'Gothic' forms (Fig.79), and his new chapel for Lincoln's Inn (1623) designed in collaboration with Donne was 'Gothic'. Indeed, the 'Fallen House of British Chivalry' itself can be viewed as a 'Gothic' structure with superimposed Order; the castles which Aubrey reported Jones studying were "Gothick". Gotch points out that Jones "recognised the splendid Gothic cathedral of old St. Paul's as 'so great and noble a work'" and Strong notes that Jones,

"had nothing but praise for the nobility of Old St. Paul's...His task was to superimpose over the spiritual truths of the old traditions the rediscovered rules of the classical canon".

The Orders themselves might thus have been seen as a progression and perfection 'superimposed' onto the heroic architecture of the middle ages, much as Laud accepted the shared origins of the Church of England with that of Rome. The old Cathedral itself represented the 'foundations' upon which the new structure, physical and spiritual, was superimposed - or as Waller's poem (quoted below) on Cathedral repair put it, "an earnest of his grand design, / To frame no new church, but the old refine". The vitality of

---

42 Commented on by Wren, S., PARENTALIA (1750), p.273.
43 See Dugdale, W., Origines Juridiciales (1666), p.234. D.N.B. entry for Jones notes: "it was the only building in which he essayed a Gothic manner".
46 See H.H. Milman, Annals (1868), p.341: "On the whole, the Cathedral, restored under the auspices of Laud, might seem to bear a singular similitude to the religion which Laud would establish in the Church of England, retaining as much as would stand of the old mediaeval building, but putting a new face upon it. It was altogether an inharmonious and confused union of conflicting elements, a compromise between the old and the new, with services timidly approaching Catholicism...but rejecting their vital and obsolete doctrines, and with an episcopal popedom at Lambeth, not at Rome."
Gothic working methods ordering an 'antique' skin might serve as an illustration of such 'refinement'. Together with the background influence of hermetic lore on Jones's work, this 'Gothicism' has been largely ignored by commentators, following Walpole's view of Jones's Cathedral sides as "very bad Gothic".47

Finally, mediaeval stonework practice, and its associated lore, was not alone in being absorbed into the emerging Renaissance in England. Mediaeval chivalry also became absorbed in this way - as were the arts in which chivalrous themes found expression, such as heraldry and pageant. The "Knights masquers" (Fig.13) within Jonson and Jones's temple-palace of Oberon articulated the theme of Arthurian chivalry in invisible circular form,

"...then let your nimble feet
Tread subtle circles that may always meet
in point to him, and figures to express:
May without stop point out the proper heir
Designed so long to Arthur's crowns and chair" (Ins.291-298).

Oberon, The Fairy Prince was performed in 1611 - a product of the period of accord between Jones and Jonson on the objectives of masque and on the role of neoplatonic inspired arts, such as mechanics and perspective, as a partner of text. Jones's architectural blend of the antique with native mediaevalism and the architecture of the Triumph48 was here matched by Jonson's text. Mediaeval chivalry dances to the tune of Renaissance neoplatonism, aspects of which had been revolutionary to the minds of Bruno's audience thirty years before. The 'old' is once again absorbed within the 'new', as the Orders 'absorbed' mediaeval stonework geometry and heraldry at St. Paul's.

However, for a more direct understanding of what this geometry meant to Jones we should return to the second half of his STONE-HENG Restored, for in Jones's text might be found a 'key' to the west front of his Cathedral.

---


The west front of St. Paul's and Stonehenge; the Vitruvian theatre plan as a 'temple' to music and memory

"Not only...the circular form, but the meer segment of a circle amongst the Egyptians was a Hieroglyphick of Coelus...[Pier Valerianus Hier.lib.39]...The Magi adde that a triangle of equall sides is a symbole of Divinity, or sign of celestiall matters".

[Jones, I., STONE-HENG Restored (1655), p.102, p.106].

In 1609 Jones visited the remains of the Roman theatre at Orange, a visit which Higgott claims led to Jones's "preoccupation with theatre design".49 At Vicenza on 23-4 September, 1613, Jones viewed the Teatro Olimpico, Palladio's reconstruction of the ancient theatre. As chapter six discussed, Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius' records him underlining and translating parts of the chapters on the theatre and includes his study of the triangular scheme in Palladio's illustration of the theatre plan (Fig.37)50 (like Jones, it was this edition of 'Vitruvius' which Laud owned).51 This scheme influenced his design of theatres at Drury Lane and Cockpit-in-Court (Fig.44), where, as Orrell notes, the 'antiqueness' of Jones's intentions is obvious,

"marked on the elevation of the frons scena are busts and statues of ancient Greek muses and poets, at the centre is the Horatian tag 'Prodesse & Delectare,' there are five doors of entrance in the Vitruvian manner...located at points dictated by five of the twelve points of the Vitruvian scheme".52

In Webb's design for the Paved Court theatre at Somerset House, the apex of an equilateral triangle based on the back wall locates the orchestra centre.53


50 Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', annotations to bk.v chs.iii-ix, pp.223-262.


Chapter Eight

Whilst Jones was well aware of the origin of his Stonehenge plan in Vitruvius's theatre - a marginal note even referring to the relevant section in the Barbaro 'Vitruvius' - his text avoids any direct reference to the theatre. Instead, as chapter six discussed, for Jones the theatre plan became generalised into an "Architectonickall Scheme used by the Romans" - here employed to form a temple. After Dr Charleton had pointed this theatre origin out in CHOREA GIGANTUM (1663), Webb ingeniously remarked that,

"If then Scamozzi, for the designing of Churches consecrated to the true God, making of Altars, Tombs, and whatever other Occasions as well sacred as prophane, took his Example from the Porticoes behind the Scene of the Theatre; who can deny that a Temple for idolatrous Use might be formed by the same Scheme, that made the Theatre it self?"

In his 'Temple formed by the Theatre' Jones followed his contemporaries, who conceived of the theatre as a representation of the cosmos, a 'moral emblem' or 'temple'. For the theatre was itself an Idea building in the Renaissance. Alberti opened his chapter on the ancient theatre in De re aedificatoria by calling it a temple of humanity and comparing it to the temple of the Jews. Later, in this country, Thomas Heywood in An Apology for Actors (1612) outlined the ancient dignity of the theatre, "the round Circle" instructing citizens "by moralized mysteries".

Frances Yates has discussed this link between the theatre and church, noting,

"The ancient theatre could be moralized and transformed into a building which was not only a Theatre of the World in the cosmic sense, but also in a sense compatible with Christianity and its teachings. Abroad, churches and cathedrals were being built to express the religious spirit in neoclassical architecture. In England perhaps only the public theatre was able to share to

57 Heywood, T., An Apology For Actors (1612), bk.i.
some extent in this movement and to anticipate the English neoclassical church architecture of the future".\(^{58}\)

In 'restoring' Stonehenge using the Roman theatre plan, Jones both evoked and built on the most Roman of Elizabethan buildings, Spenser's "goodly theatres".\(^{59}\) Yates has argued that the plan of the Globe theatre was directly based on the Roman theatre geometry, the main thesis of Theatre of the World (1969) (Fig.43). This book also implies that the Globe's shadow fell over Stonehenge, the English public theatre one of the "patterns imprinted on Inigo Jones's mind";\(^{60}\) Jones was certainly acquainted with Burbage.\(^{61}\) This prompts the idea that following Stonehenge Jones's Cathedral, with its theatre geometry also represents an example of such a transfer from theatre to church, the refaced west front representing as it did one of the first examples of "English neoclassical church architecture". At the very least, Yates's argument implies that there was a familiarity with a 'device' of linked triangles in the design of buildings in London. Both Globe and Cathedral were certainly visibly linked through jointly standing out as overtly 'Roman' in character within an Elizabethan sprawl, as map views reveal. Indeed, there were direct links between St. Paul's and public theatre, for from the end of the 14th Century until 1608 the Cathedral housed a company of choirboy-actors - 'The Children of Paul's' - who enacted not only moral and mystery plays but also popular drama by such as Lily and Middleton.\(^{62}\) There is even evidence of an actual theatre building at the Cathedral, with a round or semicircular auditorium.\(^{63}\)

St. Paul's obviously represented the boldest example of the superimposition of the Orders on Gothic structures. Whilst discussing the

---

63 The Prologue to Marston's Antonio's Revenge (1602), "sundry times acted, by the children of Paules", alludes to the audience located "within this round...within this ring". Gair concludes that "Paul's auditorium could have been semi-circular", quoted by Orrell, J., The Human Stage (1988), p.279 n.2.
new learning and fashion represented by the treatment of superimposed Order on Elizabethan theatres and country houses, Rykwert points out that the chief exemplars for the use of the Orders were the antique theatres themselves. The vast size and preservation of the Colosseum and the Theatre of Marcellus in Rome had given both enormous prestige amongst Renaissance architects and patrons. Jones himself noted in his 1560 edition of 'Serlio' "this colombe above is as big at the foot as ye collomb below is at ye head. this is tak[en] fro[m] ye theater of Marcollus" (bk.iv, ch.ix, fol.65). Indeed, the use of the four Orders at St. Paul's followed the obvious example of the Colosseum65 - the four Orders of which had been described in some detail by Serlio (bk.iii, ch.iv, fol.30-35).

This notion of 'theatrical' Orders returns us to chapter two, which concluded by entitling 'Jones's Cathedral designed as a backdrop to Court 'theatre'" - the setting for the enactment of Court spectacle, or symbolic festivals, and sermons delivered at the 'theatre' of Paul's Cross. The 'theatrical' Orders on the skin-deep, 'stage-set' west front, examined then, can now be seen as linked using the theatre geometry. In pointing out that Jones's portico was designed to rehouse the infamous public 'theatre' of Paul's Walk, a migration of the Orders from the face of Jones's west front - with this theatre geometry - to the portico was observed. Porticoes were in themselves an element of the ancient theatre, as Webb's remark on Scamozzi indicates, placed behind the stage to provide shelter from sun and rain (Vitruvius, bk.v, ch.ix) (Jones even referred to Stonehenge as a 'Double Portico' structure). Jones's annotations to both his 'Alberti' and Barbaro 'Vitruvius' show his interest in the theatre portico.66 Further, following Nicholas V and Pius II's St. Peter's, the Cathedral portico was to serve as a framework for more noble dramas, forming a 'theatre' for the Bishop's reception of the Lord Mayor or the King on the occasion of the Triumph, as chapter two discussed. With James pictured kneeling at the west door, the 1620 procession proclaimed not only the sacredness of the west front but its

65 Ibid. p.200 n.22.
66 Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', bk.v ch.ix p.261 against Vitruvius In.I "thes porticos wear about ye walk & behind the seeone as I gave it remaining b[e]hind the Theater of Orange ye rest of which had binn of timber the colloms are gonn". Jones's copy of the Bartoli 1565 'Alberti', bk.viii ch.vii p.229-30, bk.ix ch.iii p.253 against Alberti on the curved portico "ye portico of ye theater".
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importance as a setting for such theatrical spectacle. And with restoration as its theme, it revealed a 'theatrical' programme to Jones's work, the Orders on both designs responding to specific 'theatrical' rituals.

In this way when presenting the theatre plan as a temple at Stonehenge, Jones mirrored traditional associations found in the London theatres, such as the Globe, and even at St. Paul's itself. In Renaissance theory the plan of the Vitruvian theatre became a 'temple' through embodying what were considered specific antique virtues; these included musical harmony, the backdrop of mnemonics used in drama and sermon, and the zodiac diagram. Following the links with 'real' theatre, these can also be jointly traced in Stonehenge and at St. Paul's.

1 Two Vitruvian temples of music. In STONE-HENG Restored Jones quotes the famous passage in which Vitruvius outlines the antique theatre's 'musical' plan (bk.v, ch.vi),

"four equilaterall Triangles, inscribed in a Circle, such as the Astrologers use in describing the twelve celestiall signs in musicall proportions. According to that of Vitruvius..."by which figures also, Astrologers from the musicall harmony of the stars ground their reasonings, as concerning the description of the twelve celestiall signs"...".67

Here Jones makes explicit the whole musical basis of his "Architectonical Scheme", the embodiment of "harmonical Proportions". Barbaro's commentary in the 1556 'Vitruvius' went into some detail on this aspect of the theatre (bk.v, ch.iv, 'Dell Armonia'). Against the Roman theatre in his copy Jones notes that "the Anci: Arrch: followed ye trackt of nature in ordering ye degrees mathematicaly and musicaly".68 In chapter six Rene Taylor was quoted 'ordering' the Escorial according to the Vitruvian theatre plan (Fig.46). Taylor further comments on the musical associations of the double 'seal of Solomon' forming this plan overlaid on the Escorial, "A plan based on this zodiacal configuration would... necessarily be in tune with the musica convenientia astorum of

---

67 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.106.

68 Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', against Vitruvius bk.v ch.iii ln.41 p.226.
Vitruvius. Hence there would be no need to have recourse to the alternative magia of the pythagorean musical intervals".69

Needless to say, Jones was also well aware of such Pythagorean musical virtues, again noting in his Barbaro 'Vitruvius' that "Pithagoras his followers made their presepts with cubik reason".70 In his 1614 Italian translation of Plutarch's Opusculi Morali, di Plutarco Cheronese Jones paid particular attention to the essays Della creazione dell'anima descritta nel Timeo di Platone, and Della Musica, in which the whole theory of ancient music is discussed with reference to Pythagoras and Plato.71 In his 1554 Italian edition of Plato's Republic Jones notes "the end of Musik love of ye beautifull or fairer".72 Indeed, as has been seen, Jones was attacked by Jonson in Love's Welcome at Bolsover for designing disharmonious Pythagorean temples.

Such musical virtues further emphasised Stonehenge's status as Idea, in line with the Vitruvian theatre itself. Hence, any musical themes within celebrations of Cathedral restoration might suggest a further context for Jones's manipulation of this 'musical' theatre plan.

The music of the King's 'peace' and 'policy' was a common metaphor in Stuart propaganda and panegyrics, with the harp of David and Amphion, and the songs of Solomon frequently used as symbols for James's art of


70 Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', against Vitruvius bk.v ch.i ln.18 p.205. Against Barbaro ln.23, 27, 29, bk.i ch.i p.24 Jones notes "In musicke the[d] must be a proportionall distance betwene the low and heeygt / The same sympathy is in the Stairs / the ruel[s] of arethmaticke shad unite musicke with astrologi[y]."


In Plutarch's 'Della Musica', pp.221-237, Jones annotates every page from p.228 onwards, noting for example on p.228 "plato in ye creatian of the Soule. Timeo" and in the 'Timeo di Platone', pp.315-338, Jones annotates pp.317-8, pp.320-2, p.327, pp.333-4, noting for example on p.320 "the other soul evoc[ed] by god in number and proportian". In his copy of Plutarch's Alcuni opuscoli de le cose morali del divino Plutarco, Venice, (1567) part two p.42 against text on music Jones notes "pithagoris saw this dubbel dispositio of ye mind" and on p.46 against text on Plato "Rasionall & irrationall liknd by Plato...".

72 Plato, La Repubblica di Platone, trans. by P. Fiorimbene, Venice (1554), p.124. Jones annotates book three in particular. In his copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', bk.iii ch.i p.112 against Barbaro ln.6 Vitruvius ln.12 Jones notes "what a perfect thing is / Plato affirms tenn to be a perfect number".
government. Marcelline's "misticall symphony", forming the epigraph, would seem composed with the invisible circles and triangles of James's harp. David exorcising Saul by means of his music is recorded in Samuel ch.xvi, v.14-23 and was developed at some length by Agrippa. According to hermetic philosophy, this kind of exorcism was achieved through a connection with the harmony of the celestial spheres, which in turn reflected the harmony of the supercelestial world of God. Per Palme points out that when the King embarked on the Banqueting House in 1619, "soon to be followed by the restoration scheme for St. Paul's", he was, "inevitably, 'charming' the stones with the music of his peace". Such 'musical magic' echoed in John King's Sermon...on behalfe of Pauls Church (1620), where, in arguing for restoration, "the tongue of a King, like the harpe of Amphion,..[will] draw stones to the building". And later Edmund Waller, when commenting on a partially restored Cathedral, made the Stuart Kings "antique minstrels", with "Cities their lutes, and subjects' hearts their strings",

"He, like Amphion, makes those quarries leap
Into fair figures, from a confused heap;
For in his art of regiment is found
A pow'r like that of harmony in sound...
Not ought which Sheba's wond'ring queen beheld
Amongst the works of Solomon, excell'd
His ships and building; emblems of a heart
Large both in magnanimity and art".

What more appropriate way of bringing the Cathedral's "confused heap" into a unity "like that of harmony in sound" than "fair figures" of interlocked triangles and circle, an emblem of Solomon understood to be in tune with Amphion's musical magic and Vitruvius's musical theatre - Jones's "Architectonickall Scheme" of "harmonical Proportions"? Toplis notes the "neoplatonic overtones" of this verse, which he finds "resounding" in the

74 Ibid, p.70.
75 King, J., A Sermon at Pauls Crosse, on behalfe of Pauls Church (1620), p.53.
Banqueting House. Solomon's musical magic featured in a further contemporary "dream" or "vision" for St. Paul's; as part of his series of appeals for Cathedral repair, Henry Farley's *Complaint* of 1616 allows the Cathedral itself the gift of speech,

"...thou send'st a second Salomon,...
His song of songs most sure shall be,
That shall set forth His Kingly love to me,
His chiefe delight is all in Trinitie,
Of them to make a perfect Unitie...
That He an Israel new may build and reare,...
I must complaine of more then yet you see,
Which I desire may well amended bee:
My body round within, and eke without,
My windowes, and my pillars all about,..
For he that in his breast doth weare that Sheild
(as doth this David) needs not feare the field".

Here again, Farley's Cathedral would seem to urge the need to "weare that Sheild", the emblem of Solomon musically harmonising the Trinity within a circle, "of them to make a perfect unitie". It was this very 'protective' Shield of David to which Laud also made reference.

2 Two Vitruvian temples of memory. With chapter three in mind, *STONE-HENG Restored* would seem to provide direct proof of an interrelationship between Jones's architectural Orders and hieroglyphs or emblems. For Jones's Tuscan temple was 'designed' or geometrically 'composed' with reference to emblem books such as Piero Valeriano's *Hieroglyphica* (1556), the standard Renaissance guide to emblems. In reading Jones's text we glimpse something of his design 'process' itself. The two references in *STONE-HENG Restored* both concern geometry (quoted above), but Valeriano was equally used by Jones for costumes of symbolic characters within masque and stage settings in which, as has been seen, his

---


actual buildings - Whitehall and St. Paul's - also sometimes appeared. The emblem for mathematics within Ripa's Iconologia (1603), to which Jones also frequently referred, includes 'Solomon's seal' (Fig.29). Webb specifically linked interlocked triangles to hieroglyphic virtue in his ESSAY towards...the Primitive LANGUAGE (1669),

"aswell before the flood, as long after it, significative Characters only were in use; for without all peradventure that famous Inscription at Persepolis in Persia consists of such Characters; and although it differs, its true from the received Hieroglyphical way, being composed of the form of Triangles several ways transverted only. Yet we cannot but allow, in regard the people in those early days framed the Characters to their Language correspondent to the fancy of their imaginations".80

Mentioned twice, as a surviving sign of a lost wisdom such interlocked triangles would seem to hold special importance for Webb.

In The Alchemist (1610), Jonson makes explicit the way in which it was thought such emblems worked, ridiculing their secret power, and John Dee in particular, during a scene in which the alchemist designs a shop sign for one 'Abel Drugger',

"Formed in some mystic character, whose radii,
Striking the senses of the passers-by,
Shall, by a virtual influence, breed affections,...
He first shall have a bell, that's Abel;
And, by it, standing one whose name is Dee,...
There's Drugger, Abel Drugger. That's his sign.
And here's now mystery and hieroglyphic!"81

With Jones's work later similarly dismissed by Jonson as "Court hieroglyphics", the alchemist composing his 'mystic character' might be seen as much like Jones when describing his 'restoration' of Stonehenge. Indeed, it was the circle which for Jones had made Stonehenge a "Hieroglyphick of Coelus", following Valeriano. The harmonies of architecture in masque were intended to have a talismatic effect, as, perhaps, geometry in Jones's built work.

80  Webb, J., An HISTORICAL ESSAY...the Primitive LANGUAGE (1669), p.149.
Chapter Eight

In what became an occult art, artificial memory systems employed these same emblems, or hieroglyphs, to represent particular points to be recalled in oration or sermon, imagined deposited against specific architectural 'settings' as an aspect of the complex art of rhetoric. Evidence of this memory tradition can be detected at St. Paul's. Chapter seven discussed Francis Bacon's interest in the use of architecture in such mnemonics, and Jones's friend, Edmund Bolton, outlined the workings of this art whilst discussing heraldry. Artificial memory, as an aid to oratory, was traditionally practiced in Theatres and Cathedrals. Both also served as memory buildings themselves. Mediaeval Cathedrals, crowded with images, become for Yates like "invisible cathedrals of memory". Solomon's 'House of Wisdom', with its seven pillars, had formed the paradigm for Giulio Camillo's Renaissance memory system, with its plan based on the Vitruvian theatre. Jones's contemporary Robert Fludd was also to base his memory theatre on the Vitruvian scheme. Both Bruno (Fig.27) and Lull (Fig.28) designed mnemonic seals in the form of 'Solomon's seal', some of which Bruno had

83 Dugdale records that the Cathedral library, not surprisingly, contained a number of copies of "Tullius in Rethoricis" (History (1658), p.277). The *Rhetorica ad C.Herennium* and the *De Inventione Rhetorica*, then credited to Cicero, forming one of the antique sources for the rules of artificial memory. Dugdale reports that during Henry VIII's reign 'The Dance of Death' was added to the cloister, comprising a set of 'emblems' for the mediaeval estates - from 'Pope', 'Emperor', 'Cardinal', 'King', 'Bishop', down to 'Child'. Each was accompanied by a verse and in total formed a visible sermon or, perhaps, with the cloister's contemplative role in mind, a kind of didactic mnemonic sequence, (reported in Ibid, p.132 and pp.290-4. Discussed by W. Lethaby in *The Builder*, Sept.5, 1930).
84 Bolton, E. *The Elements of Armorories* (1610), p.121: "I will once more view the Slate, whereupon you have cyphered your remembred parts of the lecture, and therein supply what is wanting, that you may have all the passed examples together, and in sight at once upon one Plane, and by them (as by so many places of artifical memory) both call them to your minde the better, and hold the depending doctrines the surer".
86 See Ibid, pp.131-145.
88 For example, see text surrounding illustrations in Yates, F., Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition (1964), fig.11-14, pp.306-307. Taylor, R., 'Architecture and Magic', *Essays in the History of Architecture Presented to Rudolf Wittkower* (1967), p.95 notes that 'Solomon's seal' "is also a basic figure in Lull".

224
published in England (Lull's geometric seals may have had a general influence on Renaissance architectural theory). Hence, a further theatre-temple association becomes apparent, once again a link both 'real' and 'imaginary'.

The early conception of the city as a kind of processional memory theatre was to be found in William Fulwod's *The Castel of Memorie* (1562),

"no man is ignorant of the situation of the Citie where he was borne, or in the whiche he hath longe dwelled. Therefore when the mynde entreth in at the gate, whiles it considereth the diversitie of wayes, directing and leading to divers countreyes, and whiles it remembrith frendes houses, publike dwellinge places, Palaces, or comon places of Judgement, it shall fynde out a marveylous number of places. Hereto also it may imagine great courtes or palaces of larger roume, wherein it may devise as great a number of places as it listeth, so that every thing may be written therein that he will have".

Given the important role of architecture in this art, following Bacon and Bolton Jones himself may have been influenced by this artificial memory tradition - in the workings of which we have preserved a clue as to the 'layout' of the Renaissance imagination itself. It has been suggested that Renaissance princes planned and furnished their palaces and grounds as a kind of living memory system, through which in elaborate arrangements of place and images, all knowledge, the whole encyclopaedia, could be stored in memory. Here we are reminded of Whitehall palace, where hundreds of antique statues and busts, bought from the Duke of Mantua in 1627, adorned the gardens. The sequential presentation of emblematically conceived buildings along a prescribed route in the city, culminating at a temple, owed something to this mnemonic tradition (as did the temporary arches for royal Entries, adopted by James in 1604). These formed a complete linear presentation of the virtues of the monarch to the city, like such encyclopaedic

---


91 Fulwod, W., *The Castel of Memorie* (1562), ch.vii, 3rd page [unno.].


gardens or the role of architecture in the moving talisman of masque. Jones's statue of King James at St. Paul's might well have served a mnemonic role, as might the royal emblems on Temple Bar. The 'restoration' of the Temple of Lyon in the 17th Century was disposed around such a sequential presentation of mnemonic emblems, also culminating at a temple.94

These emblems and geometry 'unfolded' on such a route in London have been traced back to Stonehenge as Idea, Jones's 'imaginary theatre'. As a storehouse for emblems of cosmological virtue, and origin from which all might be 'traced', the otherwise unique Stonehenge 'theatre' might have operated in Jones's imagination much like Fludd's imaginary theatre of the mind.95 This is not to say that Stonehenge actually was a memory theatre, merely that an operative parallel might be seen in the way memory theatres were used to store emblems and the way Jones builds up emblematic virtue at Stonehenge (using the Tuscan Order, geometry and Cherubim, for example). The mnemonic systems of Camillo and Fludd certainly added further virtue to the Vitruvian theatre geometry used at Stonehenge, and it is to a component of artificial memory that Jones refers when employing Valeriano's emblematics on his Stonehenge theatre plan. Both represent compatible patterns of Renaissance thought, as the previous chapter discussed.

Memory theatres were certainly not unrelated to 'real' buildings; Fludd may have recorded the Globe’s supposed Vitruvian stage,96 and it was likely that most of the London theatres built after the Globe were influenced by 'Vitruvius' modified by books on the art of memory.97 It was pointed out that Jones's Cathedral stood next in line from such a Vitruvian 'tradition' in London and as a setting for rituals obviously followed mediaeval Cathedrals and public theatres - in which mnemonics traditionally assisted sermon and


95 Yates, F., *Theatre of the World* (1969), pp.83-84 notes: "And now let us consider the remarkable parallels between the lives of Inigo Jones and Robert Fludd...Compare, for example, Jones's design for a palace in the masque of Oberon...with Fludd's Temple of Music. Fludd's Temple possibly reaches about the same level of vivid dramatic fantasy, expressed in uncertain draughtsmanship, as Jones's Palace". Rykwert also accepted links between the two in *The First Moderns* (1980), p.127, p.205 n.58.


drama. And like Camillo's theatre, Jones's Cathedral found its basis in Solomon's temple, or 'House of Wisdom'.

With its dedication to James, Fludd's memory theatre appeared in *Utriusque Cosmi Historia* published between 1617-19 - that is, just before Jones's Stonehenge survey and first Cathedral design. When King of Scotland James had himself been taught the art of memory; indeed, a general interest in the art in his Scottish Court has been detected, linked in particular to Bruno.98 William Schaw, Scottish Master of Works and general warden of the Scottish masons, in attempting to organise the craft through his second statutes of 1599 cites the art of memory as one of the tests for a mason.99 It has been pointed out that in using an architectural framework the art would have been attractive to masons, a way, perhaps, of memorising their craft secrets and acquiring secret wisdom.100 Further, the 17th Century Scottish masonic lodge may have been in one sense a memory temple, an imaginary Solomon's temple in which places and images were fixed as aids to memorising the masons' secrets and the rituals of initiation.101 Perhaps when the King came south the use of architecture in this art was discussed with his new Master of Works and Cathedral mason, Inigo Jones?

3 Two Vitruvian temples to the Zodiac. In *STONE-HENG Restored*, as the opening quotation indicates, Jones supplies us with his understanding of such platonic norms as circle, triangle and hexagon, and thus by implication an interpretation of the new facade for St. Paul's when understood as composed by this geometry. Jones's whole 'Roman' argument finds its basis in astrology, with the ruins physically aligned with the compass points. In line with Valeriano he interprets the circle as indicative of heaven, the ancients, "especially delighted with making of [temples]...round, as representing thereby the Form or Figure of Coelum, Heaven".102 It is thus within the circumference of this circular 'heaven' that his new Cathedral face is conceived. In his copy of Plutarch's *Opusculi Morali, di Plutarco*


99 Ibid, p.45.

100 Ibid, p.95-96.


Cheronese Jones noted "Astrologi depends on Geomitria". At Stonehenge, following Vitruvius’s theatre, the hexagon, triangle and circle constituted the geometric scheme by which the Magi found expression for astrological divinity,

"The Astrologers make use of three sorts of figures; the Triangle, Tetragon, and Hexagon. Furthermore, the three entrances leading into the Temple from the Plain, were parted by an equilateral triangle; which was the figure whereby the Ancients expressed what appertained to Heaven, and divine mysteries also".

It is a hexagon which linked the Orders on the face of St. Paul’s and a triangle which dictated the Cathedral’s height. In line with Renaissance architecture in general, and the Vitruvian theatre in particular, Jones finds it natural that an "Architect" should base his design for temples on geometry made sacred through links with astrology,

"Now this Antiquity consisting of several stones, orderly disposed into one entire work, in imitation, as it were, of those several stars which appearing to us in the Heavens in form of a circle, are called the celestiall Crown, and wholly designed by those Schems wherewith Astrologers use to describe celestiall bodies, which figures, usually applied by them to particular accidents onely, being all joyntly made use of by the Architect for confirmation of this sacred structure, it is not improbable Stone-Heng was so composed, because dedicated to Coelum".

Here, again echoing memory systems, Jones's plan becomes an embodiment of planetary order and the twelve houses of the Zodiac.

Chapter five pointed out that in dedicating Stonehenge to Coelus, Jones 'Protestantised' the monument. But further, Coelus was closely related to Mercury who, as Hermes, was patron of the occult arts and master of Cabala. According to Natalis Comes, to whose Mythologiae (1567) Jones

103 Jones's 1614 Italian translation of Plutarch's Opusculi Morali, di Plutarco Cheronese, p.492.
104 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.106.
105 Ibid.
makes frequent reference, the first God to exist was Mercury, who created and thereafter controlled everything; out of Chaos, the original substance, he formed Coelus, who in turn became a creator. In his article on \textit{STONE-HENG} \textit{Restored}, Stephen Orgel points out that as a direct translation of the Christian scheme into classical terms, Mercury, patron of rhetoric, is placed first "Because in the beginning was the Word", and,

"As the agent of God's will, he is parallel with Christ. Thus he becomes naturally the most powerful god in the Renaissance pantheon, and (commonly under his Greek name Hermes) the embodiment and patron of the highest and most secret wisdom - hermetic philosophy takes its name from him. Coelus, then, is God the Father; and this identification has nothing to do with mythology...nor with classical religion...but only with an analogy to Christian doctrine."

In this way Coelus becomes closely related to Hermes in a christianised order. As a temple to such heavenly wisdom, dedicated to the God from whom according to Jones "all things took their beginning", Stonehenge itself came to physically represent the origin of all things - including the architect's own work.

\textbf{4 Two direct references by Jones to St. Paul's.} The suggestion that Inigo Jones was influenced by the occult sciences would seem confirmed by a reference in his Stonehenge 'treatise' to a work by the Elizabethan 'Neoplatonist', or 'Natural philosopher', John Dee. For the architect refers to Dee's 'Mathematical preface' to Billingsley's \textit{Euclid} (1570). Here, Jones indicates no warning against an author it has been seen was publicly attacked by Jonson as a magician. A copy of Billingsley's Euclid was in the library of Jones's first patron, Prince Henry, and it may have been this copy which Jones used.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Chapter Eight}
  \item 106 Ibid, p.91, p.96, p.100.
  \item 107 Discussed by Orgel, S., 'Inigo Jones on Stonehenge', \textit{Prose} III (1971), p.122.
  \item 108 Ibid, p.123.
\end{itemize}
Dee embodied one of the main strands of early Vitruvianism in this country before Jones. Vitruvius is often quoted in Dee's 'preface', but the Vitruvian subjects are placed alongside certain neoplatonic subjects, traced back by Dee to "Moses Philosophy". In this work Jones would have seen Dee's art of 'Anthropographie', or "perfect body of MAN" ('Microcosmus'), under which Agrippa's De Occulta Philosophia is cited. Here Dee refers readers to chapters 27-28 of Agrippa's second book, in which 'hermetic man' is pictured encircled by the Zodiac (Fig.33) and embodying, as the text points out, an equilateral triangle. Dee links this to the proportions of Noah's Ark, following St. Augustine (De civitate Dei, 15.26) and Alberti (De re aedificatoria, bk.ix, ch.vii). Since the Ark was the earliest of the biblical structures, prefiguring the Tabernacle and, therefore, the temple of Solomon, in this way Dee's 'preface' can be seen to have proclaimed a neoplatonic Idea of the ancient Church based on the circle and triangle of 'hermetic' man (discussed further in part four). Here Jones would also have seen Dee's 'Hieroglyphical Monad', placed prominently within the opening letter 'D' of the preface - a hieroglyph which, not surprisingly, embodied the idea of fused elements expressed in 'Solomon's seal' (Dee had inscribed this 'seal' on his table used for angel conjuring (Fig.31); it also formed the printer's mark of John Daye, to be found at the end of the 'preface' itself). Under 'Architecture' Dee cites the ancient theatre, the only direct reference to an antique building. Yates has suggested the influence of this work on the Globe in arguing that the playhouse was based on the Roman theatre plan. As a practical 'manual' this English Euclid was specifically aimed at Companies of Masons and Joiners; it was reported that Jones had been apprenticed to a joiner in his younger years, working in St. Paul's churchyard and it was, of course, this workforce which later refaced the Cathedral.

Jones refers to Dee's work whilst responding to opinion as to Stonehenge's construction,

112 For the 'magic' and expressly platonie content of the 'Preface' see Chulee, N., Ibid, p.147, pp.166-176.


"They Wonder also...by what Means they (that is, such huge stones) were set up. What may be effected by that Mechanical Art, which Dee in his Mathematicall Preface to Euclyde, called Menadry, or Art of ordering Engines for raising weights".116

This is then followed by the passage dated post 1646 in chapter one,

"Had I not been thought worthy (by him who then commanded) to have been sole Architect thereof, I would have made some mention of the great stones used in the work, and Portico at the West end of S. Pauls Church London, but I forebear; though in greatness they were equall to most in this Antiquity, and raised to a far greater height than any there".117

Here, in proud but modest tones, either Jones or Webb writing for Jones directly place in comparison Jones's work on the west front of St. Paul's with Stonehenge. Further, both would seem monuments built with reference to Dee's work. Chapter three quoted Bolton tracing such "Arch-mysteries" back to the building of Solomon's temple, with St. Paul himself later initiated in the "mysteries in the Mechanicks".

Also in the tradition of such occult arts, Jones drew Stonehenge in perspective (Fig.51) - one of the 'Dee' subjects which had been ridiculed in Jonson's Alchemist.118 Both Perspective and Menadry were also important for Jones's masques, where 'Prospero-like' he conjured scene changes by engines and weights. John Wilkins's Mathematicall MAGIC, outlining such mechanics, was published during Jones's lifetime, in 1648. Indeed, both Charleton and Webb cite an example from Wilkins in their arguments on Stonehenge's construction.119 The building records testify to the importance of cranes in the mechanics of refacing St. Paul's,120 as the drawing by Webb

116 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.34.

117 Ibid, p.35.

118 Act iii sc.iv, lns.87-90, Ben Jonson (ed. I. Donaldson, 1985), p.169: "He'll show a perspective, where on one side / You shall behold the faces and the persons / Of all sufficient young heirs in town, / Whose bonds are current for commodity".

119 Charleton, W., CHOREA GIGANTUM (1725 ed.), p.46; and Webb, J., VINDICATION (1725 ed.), p.216.

120 Guildhall MS. 25, 471 W.A.5, November 1635 notes "John Snoett, Carpenter payed for framming and setting upp of two great cranes, one at the Tower wharf the other at St. Paul's wharf". The crane at Paul's wharf evidently later collapsed in raising a cornice stone for the west face, W.A.15 May 1641. W.A.13 October 1639 and July 1641 notes "in laying over
illustrates (Fig.79).\textsuperscript{121} Whilst referring to the building of Stonehenge in his \textit{VINDICATION}, Webb provides further insight into this use of cranes - once again presented as 'Menadry',

"Furthermore, why might [Stonehenge]...not be raised by a Pair of Shears composed of two Masts,ocketed or mortaised into a Plank? which resting upon the Ground, was removed at Pleasure; having Guide-Tackles, Blocks and Shivers proportionable, and Capitals also, firmed in proper and convenient Places: since that in the same manner we have beheld hanging in the Air above thirty, forty, yea, seventy Foot high, those ponderous Masses in the Work at St. Paul's, and with a delightful Facility veered by ten or twelve Men only, to the just Places where they were ordered to be set...All which, nevertheless, I leave to be farther enquired into by those that are better skilled in the Art of \textit{Menadry} than I pretend".\textsuperscript{122}

Webb's stones "beheld hanging in the Air" certainly hint at 'mechanical magic' at St. Paul's.

This passage indicates not only Webb's familiarity with Dee's 'preface', but also provides further evidence that he is the likely author of the 1655 comment. In any case, the very fact of this addition surely illustrates the continual importance of Stonehenge to the Jones-Webb partnership in their work at St. Paul's, as to their built work in general. That we can accurately date at least this passage to after 1646 has gone unnoticed, as has the association of Stonehenge with an actual piece of architecture by Jones, placed against a reference to an aspect of Dee's 'neoplatonic' philosophy.

Further, there is a second direct reference to St. Paul's within \textit{STONEHENGE Restored}, again suggesting associations between the two. For clearly if Stonehenge was to be Romano-British, so was the original foundation of St. Paul's. Following the popular myth that a temple dedicated to Diana once stood on the site, Jones presents a temple buried under the Cathedral,

\begin{quote}
above great peece of Tymber from the head of the great shivers to the church, for the taking up and setting of the Capitalls and Architrave on the northend of the portico at the westend of the church". See also \textit{London Topographical Record}, vol.xviii, (1942), iv, p.43, "Ropes, Pulles or any other tooles whatsoever".
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{121} For a discussion of this pulley see Bold, J., \textit{John Webb} (1989), p.168.

"Yet that there might be a Roman Temple in old time standing in that place, I will not deny, the numbers of Oxe-heads dug up and anciently sacrificed there, setting all other reasons aside, so probably manifesting the same".123

Stonehenge itself obviously represented Jones's Idea of just such a Romano-British temple, the last remaining on these shores (at which Jones had also dug up "the heads of such beasts").124 Thus, through embodying the geometry of Stonehenge at St. Paul's, Jones merely 'refound' what he understood to have already stood on the site itself (a notion echoed later in his portico, as will be seen). Indeed, Webb unites both, for

"not any one of our Historiographers...relates the like Reliques in like Number to be found in any place throughout England, besides these two, St. Paul's and Stone-Heng".125

Stow's Survey of London (1633 ed.) also reports the site of St. Paul's anciently used for Roman sacrifice, for "both wise and learned, have thought the Buckes head borne before the procession of Pauls, on Saint Pauls day, to signifie the like".126 An ox head sits over the central door in Jones's 'pre-built' design (Fig.56). Certainly the existence of this temple in antiquity must have held some importance for Jones's St. Paul's, for why else would he, and indeed Dugdale, choose to repeat the myth as authentic? A contemporary song even pictured St. Paul's built on the foundations of an early Christian temple,

"Forsooth, all Papists aske us where, Our churche was many a yeare Invisible, when theirs was in the height: But let the poore deceived souls Look underneath the quire of Pauls, And they may see her holly fayth".127

123 Jones, I., STONE-HENG (1655 ed.), p.68.
Perhaps the restoration of this British "churche...Invisible" at St. Paul's found expression through an 'invisible' geometry signifying Solomon, father of the early Church itself.

Of course, the discovery of skulls at St. Paul's might have had a further significance to Jones. The sacrifice of bulls would seem to have formed part of ancient town foundation customs, and so the discovery of 'Roman' ox heads during the new work - and Jones's willingness to associate these with Roman sacrifice - would generally have aided the notion of a 're foundation' of London in antique splendour. The future greatness of the City of Rome was prophesied by the digging up of a human skull on the Capitolium - 'the place of the skull' - which was, as it were, at the head of Rome. Hence by implication the discovery of Roman skulls (albeit animal) on the site of St. Paul's may well have been understood to foretell the 'greatness' of Jones's restored Cathedral, refounded as a 'christianised' Roman temple inaugurating the Stuart Golden Age; Bishop King hailed the idea of a restored Cathedral in 1620 as equal to "Roma Caput Mundi, Rome the head of the World". Roman triumphs led from the Campus Martius to the Capitoline (where white oxen were sacrificed); situated at the 'head' of the procession at the summit of Ludgate Hill, St. Paul's thus occupied the position of the Capitoline at the head of the city in James's new Rome. According to contemporaries St. Paul's was,

"a stately Cathedral Temple, and Dome of devotion...near the Centre of the City, and upon rising ground...raising it self above the rest, and serving as it were for a Crest to the whole City".

Like the Capitoline, St. Paul's served as a symbol of the city as a whole, and its restoration as a symbol of that of the city - refounded, as Rome before it, as a 'New Troy'. Further, Bolton relates that the Roman counter-part to the City Companies,

"the Knights or Gentlemen of Rome, professing Merchandise,... had their Hall, or seat of their Colledge, or companie upon

129 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.44.
130 Howell, J., LONDONOPOLIS (1657), p.399.
Mount Capitoline itselfe, dedicated to their patron Deity, or tutelarie God-head, Mercurie.131

Hence, any associations between St. Paul's and the Capitoline would have aided the Building Companies' identification of the work as a symbolic restoration of their mythic past. Following Jacopo de' Barbari's view of Venice of 1500, Hollar's London panorama of 1647 presented Mercury hovering over St. Paul's (Fig.69) and, as chapter seven noted, Mercury featured alongside other figures taken from neoplatonic mythology in the Companies' procession to St. Paul's in 1620.

5 Two Vitruvian temples of Solomon. In his article on STONE-HENG Restored Stephen Orgel concludes that Jones "establishes the Jerusalem of Puritan visionaries in England's green and pleasant land". For with a final jump of imagination in his process, compatible with notions of the early British Church, Jones makes Stonehenge an analogue of Solomon's temple; the 'scheme' of triangles and circle becomes explicitly moralised by association with cherubim, emblems of Solomon's temple,

"Yea further, (if lawfull to compare an idolatrous place with so divine a work) was not the Temple at Hierusalem adorned with the figures of Cherubims, that thereby the Nations of the Earth might know it was the habitation of the living God? and, why not in like manner this Temple composed by Astrologicall figures, that after Ages might apprehend, it was ancietly consecrated to Coelus or Coelum Heaven?"132

If Jones here understood cherubim as emblems of Solomon, their function on the 'pre-built' face of St. Paul's could only have served to also signify the temple. And finally, in this passage prescribing the meaning of Stonehenge might equally be seen 'summed up' the Idea of Jones's west front, cherubim and palm in association with "Astrologicall Figures" of circle and triangles, all as emblems of Solomon - designed for the British Solomon's new Jerusalem. It was, after all, James himself who had commissioned both Jones's 'survey' of Stonehenge in 1620 and his 'survey' of the Cathedral of the same year.


This shadow of Solomon’s temple over Stonehenge, represented by an emblematic overlay, suggests a final parallel with the memory theatre tradition represented by Camillo’s ‘House of Wisdom’. However, in what contemporary work might Jones have found an association between Solomon’s temple and cherubim, in combination with an astrological plan and, most importantly, the architectural Orders themselves? One possible answer lies in the work of the Spanish Jesuit, Juan Bantista Villalpando, and his version of Ezekiel’s vision of Solomon’s temple.
"the Temple at Hierusalem adorned with the Figures of Cherubims"; a Cathedral, a Palace and Villalpando's temple of Solomon

"Now your turne comes, to speake, or god in you by yf hand, for soe he uses to speake many times, by ye hand of Moses & Aaron, & by ye hand of Esay & Ezekiell, & by ye hands of you his minor Prophets now".

Thus concluded Bishop Richard Corbet, calling for contributions towards the restoration of St. Paul's at Norwich in 1634. The influence of John Lightfoot's The Temple Especially as it stood in the dayes of our Saviour (1650) has been suggested in Jones's design for Lady Cotton's tomb. Lightfoot's temple was not, however, formed from the Vitruvian Orders; Jones's most likely contemporary source for such a temple would have been the second volume of In Ezechielem Explanationes et Apparatus Vrbis ac Templi Hierosolymitani, published in 1604 by the Spanish Jesuit, Villalpando - the first, as chapter two pointed out, to illustrate an Ordered temple. Ezekiel was himself the most 'hermetic' of the prophets - Gordon's 'cabalisticall collections' preached before James including "that out of Ezechiell" (quoted in chapter four); Dugdale records that the Cathedral library possessed no less than five separate copies of the Book of Ezekiel, the largest number of any of the Books of the Bible. In line with Villalpando's interest in Lull (following his master Philip II), his study itself has a hermetic character, expressed in particular through the temple's elevations and astrological plan (Fig.48). Villalpando identified the central four bastions with the four elements; Astrology, numerology, mystical geometry, anthropomorphism, pythagorean musical intervals and Cabala itself all play their part (subjects Jones would have seen alluded to in Dee's 'preface').

Villalpando's commentary certainly had influence in this country; a copy belonged to the old Royal Library and bears James I's arms on its binding, and Thomas Herbert reported that when Charles was imprisoned at


Carisbrook Castle he studied "Villalpandus upon Ezekiel". Villalpando's currency in the Court is recorded as early as 1625, for, along with Serlio, his commentary was twice cited in Great Britains SALOMON, the sermon delivered by Bishop Williams at the funeral of James I. Here in addition Williams notes,

"Salomon beautified very much his Capitall Citie with Buildings, and Water-workes, I Kings 9.15. So did King James...the most constant Patron, of Churches".

As a biblical scholar and a theologian Villalpando was here used to justify the building enterprises of King James - as indeed his study had justified the building of the Escorial, the church-monastery-palace of Philip II (who, in cultivating the title 'King of Jerusalem', had equally sought identity with Solomon).

Later still in Britain John Evelyn's Parallel...upon the Five Orders (1664) cites Villalpando when describing the Corinthian,

"You see what Vitruvius reports: But Villalpandus who will needs gives this Capitel a more Illustrious and antient Original, pretends that the Corinthians took it first from the Temple of Solomon, of which God himself had been the Architect...the true Originals of the Temple were of Palm-branches bearing Fruit, to which the Leaves of the Olive have a near Correspondence. The Design which we shall hereafter describe with the whole Entablature of the Order, drawn precisely according to the Measures which Villalpandus has Collected, and which I expressly followed".

Various attempts have been made to find stylistic sources for Jones's early design for St. Paul's. The most recent, in 1989 by Harris and Higgott,

---

136 Herbert, T., Memoirs Of The Two Last Years Of The Reign Of That Unparallell'd Prince, King Charles I (1702), p.43.
137 Williams, J., Great Britains SALOMON (1625), p.25, p.29.
140 Evelyn, J., A Parallel of the Ancient Architecture with the Modern (1664), p.67.
makes the traditional reference to Jesuit church facades;\textsuperscript{141} in this work no analysis of the symbolism is offered, Solomon never mentioned, and the essential contradiction between Jesuit symbols and Protestantism, although pointed out, is unexplained. Given the currency of Villalpando, perhaps the source for this symbolism on St. Paul's was his temple; here Jones would have seen the Orders, together with an astrological layout, heraldry, cherubim and palm, candelabra and hanging vine (Fig.50), all used together for the first time as emblems for Solomon. This would explain what has been described as Jones's "strange mixture of classical motifs"\textsuperscript{142} on St. Paul's. De la Ruffiniere du Prey has drawn attention to the Solomonic symbolism in the University Church of Sant' Ivo della Sapienza, Rome, by Borromini (1599-1667), which not only included palm trees and cherubim, presented as "following Villalpando", but also has a plan possibly derived, according to the author, from the "sigillum Salomonis".\textsuperscript{143}

Further, if we accept 1620 as the correct date for Jones's 'pre-built' drawing, the political circumstances of around this time may have provided a context for Jones's use of the Spanish Jesuit's work. 1620 was a key date in James I's search for a Protestant universal Church.\textsuperscript{144} Peace had been made with Spain in 1604, and the policy of union was to culminate in the proposed marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta. At first, the Spanish demanded a public Roman Catholic church in London for the Infanta. This demand was, of course, denied but James allowed the Infanta a private chapel, with Jones commissioned to build chapels in Denmark House and at St. James's Palace. It follows that the timing of this Catholic union may have provided a specific 'political' motive for the 1620 St. Paul's commission, prompting as it did Jones's construction of these other Court-patronised churches. The Infanta's visit would certainly have provided stimulus for the

\textsuperscript{141} Harris, J., Higgott, G., \textit{Complete Architectural Drawings} (1989), p.241: "Jones's elevation is redolent of Roman Catholic Italy". Two churches are suggested, Il Gesu in Rome (1571), San Ambrogio in Genoa (1589-1606).

\textsuperscript{142} Fraser, P., \textit{A Catalogue of Drawings in the Burlington-Devonshire Collection} (1960), p.92. Fraser also points to Il Gesu in Rome.


Cathedral’s basic repair; economic circumstances would seem to support this suggestion, as Per Palme notes,

"We know that Lionel Cranfield was a directive force in the economic and political endeavours associated with the marriage negotiations; we know that he was engaged in the preparations for the Banqueting House and the chapels. Is it a mere coincidence that this shrewd politician early in 1620 'procured a commission...for the repairing' of the Cathedral? A restoration was certainly needed, but it is not very likely that Cranfield spent the King’s money, or his own, for other than some mundane purpose... Cranfield probably knew more about the climate of opinion in the City than any other Privy Councillor, and he might have thought it wise to meet the uneasy opposition to the Spanish Match with a gesture of reassurance".145

Palme suggests that the Whitehall Banqueting House was erected as a sign and in celebration of the expected triumph of the Spanish match. This match might also provide a specific 'context' for Jones's overt display, on a Protestant Cathedral, of the cherubim, statues and IHS monogram, not only suggestive of Jesuit church facades (as chapter four pointed out) but naturally found in the work of the Spanish Jesuit, Villalpando. At this time Jesuit works certainly influenced members of the Church of England, including, significantly, John Donne.146 Chapter four discussed the Laudian tendency towards the ecumenical, and St. Paul's as an 'ecumenical temple'. Stuart Court celebrations not only frequently projected 'peace' as a theme (expressed in James's motto, 'Beati Pacifici') but the Court itself enjoyed more peaceful times in Europe up to 1620 - an optimism in which, at a general level, the early Cathedral restoration plans participated. Chapter three noted that peace formed the theme of the 1620 pageant inaugurating the Lord Mayor serving on the restoration committee of that year, with "tydings of peace" forming the restoration sermon itself.147 On proceeding to St. Paul's in 1620 to announce the restoration, James ordered the procession to halt in front of the house of the Spanish ambassador. After the ambassador's greeting, the King bowed two or three times, with his hat very low and by

147 King, J., *A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church* (1620), p.39.
contemporary report "great importance is attached to this"; after the failure of the Spanish treaty, the collection of building materials at the Cathedral came to a standstill.

Just before this failure, 1620 had seen the overthrow of the rule of James's daughter, Elizabeth, over Bohemia (the other, Protestant half of James's policy of religious union through marriage). 'Jesuit' iconography is absent from the built facade, with its more austere profile - a later Cathedral which would seem more specifically 'Protestant-Imperial' in its overt celebration of Stuart Christian ancestry. Indeed, this general collapse of James's policy may be a less functional reason for the removal, not only of iconography, but also of its ordering scheme of interlocked triangles, the alchemical emblem of union. It was pointed out that the union of opposites, both Royal and Religious, was a popular theme of Stuart art; hence, perhaps in the first design the union of such religious opposites through peace with Spain was celebrated in iconography from Villalpando and the geometry explored in chapter six.

In a drawing by Webb for the frontispiece of Brian Walton's *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (1655-7) (a copy of which was in the Cathedral library), an equilateral triangle illuminated by a sunburst crowns the apex (Fig.86). Immediately following Webb's frontispiece Walton's Bible opens with a reconstruction of Solomon's temple taken from Villalpando, illustrations copied and somewhat simplified by Hollar; there follows a long paper, chiefly about Villalpando's temple, by the French Hebraist Louis Coppel. This confirms that Webb certainly knew Villalpando's reconstruction. Indeed, Webb's design for the Royal bedchamber at Greenwich palace was clearly based on Villalpando (Fig.49). Thomas Winniffe, Cathedral Dean after Donne and member of the second restoration committee, also gave active assistance to Walton in the preparation of the Polyglot Bible, and presumably, therefore, would not have been antagonistic to any reference by Jones to Villalpando. Incidentally, added to Webb's frontispiece in his

151 This emblem was used in the pediment to one of Webb's church designs, illustrated in Summerson, *The Unromantic Castle* (1990), p.55, fig.41.
handwriting\textsuperscript{152} is the curious title 'The Assention of Baronius'; given the advocacy by Caesar Baronius of hermetic lore,\textsuperscript{153} perhaps when noting Baronius's 'assention' Webb also intended his emblem, with its representation of Moses, to proclaim the authenticity of the 'Corpus Hermeticum' by then under attack - as indeed his quotations elsewhere from Kircher indicate.

As the pupil of Herrera, the architect of the Escorial, Villalpando's temple reconstruction had a direct influence on the palace design, as a 'hermetic' building.\textsuperscript{154} In line with the representation of James as Solomon on the Whitehall Banqueting House ceiling, at least one early drawing for Whitehall palace shows a square plan with central church and courtyards identical to those of Villalpando's temple (Fig.48). Roy Strong in his geometric study of Whitehall (noted in chapter six), in following Taylor's Escorial overlay, points out the possible influence of Villalpando's temple on Whitehall.\textsuperscript{155} John Harris has speculated that Jones would have known of the design of the Escorial itself from engraved views,\textsuperscript{156} and, following Summerson (quoted in chapter two), recently asserted that the "new Palace of Whitehall [was]...modelled on the Escorial".\textsuperscript{157} Prince Charles was entertained at the Escorial whilst in Spain,\textsuperscript{158} and would certainly have

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{152} Attributed by Margery Corbett, \textit{Catalogue of the Drawings...at Worcester College, Oxford} (ed. J. Harris, A.A Tait, 1979), p.42.
  \item \textsuperscript{153} The twelve volumes of the \textit{Annales Ecclesiastici} of Caesar Baronius had appeared between 1588 and 1607, and, according to Yates, "implied the whole elaborate interpretation of the Hermetic writings as Gentile prophecy of the coming of Christ", \textit{Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition} (1964), p.399.
  \item \textsuperscript{155} Strong, R., \textit{Britannia Triumphans} (1980), pp.61-63.
  \item \textsuperscript{156} Harris, J., \textit{The King's Arcadia} (1973), p.146. The palace was frequently visited by early 17th Century travellers and described in subsequent 'guidebooks', for example, the Escorial is described by James Wadsworth, \textit{Further Observations of the English Spanish Pilgrime} (1629).
  \item \textsuperscript{158} See Whitelocke, B., \textit{MEMORIALS OF THE ENGLISH Affairs} (1709), p.307: "The Prince took his leave of the Queen and Infanta, the King brought him to his sumptuous Palace, the \textit{Escorial}, which is built in the form of a Gridiron, the Instrument of the Martyrdom of St. Quintin, in whose Honour it was founded. Here the Prince was feasted, and seal'd the Proxy, and swore to perform the Marriage".
\end{itemize}
handwriting\textsuperscript{152} is the curious title 'The Assention of Baronius'; given the advocacy by Caesar Baronius of hermetic lore,\textsuperscript{153} perhaps when noting Baronius's 'assention' Webb also intended his emblem, with its representation of Moses, to proclaim the authenticity of the 'Corpus Hermeticum' by then under attack - as indeed his quotations elsewhere from Kircher indicate.

As the pupil of Herrera, the architect of the Escorial, Villalpando's temple reconstruction had a direct influence on the palace design, as a 'hermetic' building.\textsuperscript{154} In line with the representation of James as Solomon on the Whitehall Banqueting House ceiling, at least one early drawing for Whitehall palace shows a square plan with central church and courtyards identical to those of Villalpando's temple (Fig.48). Roy Strong in his geometric study of Whitehall (noted in chapter six), in following Taylor's Escorial overlay, points out the possible influence of Villalpando's temple on Whitehall.\textsuperscript{155} John Harris has speculated that Jones would have known of the design of the Escorial itself from engraved views,\textsuperscript{156} and, following Summerson (quoted in chapter two), recently asserted that the "new Palace of Whitehall [was]...modelled on the Escorial".\textsuperscript{157} Prince Charles was entertained at the Escorial whilst in Spain,\textsuperscript{158} and would certainly have

\begin{footnotesize}

\item[153] The twelve volumes of the \textit{Annales Ecclesiastici} of Caesar Baronius had appeared between 1588 and 1607, and, according to Yates, "implied the whole elaborate interpretation of the Hermetic writings as Gentile prophecy of the coming of Christ", \textit{Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition} (1964), p.399.


\item[156] Harris, J., \textit{The King's Arcadia} (1973), p.146. The palace was frequently visited by early 17th Century travellers and described in subsequent 'guidebooks', for example, the Escorial is described by James Wadsworth, \textit{Further Observations of the English Spanish Pilgrime} (1629).


\item[158] See Whitelocke, B., \textit{MEMORIALS OF THE ENGLISH Affairs} (1709), p.307: "The Prince took his leave of the Queen and Infanta, the King brought him to his sumptuous Palace, the Escorial, which is built in the form of a Gridiron, the Instrument of the Martyrdom of St. Quintin, in whose Honour it was founded. Here the Prince was feasted, and seal'd the Proxy, and swore to perform the Marriage".
\end{footnotesize}
witnessed, amongst other treasures, the library frescoes replete with their hermetic mysticism (including Euclid with 'Solomon's seal', emblematic for the knowledge of which he was patron (Fig.45)); Spanish customs certainly influenced Charles's later Court.\(^{159}\) Of the 1620 commissioners, Buckingham saw the Escorial whilst in Spain with Charles, and Bacon expressed knowledge of its design.\(^{160}\) An oblique, contemporary reference to Jones's desire to rival the Escorial has been identified in Jonson's poem *To Inigo, Marquis Would-Be*,\(^{161}\) in which the Escorial's plan, "a forum with quadrivial streets" (ln.11), is placed in comparison with Jones's intentions for Whitehall.

To James, the resurfacing of St. Paul's became a spiritual exercise on a grand scale, much as the building of the Escorial had been to Philip II. This Spanish 'hermetic' palace, and the biblical commentary upon which its design was based, directly preceded Jones's own attempt to refound the temple of Solomon. As such, the Escorial might be understood to provide a European context for Jones's use of the Roman theatre plan in combination with Villalpando's temple, not just on Whitehall, but also at St. Paul's Cathedral.

---

159 Parry, G., *Golden Age Restor'd* (1981), p.267: "he contracted an admiration for the haughty aristocratic conduct that prevailed at the Escorial, and he seems to have adopted a similar style when he ascended the throne".

160 Bacon, F., 'Of Building' (1625), in *Works*, vol.vi, (ed. J. Spedding, 1857), p.482: "We will therefore describe a princely palace, making a brief model thereof. For it is strange to see, now in Europe, such huge buildings as the Vatican and Escorial and some others be, and yet scarce a very fair room in them".

Robert Fludd and the Microcosm-Macrocosm; Circles, triangles, and the anatomy of Jones's Stonehenge and Cathedral face.

"Methodical direction how to censure Fabriques alreadie raised...passe a running examination over the whole Edifice, according to the properties of a well shapen Man. As whether the wals stand upright upon cleane footing and Foundation; whether the Fabrique bee of a beautifull Stature, whether for the breadth it appeare well burnished, whether the principall Entrance be on the middle Line of the Front or Face, Like our Mouthes, whether the Windowes, as our Eyes, be set in equall number and distance on both sides, whether the Offices like the Veines in our Bodies, be usefully distributed, and so forth. For this Allegoricall review may be driven as farre as any Wit will, that is at leasure".


Vitruvius's famous remarks on the proportions of the human figure (introducing his third book, on temples) describe how a well-built man fits, with extended hands and feet, into a circle and square. These human proportions should, he suggests, be embodied in the proportions of temples. Chapter six pointed out that through its geometry Stonehenge embodied the idea of human proportion, the source of architectural Orders traced to the circle of 'Vitruvian' man. In this way the 'individual' Cathedral Orders, which in themselves reflected male or female proportion, united to form an overall human 'body' expressed in circles and triangles (much like the notion of individual 'heraldic' columns understood to form one overall heraldic scheme). Anthropomorphism was a popular theme of hermetic philosophy. Agrippa represented the circle, pentagon and equilateral triangle as implicit in the anatomy of man (Fig.33), illustrations to which it has been seen Dee's 'Anthropographie' referred.

Whilst there is no evidence that Jones ever met Bruno, he certainly met the English hermetic philosopher, Robert Fludd. In the terminal flyleaves of Jones's 'Palladio', amongst a series of medical notes the name of "Doc Flud" is cited twice, consulted on issues of the microcosm,

---

"Doc Flud discommendes glisters for weakening the guttes...Docc Flud tould mee at Arr. House, that glisters beeing often taken doe weaken the guttes...he advised rather to take stomicall pilles"

Jones may, however, have also consulted Fludd on matters connected with the macrocosm, including perhaps the role of architecture in artificial memory. These notes record that Jones also consulted Fludd's friend, William Harvey. Jones was certainly aware of the study of anatomy through his figure drawings and the design for the Barber Surgeons' Anatomy theatre. Rykwert points out that Harvey and Fludd were the most distinguished Paracelsians in Britain, adding that "Jones would also have found Paracelsian medicine sympathetic". Curiously enough, together with Selden it had been Harvey who persuaded Webb to publish STONE-HENG RESTORED, as chapter one noted. Indeed, the joint interest of an antiquarian and Paracelsian anatomist is perhaps indicative of the terms in which Jones's Stonehenge and its restored geometry should be examined.

Jones's meeting with Fludd evidently took place at Arundel House, and Lord Arundel, one of the Garter Knights amongst the 1620 commissioners, may also have had an interest in Fludd. Indeed, Fludd also had contact with other protagonists in the refacing project, for he and Laud were at St. John's College, Oxford, at the same time and, as has been pointed out, he dedicated his UTRIUSQUE COSMI HISTORIA to James - addressing the King with the hermetic epithet 'Ter Maximus'. Hence Fludd's work may well have exerted more influence in Court circles than has so far been recognised. In 1957 Palme, somewhat disparagingly, commented,

"The pathetic hero of contemporary Pythagorean mathematics was, of course, Robert Fludd. His chapter on the visual arts appended to UTRIUSQUE COSMI MAIORIS, 1617, should be studied

---

163 Flyleaf three, verso, records "for an ordinary Glisher Doc: Harvey", and flyleaf four, verso, "...for to avoyde gravell &c from Mor Sanci. and said to bee good by Doc: Harvy".


with care - text and illustrations - by anyone interested in the 'mathematical' interpretation of Jones's architecture'.

In suggesting background influences of Fludd on Jones in 1969, Yates noted,

"Fludd's technical history should, I suggest, be studied by those interested in Jones and the Stuart masque as probably the work representing most closely the theoretical background of the early Jones productions".

Through the geometry of Stonehenge we can extend these connections.

Central to Fludd's emblematics was the geometry of interlocked circles and triangles - a norm of occult works and traceable, as was discussed, in the 'plan' of Fludd's mnemonics. In 1623, Fludd published *Soul, Body and Bread*, the frontispiece to which illustrates 'Universal Man', the microcosm, expressed through circles forming a 'Solomon's seal', set within an outer circle (Fig.32). This proclaimed 'The external image of man's mystic anatomy' - much like, perhaps, the 'anthropomorphic' Orders forming the same scheme on Jones's west face. Further, in the centre of Fludd's emblem an equilateral triangle is dotted, linking the three circular panels. This has at its apex the sacred monogram, IHS, surrounded in a kind of 'heaven' by the archangels Gabriel, Michael, Uriel and Raphael; the small circle to the left explains that 'Spiritus' or air and soul surround IHS, 'the light or centre of man'. These three circles form the 'triple members of internal man', the three souls, linked to the world of God by means of a triangle. As was noted, at the apex of Jones's 'pre-built' west front, within a sunburst, there is also the sacred monogram, IHS. This not only sits within an 'invisible' triangle of 'Solomon's seal', in the Cathedral's 'heaven', but, following Fludd's emblem, if an equilateral triangle is dotted from this IHS the base points coincide exactly with the base centre-line of the two statues and their tabernacles (Fig.63). Hence, perhaps coincidentally, following Fludd the three Cathedral 'icons' are physically linked by an equilateral triangle. In both, the world of man becomes spiritually linked to the world of God by

---

169 Ibid.
means of an equilateral triangle. In this way, when placed within the context of the contemporary emblems of a hermetic philosopher it is known Jones consulted, the 'anatomy' of the 'pre-built' drawing for the west face can be seen to embody the light of man's soul and the sunburst of God.

Following St. Paul (I Corinthians ch.xii, v.14) the Christian Church had traditionally been compared to a human body. In Revelations the new Jerusalem was proportioned "according to the measure of a man, that is, of an angel" (ch.xxii, v.17-18). In line with the Ark according to St. Augustine, this anthropomorphism became implicit in actual church buildings, with the cruciform plan likened to the body of Christ. Jones would have seen this illustrated in his copy of Pietro Cataneo's L'architettura (Venice, 1567). The Savior's body, the Cross and the cosmic temple were frequently linked in mediaeval speculation about building, probably echoed according to Rykwert by the verbal teaching of mediaeval Masonic lodges.170 The two corner foundation stones at the west end of St. Paul's, with their crosses, symbolised the anatomy of Christ. At St. Paul's the 1620 restoration sermon cites "that glorious Temple of Salomon, one of the goodliest limmes of that beautiful bodie".171 In uniting the concept of temple and architectural Order as 'body', Villalpando had detailed the anthropomorphic proportions of the porticoes of Solomon's temple172 and, in reference to this, Taylor has discussed the role of the geometry of the human figure in the design of the Escorial, noting that

"there was ample authority for identifying man with the triangle by way of the exemplarist geometry of St. Augustine's De Trinitate...Christ's body...supplied a tangible link with the triangle".173

Chapter three referred in passing to the concept of Kingship as it had developed through the middle ages, involving both a 'natural' and a

170 Rykwert, J., On Adam's House in Paradise (1972), p.120. For a history of the Church as a human body, see Kantorowicz, E., The King's Two Bodies (1957), p.199.

171 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.19.


'mystical' body - what has been termed 'The King's Two Bodies'.

For, as James himself often wrote, the King was two persons - as a man he was subject to mortality, whilst as sovereign he ruled with divine power, in line with the Old Testament Kings and with Christ. In Chapter Two James was quoted comparing Kingship "to the head of this Microcosme of the body of man" and in 1648 Bishop Juxon (under whom much of the Cathedral building work was carried out), in lamenting the execution of Charles was to note that "his Body was the Temple of the Holy Ghost". The 1620 restoration sermon, in proclaiming "the bodie of the King, a building not made with hands, but shaped of flesh and bloud", made this metaphor explicit at St. Paul's, for,

"when my Master himselfe shall come, and stretch his body upon the body, afford his owne bodily presence, and set himselfe to the worke...mark the pillars and pinnacles, and make it his princely care".

It is this concept of the mystical 'body' of Kingship, his role as 'royal vicar', which may have found expression on the 'sacred' doorway of Jones's west front (where the King traditionally knelt before entry). It was intended that Jones's arch at Temple Bar carry images illustrating the King's divine body, for here was to be the tripartite Idea of the monarch as Pagan Emperor, Jewish King and Christian Prince - symbolised at St. Paul's through the 'Pagan' Orders, the 'Jewish' Statues, and the 'IHS', all invisibly united, perhaps, by a 'microcosmic' geometry, as later it became explicitly embodied in the Stuart statues surmounting the portico. Hence, in forming this geometry the Idea of Jones's Cathedral Orders expressed that of the King, as in masque. Indeed, with James kneeling before the Cathedral, the west front (as an image of the divine temple), can be understood to be of a higher order than even that of the mystic body of the King himself.

As part of the body analogy which recurs throughout the De re aedificatoria, Alberti had defined a wall as being composed of bones,

174 See Kantorowicz, E., The King's Two Bodies (1957).

175 See Parry, G., Golden Age Restor'd (1981), p.239.

176 Juxon, W., The Subjects Sorrow; or, Lamentations upon the Death of Britaines Josiah, King Charles (1649), p.23.

177 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.34, p.37.
muscles and skin (bk.iii, ch.vi) with the individual column compared to a human bone (bk.ix, ch.v). Jones's annotations in his 'Alberti' show his close study of this later section, whilst he notes in his 'Vitruvius', "The bones and sustaynors ar corner Pilasters / the openings or lips are yᵉ windowes / the complimente is betwixt the bones & the openings". In this way the Corinthian pilasters might be seen as 'bones', composing a geometric 'anatomy' of triangles - much as the Tuscan columns of Stonehenge. The whole surface might be seen as a new skin (or heraldic coat); in the restoration sermon of 1620 it was reported that "every Colledge almost hath cast his old skin with the Serpent, and gotten a new coat...So the re-building of Pauls". And in conclusion the old Cathedral body was compared to "a wounded, bleeding, dying Church, falling so fast to a plaine anatomy".

178 Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius', bk.ii ch.viii against Barbaro p.83 ln.38 ln.40, p.84 ln.1. In his 1615 edition of Scamozzi's L'idea della architettura universale, Jones notes in the first part, bk.iii ch.20 p.312 "Stairs compard to yᵉ vaines in yᵉ boddy".

179 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.55.

"the chaire of Moyses, for instruction"; Jones's temple and the magic of Solomon

"[King Charles] hath...been and still is a Glorious builder. Nor will I carry you farre off for instance. As the Disciples to Christ concerning the Temple of Jerusalem, so let me say to you...See the Materialls for the re-edifying of this Mother Church, of which should I say nothing, the Timber would cry, Et Saxa loquentur, and the very stones speake. Did any Eye within these few yeares hope to behold this neglected Temple (like Sion in her mournfull widdowhood siting in the Dust) trimmed up like a fresh Bride? Her wrinckled face guttered with the teares of her decay, and furrowed by the injurie of Time, made smooth againe, Her ragged garments changed into costly robes. Need I tell you who hath put upon her, Beautie for Dust and Rubbish, and a face of Repaire for Ruine? Is it not the zeale of our most gracious Jehoash? who hath not onely (as King Jehoash) said, Goe out into the Cities of Judah, and gather of all Israel money, to repaire the House of God, but set them a pattern in His Own Munificence".

[King, H., (1640)]

Lost antique temples and theatres, magical music and memory, anatomy and masonry, sacred geometry and the architectural Orders, were all thematic norms of Renaissance attempts to 'restore' Solomon's temple - employed in the design of the Escorial before Jones and at the Temple of Lyon after. In this country such themes formed part of a general attempt to restore Albion to Jerusalem and discover its ancient signs, the language of God or Cabala. For Marcelline, "God himselfe Husbanded the Garden of that Country", and, together with Bacon and Fludd, the 'philosopher-king' James was the 'second Hermes'. Through Dee Jones employed an aspect of Cabala on the Cathedral itself, 'restored' to a magic Albion conjured by him in masque and uncovered on Salisbury Plain. Linked triangles formed a universal emblem for this divine magic 'restored', and, more specifically, here the shadow of Stonehenge over St. Paul's might be detected. In Cesariano's Milan and Jones's St. Paul's such geometry might also be seen to illustrate the continuity between so-called 'Gothic' and 'Renaissance'.

181 King, H., A Sermon Preached at St. Paul's, March 27. 1640. Being the Anniversary of his Majesties Happy Inauguration to his Crowne (1640), pp.50-1.
Chapter Eight

It was with the above claim that Henry King, the Residentiary of St. Paul's and member of the second restoration committee, concluded his sermon preached in front of a partially restored Cathedral, at Paul's Cross, in 1640. Here again, in conclusion, the anthropomorphism of circles and triangles would seem an appropriate "pattern", or "face of Repaire for Ruine" on Jones's new west front. At the same spot twenty years previously the Bishop of London had declared nothing less than the erection of "the thrones of David, for judgement; and the chaire of Moyses, for instruction". Further, with Solomon's temple "the strongest and stateliest pile of building that ever the eyes of the Sunne looked upon", at St. Paul's was to be raised a temple befitting "the body of the King, the morning and mid-day influence of that glorious Sun".182

182 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.18, p.43.
CHAPTER NINE
"the body of the King,...that glorious Sun"
St. Paul's and the 'City of the Sun'.

Chapter Nine

252
Inigo Jones's temple to the British Sun

"The celestial life, according to the Hermetic sources, is born on air, or *spiritus*, and it is strongest in the sun which is its chief transmitter. Ficino therefore seeks to cultivate the sun and his therapeutic astral cult is a revival of sun worship...in his *De sole*, the Sun is called the *Statua Dei* and is compared to the Trinity".


This study has examined the hermetic content to Jones's Cathedral restoration. As part of this, chapter three quoted the 1621 Lord Mayor's procession in presenting early Cathedral repair work as a product of the Companies' celestial rule over the City, expressed in the pageant's title, 'Sun in Aries'. Bruno's 'enlightened' vision for the Cathedral was discussed in chapter seven, chapter eight opened with Marcelline presenting James in invisible geometric terms, "Answerable to the Sun", and closed with light at the centre of Fludd's circular microcosm.

Such civic and royal solar themes thus hint at a further 'reading' of Jones's two Cathedral designs. With a sunburst itself crowning the 'pre-built' design, what became a theme of Stuart antique Britain can, once again, be seen expressed through both geometry and iconography at St. Paul's.
"taken out of darkness"; Apollo's temple in 'New Troy' and St. Paul's Cathedral in Stuart London

"Bladud...tried to go upon the top of the air, when he fell upon the temple of Apollo in the city of New Troy, and was dashed into many pieces".


The sun and moon were norms of imperial symbolism, the 'lunar' empire and 'solar' papacy - the State and Church united under the Stuarts. Identification with the sun became a commonplace of 16th and 17th Century European monarchy. Bruno's patron, Henry III of France, was proclaimed a 'solar monarch', for example, and during the middle ages the British monarchy had often sought identity with the sun. Daly points out that some of the sun imagery in Shakespeare's historical plays should be read in the light of heraldic devices. The heraldry of Richard II and Henry IV included the sun in splendour, the sunburst, the sun clouded, and the rose en soleil. The 'Sun in Splendour' was Edward IVth's heraldic badge, derived from the appearance of three suns before the Battle of Mortimer's Cross (1461) during the Wars of the Roses, which Edward interpreted as a portent of victory and which subsequently formed the livery badge of his 'Yorkist' army. It is represented on a frieze in St. George's Chapel, Windsor (Edward was buried in the choir). In Court displays and propaganda Elizabeth I was frequently cast as 'Albion's shining sun'. 'Solar' geometry and iconography on St. Paul's thereby naturally carried associations with the mediaeval chivalrous ideal - particularly for the Garter Knights given their connection with Jones's work, and the use of such solar heraldry at Windsor.

In line with Honthorst's presentation of Charles as Apollo and Henrietta Maria as Diana - the sun and moon of the British heavens - both James and

2 Daly, P.M., Literature in the Light of the Emblem (1979), p.139.
4 'Sunbursts' are to be found on the collar of the effigy of the 'Yorkist' Sir Nicholas Fitzherbert (1473), they appear in the pages of many 'Yorkist' manuscript and are used as heraldic badges on the roof-bosses of the sanctuary at Tewkesbury Abbey and Queens' College, Cambridge.
Charles were frequently identified with the God of light in masque. In *Blacknesse* the Queen is instructed by a vision to seek Albion or Britannia; the moon goddess appears and observes,

"Britannia, which the triple world admires...
Ruled by a sun that to this height doth grace it,
Whose beams shine day and night, and are of force
To blanch an Ethiop, and revive a corse.
His light sciential is, and (past mere nature)
Can salve the rude defects of every creature...
This sun is temperate, and refines
All things on which his radiance shines" (Ins.219-43).

Solar imagery becomes implicit in the theme of the prophetic restoration of ancient Britain, accomplished by the union of the triple crowns. The King, as the royal sun, cast a 'sciential light' of knowledge over his empire, a divine power displayed through the "mute hieroglyphic" (In.246) of dance. In the masque of the following year, *Hymenaei*, the *Masque of Union* (1605), 'Truth' appeared,

"Her right hand holds a sun with burning rays,
Her left a curious bunch of golden keys,
With which heaven gates she locketh, and displays...
Eternal Unity behind her shines.
That fire and water, earth and air combines" (Ins.839-41, 850-1).

Here, the sun's burning rays symbolised James's wisdom, expressed through an alchemical union of the elements. Further, the frequent associations of Charles with Neptune in masque sprang from works such as Raleigh's *Ocean's Love to Cynthia* - the moon - controller of the oceans, and Elizabethan allegories of the Queen as Cynthia. The solar metaphor within the restoration sermon itself therefore formed part of a frequently used symbol of British monarchy and the King's mystical 'body'.

In seeking to enact the roles of the British Solomon, Constantine and Christ, the Stuarts naturally promoted a solar iconography which by tradition
surrounded such divine archetypes. It follows that the Stuart policy of Divine Right found expression through solar symbolism; as Strong points out, "At the moment when the law decreed the authority of the crown to be absolute, Inigo Jones, at the Queen's command, produced a masque about light".8

Astrology, dominated by the phases of the sun and moon, had obviously played a significant role in mediaeval Church ritual, with the signs of the zodiac for example forming a common decoration in churches; the sun and moon were represented on the walls of several Suffolk churches visited by the iconoclast William Dowsing in 1643-4.9 In encircling the old Cathedral sunwise,10 mediaeval processions made an explicit reference to the sun at St. Paul's (the old Cathedral was more correctly oriented than Wren's building). Early Christianity had itself been frequently identified as a 'solar' religion. According to Diodorus Siculus, Apollo visited a 'northern isle', identified as Britain, every nineteen years where there was "both a magnificent sacred precinct of Apollo and a notable temple...spherical in shape"11 - a reference, perhaps, to Stonehenge. Michael Drayton makes reference to the importance of Apollo to the ancient Britons in his *Poly-Olbion* (1613), dedicated to Prince Henry. In this the Stuart scheme of Albion's history was repeated, with London as the original archbishopric, a British born Constantine, and native Cabalism combined with the virtues of an antique culture provided by Roman occupation but traced back to Brute's conquest. Drayton speculated on the etymology of London,

"I could imagine, it might be cald at first *Lhan Dien.i. the Temple* of Diana, as *Lhan-Dewi*...and so afterward by strangers turned into *Londinium*, and the like. For, that *Diana* and her brother Apollo (under name of *Belin*) were two great Deities among the *Britons*, where is read next before, *Caesar* testimony of the *Gaules*; and that she had her Temple there where *Paules* is, relation in *Camden* discloses to you".12

11 Diodorus Siculus, II, bk.ii, 47, Ins.1-5, (Leob, trans., C. H. Oldfather, (1946)).
Here the antique temple reported by Jones became dedicated to Diana, a notion it has been seen was echoed later by Dugdale. Following this, Diana's temple featured in Bishop Corbet's sermon calling for Cathedral restoration,

"it was once dedicat to Diana, at least some Part of it; but the Idolatry lasted not long, and see a Mystery in the Chandege St. Pauls confuting twice that idol, there in person - where the crye was, "Greate is Diana of the Ephesians!" and here, by Proxy, Paul installed while againe Diana is thrust out. It did magnify the Creation, that it was taken out of Darkness. Light is not the clearer for that, but it is the stranger and more wonderfull".  

Jones's restoration is presented by Corbet as following a masque-like movement from darkness to light. And, once again, the memory of this christianised antique temple would seem to have been important in propaganda for 'restoration'. In this way Jones's proposed 'antique' restoration became linked to a local history: a restoration of the ancient pure religion of St. Paul on the site of a Roman temple dedicated to Diana, goddess of the moon and prophetess of Brute's Albion. At the glory of the vision of a restored Cathedral, a temple equivalent to that of Diana at Ephesus, Bishop King exclaims "I am full as the Moone".  

Drayton further reports that in antiquity there was a kindred shrine to Apollo at Westminster. In this, once again, his official Stuart history echoed 'Geoffrey' and his story of the ninth King of Britain, Bladud, reportedly killed at a temple to Apollo in 'New Troy' (quoted above). Bladud formed part of James's official genealogy, featuring in Haywood's TROIA BRITANICA (1609) and Thomas Lyte's 'tree' of 1610, for example, in which Apollo's temple itself is pictured (Fig. 88). Hence as part of this 'restoration' of this ancestry Stuart St. Paul's might be seen in succession to Geoffrey's temple to Apollo in 'New Troy'. Indeed, in The Masque of Augurs (1622) Stuart London became the setting for a circular temple to Apollo, for here Apollo "can...with his voyce, / Reare townes" (Ins. 276-7) and,

"with my music,

14 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.56.
A college here,
Of tuneful augurs, whose divining skill
Shall wait thee still" (Ins.316-20).

Thomas Dekker's *London's Tempe* (1629) echoed this in featuring London as the setting for a palace of Apollo. In common with other Court presentations the *Masque of Augurs* celebrated the inauguration of the Stuart Golden Age (and Jones's Banqueting House in particular) of which the refaced Cathedral was a central sign. Following the musical connotations of triangles and circles and Waller's presentation of Cathedral work as "harmony in sound" through Laud's foundation ceremony, and Jones's skulls recalling Roman Augury, Charles's 'musical' Cathedral might be seen 'inaugurated' as just such a musical temple to Apollo. Or, in other words, the re-foundation of a "college" of clergy whose self-appointed practices under Laud included inauguration ceremonies, in succession to one group within the ancient Roman clergy, "tuneful augurs". Charles was himself cast in this masque as a "princely augur" (In.399). This would fit with the 17th Century Garter Knights cast as Roman Senators (and Jonson himself as the "English Horace"), all within the setting of London itself as a new Rome. In 17th Century Lyon the Jesuits were to be similarly identified as successors of the Augurs, priests of Augustus's Rome.

Laudian iconography frequently featured the sun. As chapter four pointed out, the origins of 'Laudian' reform expressed in the refacing project can be traced to the new chapel for Peterhouse, Cambridge, entitled by Trevor-Roper the "citadel of ultra-Laudianism"; here, in an arched ceiling painted sky-blue, each coffer contained the emblem of a golden, burning sun.

---

16 Hailed as such in the introductory poem, 'ODE to BEN JONSON / Upon his Ode to himself', in *Quintus Horatius Flaccus his Book of the Art of Poetry* (1640). See Parry, G., *Golden Age Restor'd* (1981), p.20: "the city now had its Genius, its priests, its protective spirits, even the costume of antiquity, and in his final desire to see the dawning of a new Augustan age there was doubtless the hinted belief that Jonson would be its Horace, if not its Vergil".


18 The 'Good Shepherd' chalice plate c.1615 in St. John's College, Oxford; the altar at St. John's College, Cambridge, above which was a sun 'with great light beames'; see Tyacke, N., *Anti-Calvinists* (1987), chalice p.xviii, and fig.1, altar p.194.

The Geometry and Iconography of the Sun; Triangles in Circles, Sunbursts, Obelisks and Porticoes

Of the temples of the SUN and of the MOON.

NEAR the arch of TITUS, in the garden of Santa Maria Nova, there are two temples to be seen, of the same form, and with the same ornaments; one of which, because it is placed in the east, is thought to have been the temple of the SUN; the other, because it looks towards the west, to be that of the MOON.

THESE temples were built, and dedicated by TITUS TATIUS, king of the Romans. They come very near a round form, because they are as broad as they are long; which was done in respect of the course of the said planets, which is circular round the heavens.

[Palladio, I Quattro Libri dell' Architettura, (trans. Isaac Ware, 1738), bk.iv, ch.x].

In left-hand margin: "The Temples of Soll and Luna. I".

"B. The portio is 1/4 parte of the tempell from C to D...

Noat that the statues on ye Acroterri are much bigger then thos ouer ye collomes being farder from the eye and to agree with the bignes of the collom..."

Against elevation:

"Thes statues are in hight 1/4 part of the collom Architrave freese and corrnish".

[Jones, notes to above passage in his 'Palladio', pp.48-49].

The sun, as the supreme source of the natural powers which might unit man with God, was a key element of neoplatonic philosophy and Ficino's hermeticism in particular; for the followers of Ficino the sun occupied the central orbit, as the middle of divine influences, for Copernicans the sun was the geometrical centre point.20

A 'Euclidean' scheme of circles and triangles might be seen as forming a general symbol of the sun united with the trinity. The sun was central to the memory theatres of Camillo and Fludd, to which chapter eight compared the geometry of Jones's Stonehenge. Following this, further geometric lines traceable in Jones's work can be seen mirrored by Fludd's light emblematics. In the masque *Time Vindicated to Himself and to His Honours* (1623), Jones employed an image of his Banqueting House as the backdrop to the first scene. A drawing for the second scene records the design for the proscenium arch (Fig.85). Here, between the twelve zodiacal signs supported by the figures 'Night' and 'Day', intersecting pencil lines form triangles or pyramids; these were frequently used by Fludd and Kircher to represent the cosmic duality of light and darkness as they interpenetrate one another. Thus an 'occult' setting, or emblematic framework of light, here surrounds an image of Jones's Banqueting House.

It has been suggested that John Donne was influenced by Copernican theory. Certainly the sun frequently featured in Donne's poetry, 'The Sunne Rising' (post-1603), for example,

"Busie old foole, unruly Sunne,  
Why dost thou thus,  
Through windowes, and through curtaines call on us ?..  
Love, all alike, no season knowes, nor clyme...  
Shine here to us, and thou art every where;  
This bed thy center is, these walls, thy sphare".23

Foxell has pointed out that the Christ Donne beheld was "Oriens, the Sun, which is round" and that, as the "archetypal symbol of unity and totality", the circle was frequently referred to in his sermons as well as in the *Songs and Sonnets*.24 The Dean tells his congregation at St. Paul's that "One of the most convenient Hieroglyphicks of God, is a Circle, and a Circle is end-

---

lesse; His Sun and Moone and Stars move circularly". 25 Hence we might assume that any scheme advanced by Jones which intended to evoke the power of divine mysteries, the light of God, through a geometry of circles and triangles would have found sympathy with Donne in his role as 'guardian' of the fabric.

Donne was obviously not alone in delivering sermons at St. Paul's which made reference to light expressed through geometry. James's Cathedral plans, in which the King's 'solar' body formed a restoration metaphor, were announced on 26th March, 1620, and represented the first sermon delivered at Paul's Cross in that year. In June Michael Wigmore, sometime Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, preached at Paul's Cross a sermon dedicated to Francis Bacon. Here, proof of the Trinity, although a mystery, was taught through the 'Book of Nature', in the trinity-in-unity of the soul's faculties, in the sun and moon and the "light of the Ayre, proceeding from them both". 26 And the year closed with a preacher making reference to the circular figure as a "Hieroglyphique", or "mystical representation of the revolution of the yeere". 27

Later in the century a flaming sun within a triangle of the Trinity and encircled by a serpent of eternity was to become a masonic symbol - the 18th Century architect John Wood was to use such a device. 28 In line with such hieroglyphic geometry, Jones's iconography can also be seen to proclaim the Cathedral as a temple to the royal British sun.

Jones's Cathedral portico obviously faced the setting sun (new sundials 29 were fixed to its east-west corner). This portico was taken from Palladio's


29 The principles of Dialling were outlined in Vitruvius, bk.ix, ch.vii and in Jones's copy of the Barbaro 'Vitruvius' against the title he notes "Li 9 of dialing or Gnomoniature". On sundials as an art of masons, linked with the new mathematics see Stevenson, D., The Origins of Freemasonry, Scotland's Century, 1590-1710 (1988) p.113, pl.2-3 and on solar symbolism in masonic rituals in Scotland, p.159, p.179. See also Tyacke, N., Anti-Calvinists (1987), p.120.
Roman temple of the Sun and Moon, as a simple comparison reveals (Fig. 84) - both obviously have no pediment, but further here we have the same line of statues, the same central window trio, and the same number of columns of the same Order, Corinthian. Jones's 'Palladio' records his detailed study of the portico to the sun and moon (quoted above), visiting the site itself, as these notes reveal. Jones also used elements of the temple in a design for the Council Chamber of Whitehall Palace, where the Stuart Court sat in Solomon-like judgement. With Palladio's temple as source it follows that Jones's portico (with its statues of the royal 'body' and exclusive royal funding) can be seen to have made an explicit reference to the King's role as a solar monarch, in combination with his, and Henrietta Maria's, identification with the Moon. This represented a fusion of the Stuart King with his Queen, and the monarch's reformed role as both Emperor (sun) and Pope (moon). Such a reading would have been reinforced by the mythic history of Geoffrey's temple to Apollo and of a Romano-British temple of the Moon as having once stood on the site. Indeed, such an 'authenticity', based on the idea of 'refounding' a local Romano-British original, was achieved in the earlier design through embodying the geometry of Stonehenge - circles and triangles which it has been seen equally expressed "the body of the King, .. that glorious Sun". Jones's portico itself also echoed Stonehenge, for Jones generally identified such "uncovered" Roman ruins with "Coelus, and to the Sun, and to the Moon".

Further, Jones adds in his 'Palladio' that in part this temple was taken from the temple of Peace - this temple, or Basilica of Maxentius, was believed to have been the repository of the plundered treasures of the temple of Solomon.


Jones's obelisks, placed against the skyline, each supported a sun orb at their apex. Obelisks themselves had frequently been used as symbols of solar rays, in Egypt (at Heliopolis) and imperial Rome.33 For a link between obelisks and solar illumination in royal iconography we need look no further than the emblematic frontispiece to King James's Works (1616) (Fig.83), in which the four crowns make it a particularly British symbolism.34 Jonson's Barriers presented,

"Those obelisks and columns broke and down
That struck the stars, and raised the British crown
To be a constellation...
Outstriding the Colossus of the sun" (Ins.38-40, 61).

Donne's tomb within the Cathedral has been linked to his sermons by Foxell in A Sermon in Stone (1978). The poet's tomb is here discussed in the context of the 'refounding' of St. Paul's at the centre of the heliocentric cosmology, the new universe which had "leant a new aptness to the image of an Apollonian Christ".35 Jones's portico replaced an overt reference to this represented in his earlier I.H.S. sunburst, and Farley's 'restored' Cathedral is also, perhaps not surprisingly, pictured illuminated by the burning rays of the sacred name. Such a link between the created light of the sun and moon and the higher, brighter light of the creation itself, expressed through the sacred name, is found on the emblematic title page to James's Authorised Version of the Bible (1611) (Fig.82).

Finally, the Whitehall Palace of Kent's 1727 plates carries many sun emblems (Fig.87), and, as part of this palace, the Banqueting House where the King sat at the south end (and was addressed as a figure of the sun) was aligned due north-south. There is evidence that the Globe, as the supposed

---

33 See, for example, Encyclopaedia Britannica (11th ed., 1910-11): "Obelisk'...The pyramidions were sheathed in bright metal, catching and reflecting the sun's rays as if they were thrones of the sunlight. They were dedicated to solar deities, and were especially numerous at Heliopolis, where there was probably a single one sacred to the sun of immemorial antiquity. The principal part of the sun-temple at Abusir [was]...in the shape of a stumpy obelisk on a vast scale". Augustus used an obelisk as a sundial.


first 'Vitruvian' building in London, may have been aligned to the summer solstice.\textsuperscript{36}

Hence, following Bruno's vision all that has gone before might suggest old St. Paul's finally transformed into a temple to the sun. This was to be expressed at first through a geometry of triangles and circle and later through the portico based on Palladio's temple to the Sun and Moon. Indeed, this Cathedral face also "looks towards the west" and came "very near a round form", perhaps like Palladio's temple "done in respect of the course of the said planets, which is circular round the heavens". The Court poetry of Edmund Waller often addressed the Queen bathed in heavenly light, since "the light which now informs our age / Breaks from the court".\textsuperscript{37} Therefore it is perhaps no surprise to find Laud's Cathedral, and the Stuart west front in particular, alluded to as a Sun temple in Waller's verse on the Cathedral restoration, where in conclusion we are told,

"The Sun which riseth to salute the quire
Already finish'd, setting shall admire
How private bounty could so far extend,
The King built all, but Charles the western end".


"Is it summer over the steeple of St. Paul's or winter?" Jones's Cathedral and the hermetic 'City of the Sun'

"TRYUMPHS are the most choice and daintiest fruit that spring from peace and abundance; Love begets them; and much cost brings them forth...For the chaires of magistrates ought to be adorned, and to shine like the chariot which carries the sunne; and beames (if it were possible) must be thought to be shot from the one as from the other: as well to dazle and amaze the common eye, as to make it learne that there is some excellent, and extraordinary arme from heaven thrust downe to exalt a superior man, that thereby the gazer may be drawne to more obedience and admiration".

[Dekker, T., *Troia-Nova Triumphans* (1612)]38

In placing obelisks at city junctions in 1586, Sixtus V had sought a permanent translation of Rome to a radiant city animated by the light of God, Heliopolis, like Constantine before him. Joseph Rykwert claims in passing that it was

"a great time for ideal cities: Campanella's *City of the Sun* appeared in 1623, and Andreae's *Christianopolis* in 1619... Jones incorporated this idea through the rebuilding of London".39

In placing a temple at the core of a geometrically planned city, Tommaso Campanella's *City of the Sun*40 followed the general Renaissance ideal. More specifically, Campanella's temple became central to the whole city conceived as a memory 'theatre'. As a Utopia of astral magic, in the 'City of the Sun' the round, central Sun temple was painted with the images of the stars, surrounded by concentric walls on which emblems represented the story of creation.41 Through its geometry, in chapter eight Jones's Stonehenge was

---


compared to the 'memory temples' (related to the creation by Jones through biblical emblems such as cherubim). With the mediaeval city as the Cathedral's setting, perhaps through work on a building of such central eminence it was hoped that the whole city would feel the 'warmth' of its solar virtue; the concept of Laud's clergy as Solarian priests obviously echoes that in the City of the Sun. Whilst City of the Sun was published abroad, certain examples of Campanella's work were translated into English around the mid-17th Century; Wotton owned some of Campanella's work, and, as chapter seven noted, Campanella influenced Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury (the importance of sunworship in Herbert's work has been noted).

The 'official' Stuart City, constituted by the royal processional route, can now be seen to have embodied solar virtues through the triangular and circular geometry traced at Whitehall, Covent Garden, and St. Paul's. As a part of this royal route, Jones's intended arch at Temple Bar might be seen as a 'solar gateway' to the City, based as it was on the arch of the 'solar emperor', Constantine (which carried bas reliefs of the rising sun). The Triumph itself spread such solar themes in the City through the physical presence of the monarch, or, as Dekker indicates above, the Lord Mayor (in such processions as that of 1621, 'Sun in Aries'). In the sermon following the 'restoration' procession of 1620, the text supplied by the King emphasised the Triumph itself as a theme of restoration and cast the city in the King's light,

"When ever did your Sunne, since his first arising amongst you, stand still in your Gibeon ? the person (I meane) of your King, vouchsafe to be a part of your auditorie in this place, (with that glorious starre that followeth the Sunne, and the whole host of our earthly firmament about him; with so many thousands of soules besides, seeking the face of their Ruler, as I say not but in a triumph or show where they come to gaze, or along the streets in traine and succession, there have beeene more, but in a

42 Campanella's De Monarchia Hispanica was translated by one E. Chilmead in 1654, and republished with an 'Admonitorie Preface' by William Prynne in 1660.


garland and ring of an auditorie concht togethier, never have more beene scene) til this day? A part of your auditorie, did I say? Yea, and a principall part of my simple oratorie, such as it is: He laid my foundation for me, and set me my patterne (as God did Moyses in the Mount) to worke by". 45

Here "this place" refers to Paul's Cross, the theatrical "ring of an auditorie" where the sermon was preached. With Stuart London as a celestial city, the annual Lord Mayor's pageant leading to St. Paul's came to represent a celebration of the twelve Companies as a microcosm of planetary order, Bolton's "twelve principall Monopolies (the Zodiacke of the citie, in whose Eclipticke line their Lord Maior must ever runne his yeares course)". 46

During Charles's absence in Scotland the City of London was officially pictured in darkness, with "a continuall and heavy night", "our joys... eclipsed". Only on the return of the solar King in 1641 were the streets re-illuminated by "the warme sunne of his illustrious countenance", and a banquet prepared by the twelve Companies held to celebrate the ending of their mourning, "put of at the sight of his beames". 47

The 'plan' of the Court masque as a whole can be pictured as one vast moving talisman, following such European celebrations as the 'Joyeuse Magnificences' (1581). 48 Here geometric figures, in diverse colours, moved amongst incantatory scenes designed to draw down favourable influences on the British Court, the influences of fortunate stars the most powerful of which was the sun. Love's Triumph through Callipolis (1631) inaugurated Charles's reign; in announcing the mythology of his Court it depended particularly on both Ficino's commentary on the Symposium 49 and, as chapter seven pointed out, on Bruno's Degli Eroici Furori. Performed within settings designed once again by Jones, an idealised Stuart city is discovered, Callipolis, in which the Queen is told, "Through all the streets of your Callipolis, / Which by the

45 King, J., A Sermon at Paules Cross, on behalf of Paules Church (1620), p.32.
48 See Yates, F., Astraæa (1975), pp.149-172.
Splendour of your rays made bright, / The seat and region of all beauty is” (Ins. 71-73).

Like masqued 'Darkness' transformed to 'Light', so through the triumphal progress of the Sun King across his capital to his Sun Temple, Stuart London might finally be seen transformed into the neoplatonic ideal of the new Jerusalem, a 'City of the Sun', as Giordano Bruno had once imagined.
EPILOGUE
"the House of God, in the chief City of Albion"
From restoration to ruin.
EPILOGUE
"the House of God, in the chief City of Albion"
From restoration to ruin.
Albion's second ruin; Inigo Jones and the doomed temple

_Merlin_.

"'Tis long.
Since this my magic rod hath struck the air,
Yet loss of practice can no art impair
That soars above the reach of Nature's might;
Thus, then, I charm the spirits of the night,
And unto hell conjure their wings to steer...
T'express I died t'increase my magic skill".

[Davenant, W., _Britannia Triumphans_ (1637), Ins.218-230]

Finally, in conclusion we return to where we began, to the masque _Britannia Triumphans_ where we might now understand with new insight the opening scene in which the magic art of the "most ancient prophet of this isle" (ln.209), Merlin, was performed in front of Jones's Cathedral. According to _The Barriers_, King Arthur expected of Prince Henry "that by the might / And magic of his arme, he may restore / These ruined seats of vertue, and build more" (Ins.84-86). Hence for the Court, the restored Cathedral represented a partial fulfilment of the British magus's ancient prophecies, and was thus pictured at the centre and object of the neoplatonic Court drama - as, indeed, the restoration itself has been examined here.

It was clearly of some importance to Jones that his Cathedral should be proclaimed as the centrepiece of the Stuart 'triumphant Britain', for he emphasised the scale of St. Paul's in the backdrop to such an extent that Webb redrew the scene (Fig.71) with a smaller, more realistic Cathedral, corresponding more closely to the text.¹ St. Paul's thus placed on the stage further illustrates the inter-relationship between the theatre and the temple. Indeed, within this foreground, as Orrell observes,

"...the Globe Theatre appears, neatly aligned with St Paul's west end. Thus the scene with which the Masquing House opened confronted the audience with two pillars of Stuart cultural policy: the Laudian reformation associated with the renewal of St Paul's, and the humbler but hardly less attractive institution of the King's Men at the Globe".²

---


² Orrell, J., Ibid.
Here, pictorially at least, we have a connection - placed on stage and in Jones's hand - between the theatre and the temple, a connection found in Jones's Stonehenge and, possibly, on the west front of St. Paul's. 'Theatrical' notions would seem to have surfaced time and again in this study, the dangerously artificial aspects of Court life, the masques and diversions, which also pervaded Jones's architectural 'backdrop'. In line with the Renaissance magus, Jones was, after all, a master of illusion. Jonson's rebuke of Jones focussed on the importance of Stuart theatre as the realm in which Jones's architectural ideals were declared. Andrew Marvell, in his An Horatian Ode upon Cromwel's Return from Ireland (1650), cast Charles's execution as the last act of a long theatrical career,

"Then burning through the Air [Cromwell]...went,  
And Pallaces and Temples rent...  
That thence the Royal Actor born  
The Tragick Scaffold might adorn:  
While round the armed Bands  
Did clap their bloody hands.  
He nothing common did or mean  
Upon that memorable Scene:...  
So when they did design  
The Capitols first Line,  
A bleeding Head where they begun,  
Did fright the Architects to run".  

'Architects' here refers to all those who were involved in building a new order.  

As one of the traditional 'settings' for royal marriages, the Cathedral naturally became associated with celebrations of British history and the Arthurian chivalric tradition expressed in masques such as Britannia Triumphant; as has been seen, through Geoffrey's History Stonehenge was understood to form part of this past. References to Stonehenge at St. Paul's were always implied, therefore, on such occasions - a link which might explain an otherwise unintelligable reference within the description of the decorations at St. Paul's in 1502 for the marriage of the son of Henry VII, Arthur (consciously named after Geoffrey's hero), to Katherine, daughter of

---


4 See Ibid, p.300.
the King of Spain. By report a 'halpas' 12ft. wide and 4ft. high was made of timber from the west door to the choir. And without further explanation, reference is also made, somewhat obscurely, to a "ferrament vocat Stonehenge".5

Jones was to be indicted by the Puritans as "Sole Monarch"6 of the Cathedral work, for he had unilaterally removed the surrounding mediaeval houses and attempted to demolish the attached, 'humble' church of St. Gregory. This clearance had the effect of creating not only the new open space around the Cathedral but also the opportunity for distant views of the imperial monument, so long obscured. In 1598 John Stow reported that on the south side licences had been granted, "first to builde lowe sheddes, but now higher Houses, which do hide that beautifull side of the Church, save only the topppe and South Gate".7 In A Panegyrick to King Charles (1649), Wotton praised the King for his care of the architecture of London, mentioning especially the restoration of St. Paul's, "in demolishing those private dwellings which disgraced the aspect of so goodly a fabric".8 The streets 'radiating' from Jones's Cathedral to the west, down Ludgate Hill, and to the east, down Cheapside and Lombard Street, were cleared9 in an effort to extend the Cathedral's radial presence into the City itself. When King Christian IV of Denmark visited the Cathedral with James in 1606, he,

"...went to the topppe of the steeple, from whence he might take the prospect and full view of the whole Citie, whose outstretched limmits...inflamed him both with delight and admiration".10

---


9 Clarendon, reported by Milman, H.H., Annals (1868), p.335, records that all shops in Cheapside and Lombard Street, except those of goldsmiths, were directed to be shut up - probably referring to booths standing on the public way.

Looking out from the highest point in the city, the Cathedral tower, what in Elizabeth's day would have been open meadows at Smithfields and Lincoln's Inn had become partly covered, built up in regular terraces and planted in neatly ruled rows of trees, all forming a geometric pattern when viewed from above. London was here revealed, seen by royal eyes as a whole and as a 'groundplot', a perspective offered by map panoramas and in masque. *Britannia Triumphans* can be seen to offer the vision of distant city views of old St. Paul's, as such part of the unprecedented idea of a city plan for London with the Cathedral at its centre. In both stage drawings even the foreground 'mediaeval' buildings are only superficially mediaeval in character, for with their regular, symmetrical facades they represent a transformed city as a whole.11 Such a city plan, or 'urban programme', followed what Westfall entitled the 'Invention of conscious urban planning in Rome, 1447-55',12 by Nicholas V, almost exactly two hundred years before. In *Britannia Triumphans* London becomes a symbol for ordered nature and good government, with transformed St. Paul's as its focus. The antimasquers emerge from "a horrid hell...the nearer part expressing the suburbs" (Ins.231-3) - that is, an area of wilderness outside but defining the city.13

As part of the Stuart 'programme' for London as a new Jerusalem and Rome it was clearly hoped that the whole city should eventually be transformed, like St. Paul's, into a surface unity. The single extant letter written by Jones records his membership of the royal commissions (1619, 1625 continuing until 1642) controlling plans of new houses, with the view to reducing streets to uniformity.14 The commission of 1619 planned just such a transformation of the area around Lincoln's Inn fields, which Jones was charged to "drawe by way of mapp or Ground Plot".15 Given the 'Egyptian'

---


basis to aspects of neoplatonism, it is perhaps significant that Stukeley, (echoed later by Walpole)\textsuperscript{16} reported that,

"the side of the greater pyramid at base, is 693 English feet; which amounts exactly to 400 Egyptian cubits,. . . I have taken notice that Inigo Jones observ'd the like dimensions, in laying out the plot of Lincoln's-Inn-fields".\textsuperscript{17}

Certainly this indicates sources for Jones's work outside Palladio.\textsuperscript{18} Following the route taken by the royal procession, in linking Jones's geometric Idea at St. Paul's Cathedral and Covent Garden back to that of the proposed palace at Whitehall, one of the means by which such a unified vision was to be achieved becomes apparent.

We might now look with new insight at Hollar's panorama of the City of London (Fig.69) drawn in 1647 and dedicated to Princess Mary of Orange, the daughter of Charles I.\textsuperscript{19} In this Hollar chose to place Hermes directly above Jones's newly refaced Cathedral - as if blessed by the God in person. Incidentally, Hollar must have known Jones well, for both, by report, were amongst the prisoners taken after the long seige of Basing House in 1645.\textsuperscript{20}

Like Sir Fulke Greville, Jones was to be associated with St. Paul's all his life. According to Vertue,\textsuperscript{21} who had it from Wren, Jones's apprenticeship to a joiner had been within St. Paul's churchyard and the last appearance of St.

\textsuperscript{16} Walpole, H., Anecdotes of Painting in England (1782 ed.), vol.ii, p.276n reports that the "square is laid out with a regard to so trifling a circumstance, as to be of the exact dimensions of one of the pyramids".

\textsuperscript{17} Stukeley, W., Stonehenge a Temple Restored to the British Druids (1740), pp.6-7.

\textsuperscript{18} Jones's notes in his 1565 edition of Strabo's La seconda parte della Geografia di Strabone, Lib.xvii p.289, "discription of ye6 dessigne of the Egyptian tempels". The annotations to his 1539 Italian translation of Herodotus's Herodoto Alicarnaseo Historico delle guerre de Greci & de Persi show his study of Egyptian antiquity.

\textsuperscript{19} For factual analysis see Parry, G., Hollar's England (1980), plate 52-9.

\textsuperscript{20} See D.N.B. This would seem to go back, through Vertue, to Francis Place. See also Parry, G., Hollar's England (1980), p.19. The first edition of STONE-HENG Restored carried an engraving of Jones by Hollar and, as was pointed out, he supplied the engraved views of Jones's Cathedral to be found in Dugdale's History and those of Solomon's temple within Walton's Bible (images based on Villalpando's temple).

\textsuperscript{21} 'Vertue Note Books I', Walpole Society XVIII (1930), p.105.
Paul's in Jones's work was on his sarcophagus-tomb. The latter epitomised the relationship between theatre and temple, for together with Jones's bust flanked by obelisks, at each end bas-reliefs were placed - one representing a view of the Banqueting House, the other his west front of St. Paul's. Jones did not live to see the full destruction of his Cathedral by the new order and, ultimately, by the fire. The restored St. Paul's celebrated a Court which had cultivated authoritarianism and the idea of Catholic marriage, and so inevitably once again became the symbolic focus for Church destruction, this time of the whole 'edifice' of Laud's Church. Elements of this discontent had been sown from the commencement of Stuart rule, for the Puritan party had become rapidly disillusioned when James, recognising their anti-episcopal drift brushed certain Calvinist arguments aside at the Hampton Court conference of 1604. Likewise, many in the Puritan party detested all things even remotely connected with the theatre (being instrumental in the closure of the Paul's theatre in 1608) - a notion often associated with the Court; Prynne's famous attack on players, "Women actors notorious whores", was constructed as an insult to the Queen. Inigo Jones's temple might be seen to have been doomed from the start.

The forces of the Civil War were felt early at St. Paul's, for on the eve of the Long Parliament a large crowd broke into the Cathedral, and by report of the Venetian Ambassador in England,

"broke down the altar, and tore to pieces the books containing the new canons. They then tried to kill the very ministers of the archbishop".

The Puritans disfigured the portico and tore down the statues; Jones's world was shattered by the Civil War. For Dugdale, nothing less than the temple of Solomon had been destroyed for the third time,

---

24 Prynne, W., Histriomastix (1633), Index; see Parry, G., Golden Age Restor'd (1981), p.192.
25 Giustinian, G., Calendar of State Papers, (Venetian), 1640-42, Nov.9, 1640, p.93.
26 The portico was filled with shops and lofts, the columns hacked to house their joists. See Dugdale, W., History (1658), p.115. Maitland, W., History of London (1756), pp.1165-6.
"if those that saw the Temple which King Solomon built, and Nebuchadnezzar destroyed; wept when they beheld that which was erected in the room thereof, because it only fell short of the former in stateliness, and beauty; what may we do, that have lately seen the destruction of this magnificent Church, once the glory of our principall city, and of the whole Nation".  

With its opulent external skin, the Puritans considered Jones's nave suitable only for animals, for according to Dugdale "the body of the Church hath been frequently converted to a Horse quarter for Souldiers", a symbolic gesture no doubt (following the use of St. Peter's during the Avignon papacy). The Gothic choir, merely repaired by Jones, was maintained by the Puritans as a preaching place; Dugdale reports "a new partition Wall, made of Brick" built in 1649 to separate choir from nave and mark the boundary and extent of Jones's 'restoration'.

Propaganda for a Stuart restoration continued throughout the Commonwealth, with London repeatedly cast in imperial colours. For example, in 1657, James Howell published LONDONOPOLIS... The Imperial Chamber, and Chief Emporium of Great Britain. Here London was, once again, older than Rome, "built 354 years before Rome, which is a fair Age". Howell's St. Paul's had been "destroyed by the sins of the people", a destruction comparable to the persecution of the primitive Christians themselves. The aspirations of the Church of England were exiled to France and the Low Countries; the branch of the Court centred around the Prince of Wales gathered in Paris in 1647 to hear Richard Steward (nominated, but never appointed Dean of St. Paul's) warn against both Roman corruption and the excesses of Puritan censure. In Steward's sermon the state of affairs in England was paralleled with that of the Hebrew Church reformed under Hezekiah and later censured by Rabshakeh,

"withall you'1 there see the Hebrews in a lamentable estate, and yet indeed not so sad as ours. Their fenced Cities all taken by

---

27 Dugdale, W., Ibid. p.48.
the Arms of Assyria, vers.13. The Treasures of the King, and of the Temple too all consum'd, vers.15. Jerusalem itself, the Citie Royal, besieged. ('twas not yet lost, 'twas not so bad here) vers.17. and now Rabshakeh is sent to persuade the King into Chains".32

Strange rumours about the fate of the old Cathedral circulated during the Commonwealth. By report of a representative of Genoa in London the Jews of Amsterdam asked permission of Cromwell's government to form a settlement in England, promising great things in the way of commerce and offering £500,000 for St. Paul's. The State papers of 1660-61 report that after the Restoration the Jews "endeavoured to buy St. Paul's for a synagogue in the late usurper's time".33 D' Blossiers Tovey's *Anglia Judaica: or The History and Antiquities of the Jews in England* (1738), published this rumour and reproduced 'The Humble Address of Menasseh Ben Israel'34 sent to Cromwell by the Jews. Exiled for many years,35 perhaps the Jews hoped to find a home at last in the temple restored with the aid of the Hebrew inspired Christian Cabala?

Financial aspects of Cathedral repair played a key role in determining the future of the Court itself. For just as the original stripping of the Cathedral during the Reformation had enriched the Crown,36 re-embellishment aided its bankruptcy.37 Of course, such outlay speaks of the importance of the Cathedral to the Court. From the Royalist point of view lack of money had

33 *Calendar of State Papers, (Domestic), 1660-61*, p.366: In the Records Office is a copy of a Remonstrance dated 30 November 1660, addressed to Charles II concerning the English Jews, in which it is stated that "as countenanced by the said late Userpers [they] endeavoured in his time to buy the famous Cathedral church of Paul's to have made you a sinagogue", and Robert Monteith, in *History of Great Britain* (1735), states that the Jews had made an offer of £500,000 for the Cathedral, but the council of war demanded £800,000.
34 Tovey, B., *Anglia Judaica: or The History and Antiquities of the Jews in England* (1738), pp.259-261.
always hampered work, whilst for Parliament the expenditure of such large sums on Jones's Cathedral became a contributing factor to the Civil War itself. A letter on Cathedral repair from Charles to Laud of 23 April 1634 referred directly to this financial opposition,

"yet we are not ignorant what jealousies have been cast amongst our loving people by some ill affected persons, both to ourself and that glorious work;...as if contrary to our just and princely disposition the work were but pretended by us to get some great sum of money together, and then to turn it to other uses;...we are resolved to enlarge that bounty of ours, and to undertake the whole repair of the west end of that church without having any to share in the honour of that particular with us".  

Jones's royal west front was clearly seen as an emblem for the entire work; Wren comments that the portico "being an intire and excellent Piece, gave great Reputation to the Work in the first Repairs, and occasion'd fair Contributions". With this in mind, and with the financial causes of the Civil War well known, it is hardly surprising that the Puritans were to treat the portico as they did. A dome was to become the symbol of the new 'repair' in Wren's 'Pre-Fire' design, and of the restored monarchy which was its sponsor.

For the last chapter in the history of old St. Paul's was its absorption into the 'Restoration' and early work of Christopher Wren. The repair proposed by both Webb and Bishop Juxon sought to legitimise the restored monarchy and, once again, formed part of an architect's attempt to find a form and language expressive of the British Church. Some of Wren's 'Pre-Fire'
drawings enable us to glimpse the boldness of Jones's external work, in stark contrast to the old Gothic choir, together with the 'completeness' of his refacing (Fig.79). Here the old Cathedral can be seen fully transformed into Jones's Romano-British temple of St. Paul.

The great fire of London in 1666 finally brought to an end speculation on the Cathedral's future. Thomas Vincent, in his Gods Terrible Voice in the City (1667), understood the destruction of the seat of the reformed religion as akin to the day of judgment itself, a necessary precursor to the fulfilment of heaven on earth. Like the Gunpowder Plot, for Vincent the burning of the city was a product of a popish plot, adding that "the late Dreadful Fire,...hath laid our Jerusalem in heaps".44 London after the fire was, perhaps not surprisingly, compared to the ruined "picture of Troy" by John Evelyn, who lamented "Thus lay in ashes that most venerable Church, one of the [most antient] Pieces of early Piety in the Christian World".45 The fire exfoliated Jones's new 'skin', for by report "great flakes of stone scale, and peel off strangely from the side of the Walls"46 and, with much of the Cathedral destroyed, repair became impossible. One scheme by Wren, aligned on the same axis as the old Cathedral, contrived to incorporate the portico, which remained standing.

Wren's new vision for the only Cathedral in Christendom dedicated solely to St. Paul47 was to include echoes of the old, at first with this repair of Jones's nave and portico, but after the fire in its symbols. Donne's statue remained intact, built into the new Cathedral, and Wren's new symbolism was, not surprisingly, generally built on the old (Fig.77); a burning sun was represented directly under the central dome.48 As has been seen, the concept of an ancient British Church remained significant.

As the centuries progressed and knowledge became increasingly less interrelated, the emblem of linked triangles also became appropriated by

---

46 Vincent, T., Gods Terrible Voice in the City (1667), p.55.
48 Wren's mysticism has been suggested, but not explored, by Frances Yates; see The Rosecrucian Enlightenment (1972), chapter on the Royal Society.
various, separated causes. As operative Masons influenced speculative Freemasons such geometry became openly proclaimed as their sign, as Laud's Church influenced a later 'Anglican' Church it became a common Church icon, as the mythical influenced the physical state of Israel it became a national banner, as magic was reduced to a form of entertainment it became caricatured in 'magic' handbooks, and as far as alchemy influenced chemistry it became a colour emblem - in the work of George Field (1777-1841), for example, and within the central shield on the Picadilly facade of the Royal Academy of Watercolour Artists (C.1830's). Of course, all of these would once have been understood as united by this emblem, in a less visible, more magic form, and each concept - 'Masonry', 'Church', 'Israel', 'Magic', 'Science', 'Art' - was associated by contemporaries with Jones's St. Paul's.

Turning to Stonehenge, with all that has gone before in mind it follows that it was the very importance of Jones's STONE-HENG Restored, not as an isolated study, but as a key foundation to his work and emblem for its Britannic antiquity, which led Webb to publish the 'restoration' after Jones's death. The publication of STONE-HENG Restored certainly coincided with Webb's work on a general treatise on architecture. Bolstered by associations with Harvey and Selden and with its dedication to the Pembroke family, the Idea of Stonehenge became a justification and explanation in retrospect for all that the 'Britannic-Classicism' of the Jones-Webb partnership had been about. This would account for Webb's need to vindicate Jones's argument, within two years of the attack by Dr. Charleton in 1663; Charleton not incorrectly regarded Jones to have built "Castles in the Air", terming STONE-HENG Restored Jones's "Dream".

Jones was not to be the last to invent a myth of legitimacy centred on Salisbury plain, for with the Restoration came a revival of interest, not only in the repair of St. Paul's, but also in enigmatic Stonehenge and Britain's ancient remains in general. Throughout the late 17th and 18th Centuries

49 See George Field's Chromatics (1845), where linked triangles within a circle are used in Field's discussion of Turner's "inversion of keys".


Stonehenge came to represent Britain's "roofless past", the centre of a continuing debate as to "Man's ruinous myth", as Sassoon was to describe the monument.\(^{53}\) John Aubrey (writing mainly between 1665 and 1693), in executing the most complete survey of ancient remains in Britain suggested the plan of Stonehenge was based on a seven sided figure representing the seven planets.\(^{54}\) Chapter one noted that in the course of arguing for a Druid Stonehenge Stukeley claimed in 1740 that Jones's Barber Surgeons' Hall was based on an ancient oval Druid monument at Eglwys Glominog, Merionethshire; if Jones could copy an ancient monument accurately once, he could surely do it twice. In 1725 Jones's *STONE-HENG Restored* was republished, this time including 'regularised', engraved versions of the original woodcut illustrations and bound together with 'Charleton' and 'Webb'; the whole controversy was by now a matter of history. In its republished form, Jones's *STONE-HENG Restored* revealed the origins of British Palladianism to lie on Salisbury Plain.

Indeed, Jones's views were to find a strange echo in the work of John Wood the Elder at Bath. Jones's overall Stonehenge plan - the plan showing the stones enclosed within a circular ditch, with three entrances composed by a triangle - has been put forward as the source of Wood's design for the Circus at Bath.\(^{55}\) I have shown elsewhere\(^ {56}\) that the theatre plan formed Wood's layout of Prior Park. Wood certainly saw the origin of Bath in ancient British remains such as those on Salisbury plain, his own survey of which revealed, once again, a vision of the new Jerusalem in the stones. William Blake was to echo this later in the century. Christopher Chippindale observed in 1983 that Wood's "strange vision of Stonehenge, like that of his

\(^{53}\) Quoted by Fowles, J., *The Enigma of Stonehenge* (1980), p.127. Siegfried Sassoon's lines run: "What is Stonehenge? It is the roofless past, / Man's ruinous myth; his uninterred adoring / Of the unknown in sunrise cold and red; / His quest of stars that arch his doomed exploring".


\(^{55}\) First suggested by Stuart Piggott in *The Druids* (2nd ed., 1975), pp.128-31. John Wood's interest in ancient British remains linked to the origins of Bath are to be found in *An Essay Towards a Description of Bath*, London, (1742 & 1765). His interest and study of Stonehenge is contained in *CHOIR GAURE, Vulgarly called STONE-HENGE on SALISBURY PLAIN, described, restored and explained*, London, (1747).

predecessor in Palladianism, Inigo Jones, did have unexpected and very practical consequences in his building".\textsuperscript{57} Despite such isolated observations, the attitude of dismissal towards Jones's study prevails. Tim Mole and Brian Earnshaw, for example, in \textit{John Wood Architect of Obsession} (1988) - one of the most recent books on Britannic Classicism - comment that \textit{STONE-HENG RESTORED}

"reads more like the writing of a bad scholar than a good architect...Reissued along with two even more worthless studies of Stonehenge in 1725".\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
"A new heaven and a new earth" [*Revelations*, 21]; Inigo Jones and the 'City of Gold'

1 In Summary.

"And we may prescribe in mind and imagination the whole forms, * all material stuffe being secluded".

[Dee, J., "Architecture", *Mathematical Preface* (1570)]

In conclusion this thesis can be summarised in two main parts.

Firstly, Jones intended to restore St. Paul's to its pre-Gothic splendour, in line with the supposed primitive spirit of ancient Britain proclaimed by Stuart propaganda; this was mirrored by Laud's Church, and its focus on a pre Roman Catholic Britain. Jones's emblem for this antiquity was Stonehenge, the status of which as *Idea*, or primitive building, fell in line with the role in architectural history of the primitive hut of Vitruvian narrative. Hence, the traditional view of an 'Italian' Cathedral can be seen as mistaken.

Secondly, Jones intended to 'monumentalise' London, a plan heralded by a restored St. Paul's. The Cathedral, together with Covent Garden and Banqueting House, thus formed part of an overall plan or vision for London which was paralleled by the work of Sixtus V in Rome, for example.

This thesis can be constituted by five main claims.

Firstly, Jones designed a city route. The Stuart City can be described as a route, following that of the royal procession from Whitehall to St. Paul's Cathedral - with each building not considered on its own, as is generally the case, but in its particular place from Palace to Temple as part of an ordered sequence. This architectural sequence embodied specific themes of monarchy, as the temporary arches of James I's entry had first displayed in 1604. This was the new, imperial City Charles could have seen, or wanted to see, and it is this 'linear' City which should be examined.

Secondly, Jones was interested in Italy because he understood it to speak of a past Britain - Italian ruins in essence became as a mirror to British

---

This prompts a new insight into the popular title for Jones as the 'Vitruvius Britannicus', or "English Vitruvius", and to Webb's presentation of the architect in his preface to *STONE-HENG Restored* as the "Vitruvius of his Age": this would seem intended not as a unique compliment or hyperbole but to imply an inheritance of a lost British title, a title which in a past age had ennobled the very "architect" of Stonehenge itself. In its 'restored' state Stonehenge became the emblem, or 'arms' of this Vitruvian ancestry.

Thirdly, equally traceable in the triangular geometry of Stonehenge was the emblem or 'arms' of James cast as the British Solomon and of Stuart Britain as 'Albion and Jerusalem'. The restoration of St. Paul's in succession to Solomon's temple was realised, in part, through the use of this 'magic' scheme of linked triangles and circle. This is evidenced by a cross on the 'pre-built' drawing, used elsewhere by Jones as annotation for centre, and by a reference to a triangle at St. Paul's made in the course of Webb's justifications for the earlier 'Jones' Stonehenge argument. This triangular and circular geometry can be traced back along the royal route via Covent Garden to Whitehall, where a circular Tuscan temple painted on the ceiling to the Banqueting House was pictured at the start of this royal route to the Cathedral. Hence, based on its geometric fusion of Villalpando's Jerusalem and Palladio's Rome, Stonehenge was understood by Jones to have prefigured the whole Stuart City. Of course, if looked at in reverse, the acceptance of this geometry at St. Paul's provides further evidence that Jones did write *STONE-HENG Restored*, or, at the very least, that the "Scheme" by which the monument was 'restored' formed Jones's "Notes" which Webb later claimed, in his preface to *STONE-HENG Restored*, to have found. As a final memorial to Jones, a paper monument, Webb's publication recorded an invisible pattern in Jones's mind, the origin from which all else might be 'traced'. As such, the otherwise unique Stonehenge bears certain similarities to Renaissance memory theatres.

Fourthly, it is suggested that at St. Paul's Jones used Gothic geometry as a working method, a way of setting out the new work which was familiar to the mediaeval trained masons and the traditions of the Masons' lodge with which he must have worked (emerging as Jones had done from the mediaeval tradition of the Royal 'Surveyor' - unlike his pupil Webb). Hence, although the triangular scheme embodied Renaissance neoplatonic theories to the

---

initiated, on a practical level it would have been naturally understood as a mediaeval working method, as the Renaissance modular system of proportions would not have been. What emerges is a picture of Jones the mason, not just the 'British Vitruvius'. However, for Jonson at least, Jones's all consuming geometrical designs heralded a new, more 'scientific' age. In this we can sense the status of Jones as the 'bridge' between two building traditions, Mediaeval and Renaissance.

Fifthly, this influence of mediaeval stonemasonry is compatible with an understanding of the stone Orders themselves conforming to the rules of an established mediaeval art, heraldry. Close links existed between the architectural and chivalric Orders. Hence, following the notion of the Orders as emblems of British chivalry, 'technical' links are suggested between the design and composition of architectural Order and the rules of Heraldry.

Finally, these points might best be illustrated pictorially - by one heraldic detail, Fig.19, and by two 'overlay' or 'speculative' drawings, a route on the city, Fig.1, and geometry on St. Paul's, Fig.56.
2 Jones's St. Paul's as an image of the Divine Temple.

"there was always the danger that the Christian apologist would be contaminated by the Ancient Theologians he was using - that his Christianity would become unduly Platonic, or, especially from the *Hermetica*, would absorb elements of gnostic, astrally centred pantheism. In at least two cases, Bruno and Campanella, we know that the ancient religion swallowed the Christianity, which became merely one late, and somewhat degenerate manifestation of it".61

With D.P. Walker's words in mind we should qualify our picture of Jones's Cathedral, and Laud's Church generally, for clearly Christian theory has not been "swallowed" by such pagan worship. Certainly strands of this ancient theology existed, however, and, as has been suggested, exerted an influence on Jones's Cathedral through geometry and symbol. For perhaps of all the physical manifestations of Laud's movement, Jones's architecture might have lent itself most obviously to the expression of such a pre-Christian theology, visibly drawn as his architecture was from antiquity (albeit itself with a background Christianity).

Jones's architecture played a key role in promoting the Stuart Court self-image, less a matter of 'Palladian style', as tradition has it, than as 'propaganda' for the virtues of Stuart rule - at a general level the return of Astraea and the Golden Age of imperial reform centred on James's 'New Troy'. Naturally, the Stuart monarchy thought of themselves as representing eternal Rome, the true successors of Caesar and Augustus; one contemporary commented that the Church of England was enjoying "a golden time: such as the like (as his Maiestie saith) hath not been read nor heard of since the daies of the Romane Emperor Augustus".62 In this way Jones's Cathedral, and his work in general, described the nature of Stuart rule to the citizens at large, following the Rome of Nicholas V; further, the Cathedral was intended as an international message, as much an aspect of statecraft as Archbishop Maximian's great basilica of Sant' Apollinare had been in 530 AD (the mosaics of which had proclaimed Ravena ranked with Rome and Jerusalem in


spiritual splendour).63 In this way Jones's architecture and masque became interchangeable aspects of a great political enterprise. There has, traditionally, been a failure to recognise the status of Jones's Cathedral as the symbolic focus for Stuart attempts to publicly announce this new Golden Age - a Golden Age equally proclaimed through processions for which the Cathedral formed the physical focus.

The work of Inigo Jones in general, and the refacing project in particular, belonged to the heroic theme of 'Albion and Jerusalem'. Sir Balthazar Gerbier, assistant to the Duke of Buckingham and later agent to Charles I, closed his A Brief Discourse concerning the three chief Principles of Magnificent Building (1664) with a dedication to Charles II,

"May his Sacred Majesty...see St. Pauls Church in that magnificency, as the Metropolitan of the House of God, in the chief City of Albion justly requires. And his Royal Palace Built, so as to answer the matchlesse greatnesse of him, who all tongues of Loyal Subjects speaks to be Carolum, Magnum, Secundum Dei gratia, Angliae, Scotiae, Franciae & Hiberniae Regem, Ecclesia Legum, & Libertatis Populi Restauratorem".64

The restored St. Paul's would here, once again, seem to find itself linked to the old idea of an imperial Whitehall palace.

With Arthur's Albion the fabled home of the Holy Grail it followed that, as a commonplace in Reformation propaganda, the inhabitants of Britain became the children of Israel, God's chosen people initiated in his wisdom, or Cabala. This assumed messianic role had sponsored Elizabethan imperialism and a quest for Adam's paradise itself, expanded from the British Isles into the 'New World'. Sir Walter Raleigh's History of the World (1614), with its many hermetic allusions, opened in Paradise and closed in England, and concentrated on the chosen people in history, on the Jews in the beginning and on the English later. Sir Francis Drake's vision of the 'City of Gold', Manoa, led him half way around the globe, at vast expense, on a quest which left behind an Elizabethan capital much of which was in decay. The first King James sought to locate a Golden City of God closer to home,

---

63 See Simson, O. von, Sacred Fortress (1948).

64 Gerbier, B., A Brief Discourse concerning the three chief Principles of Magnificent Building (1664), pp.43-44.
in the London of Stuart rule which, for the first time, was to find through architecture an expression of its status as the capital of this renewed imperial Golden Age and purified religion. Jones's Cathedral thus represented a later, physical manifestation of the earlier symbolism of imperial reform embodied by Elizabeth herself and consolidated on defeat of the Armada. Following her death, the presentation of such a symbolism through the seemingly permanent medium of stone provided a feeling of spiritual security in the face of the break with the rest of Christendom, a necessary answer to the sense of isolation and vacuum after the Reformation.65

With James as the ruler of the chosen people, in the Protestant new Israel, it follows that the Cathedral restoration was officially understood to form part, indeed celebrate the conclusion of what might be termed 'history' itself - from ancient Church to Stuart restoration. For as the restored Jerusalem Stuart Britain stood on the brink of universal enlightenment, prefiguring the Millennium itself. In an age in which every event and action was interpreted as a portent or sign charged with religious significance, the act of physical restoration might quite naturally have been seen as the preparation for such a spiritual restoration. This followed the mediaeval Cathedral as a 'setting' for both miracles and curses66 and, after the fire of 1561, the fabric itself seen as a sign of God's favour. Henry Farley concluded his 1622 poem on Cathedral restoration with a general messianic hope, praising King James and Prince Charles, "God blesse them both, and Their Offspring, / Till SHILO come againe".67 Indeed, the bold statued portico can be seen to celebrate not only a past but an expected future Stuart dynasty enduring until the second coming. Hence, perhaps one reason (other than financial) for the omission of the statues of past monarchs was to leave space for this future Stuart line. Given the central ambition of Cabala, this messianic hope might also be seen reflected in the 'Cabalistc' geometry demarcating architectural Orders which in themselves had been first described by Vitruvius around the time of Christ's birth.

65 On national feelings of insecurity under Elizabeth see Haller, W., Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation (1963), pp.16-18, pp.82-109, p.222.


67 Farley, H., Portland-Stone in Paules-Church yard (1622), repro. by Simpson, W.S., Old City Life (1894), p.200. For interpretation of 'SHILO' as paradise see ENCYCLOPAEDIA BIBLICA (1899).
As a setting for the second coming Stuart St. Paul's was ultimately intended to evoke nothing less than the marriage between earth and heaven. According to Waller's verse, Jones's Cathedral "At once...threatens and obliges heaven", and as such became a microcosm of Stuart Britain itself, for in masque,

"The heav'n of earth shall have no oddes,
But one shall love another.
Their glories they shall mutual make,
Earth look on heaven, for heavens sake;
Their honours shall be even". (Ins.41-45).

Chloridia, in which this was proclaimed, was performed in 1631 - two years before work on Jones's Cathedral began. Following this links with architecture are made explicit in a vision,

"out of the earth ariseth a hill, and on the top of it, a globe, on which Fame is seen standing with her trumphet in her hand; and on the hill are seated four persons, presenting Poesy, History, Architecture and Sculpture, who together with the nymphs, floods, and fountains make a full choir; at which, Fame begins to mount, and moving her wings, flieth singing up to heaven" (Ins.228-33).

Here, we might picture St. Paul's on "a hill", equally "presenting Poesy, History, Architecture and Sculpture", together with its "full choir" enchanting a new "heaven". The hieroglyph of such a union between heaven and earth was the circle, expressed elsewhere in London in the form of the public playhouses - which also attempted, albeit temporarily, such transformations. Laud, preaching before James in 1621 concluded by exclaiming,

"Thus haveing made my Text my Circle, I am gone round it, and come backe to it; and must therefore end in the poyn't where I began: Pray for the peace of Jerusalem...Peace be within the walls of it, and prosperity within the Palaces".68

---

68 Laud, W., Seven Sermons Preached Upon Severall Occasions (1651), p.45.
Such circularity might be seen to have provided a 'stability' against the threat posed by the black forces in the Apocalypse.69

That the Orders spoke in general of 'harmony' and 'unity' under imperial rule was a commonplace in Renaissance theory. As the emblem for alchemical union (and of Solomon, patron of such arts), linked triangles 'unifying' the Orders on St. Paul's might have expressed both the foreign policy of union and peace pursued around 1620 and Albion's union of Scotland with England. If the Fire had not destroyed the Cathedral Gerbier's "House of God, in the chief City of Albion" was to be similarly restored with these Orders. 'Solomon's seal' might also be seen to have made manifest the ambition of unifying City, State and Church under the concept of a new Jerusalem. In signifying such unity the circle was often seen as a hieroglyph of the imperial 'idea', an 'idea' later visibly expressed in the statued, Corinthian portico.

All of which reveals an inconsistency. For British imperial intentions of isolation and martial opposition implicit in the concept of 'Albion' would seem contradicted by a seemingly opposed, peaceful Stuart policy of conciliation and union, a policy inherited from the imperial Princess, Elizabeth. An international 'language', or vehicle for such ecumenical hopes was hermeticism and chivalry (and later Freemasonry),70 both of which paradoxically became at once expressions of nationalism whilst at the same time being employed to foster union.71 This mixture found expression in James's Court and, ambiguously, on the face of St. Paul's. For through iconography and geometry the new Cathedral spoke both of imperial nationalism - with a proud, statued portico unrivalled north of the Alps - and international union, peace, Catholic tolerance and even marriage - with the I.H.S. sunburst and statuary. The Orders and their unifying geometry might be seen to signify both 'Union' and 'Separation'.

The projected refacing attempted to make permanent the temporary platonic perfection evoked in masque. For as far as Charles was a platonist


he saw the world in ideal, absolute terms; and for such a mind only the ideal was real. With the physical work itself executed during the period of absolute rule, the Cathedral was to become a permanent setting for, and symbol of, Stuart absolutism, a celebration of the Stuart Kings' faith in their Divine Right. As such, the object of all transient masque naturally led to a permanently restored St. Paul's, as *Britannia Triumphans* expressed. The logic of such rule, as in France, would lead to the identification of the King with the sun, and, as an aspect of this, Jones's 'obelisked' Cathedral physically represented the idea of absolute rule conceived as a vision of light.

In the end, of course, the Royalist dream of evoking such a radiant New Jerusalem was shattered by Puritans motivated by an alternative approach to the same prophecy - finding voice through such as John Bunyan's *The Holy City, Or, The New Jerusalem* (1665), and *Solomon's Temple Spiritualised* (1688). Alternative, since the Puritan temperament resisted - and would seek to destroy - an architecture which claimed to physically embody and signify the word of God.72 Villalpando, of course, had implied just such a possibility when specifying a biblical paradigm formed from the Orders. In 1658 Elias Ashmole, who held the post of Windsor Herald but was by then equally famed as astrologer and alchemist, presented the whole Cathedral as just such an 'icon' in a shield at the head of a plate supporting Dugdale's appeal against Puritan 'Iconoclasm',

"Elias Ashmole, armiger, desired that this great choir, sanctified and holy, should remain as an icon so that the testimony of History should not be concerned that the holy temple of God, this majestic sanctuary of the building of St. Paul, should be destroyed by the passing of the ages or have been damaged by the sacrilegious neglect of future times".73

St. Paul's became superfluous to Puritan service not only through the richness of its architectural setting and choir screen, but also because the long Cathedral aisles were not required for the new, procession less service. For

---

72 Addleshaw, G., Etchells, F., *The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship* (1948), p.118 notes that "irreverent and careless behaviour towards the altar was encouraged by the Puritans who disliked the attribution of particular sanctity to material objects and special places".

73 View of choir in Dugdale's *History* (1658): "Ne sacra Dei adita, augustumque aedis PAULINAE sacrarium longa temporis injuria et sacrilega sequioris seculi incuria ruiturum veluisse, laboraret Annalium fides, ingentem hunc CHORUM religione ingenti sacrum, in Iconismo superstitem esse voluit. ELIAS ASHMOLE, ARMIGER".
the size of a Laudian Cathedral nave had been dictated by love of architectural magnificence and the need to provide pathways for Sunday and Royal processions as much as it had the need to house a large congregation.74 Hence the animosity towards Ashmole's beloved Cathedral.

Once inside Jones's Cathedral, the monarch progressed through the restored choir screen to enter a chancel conceived as a permanent home for the Eucharist - concluding his journey across the city at the Cathedral altar, 'restored' by Laud to what was understood to be its ancient position against the east wall. This relocation, from just inside the chancel, had the obvious effect of enhancing the processional thrust of the church plan itself. The choir screen, newly resplendent with statues of past British Kings, represented an internal counterpart to the statued portico 'gateway' - the King thus progressing through, and linking, the present Stuart monarchy to the past.

In Eikon Basilike (1649) the sufferings of Charles are frequently alluded to as akin to those of Christ. Jones's palm leaves on the 'pre-built' design echoed those laid before Christ on his progress through Jerusalem, and as emblems of peace served as additional reminders of the monarch's role as a Christian Prince and sponsor of the renewed Golden Age. Mantegna's epic, The Triumph of Caesar, (in Charles I's collection) pictured the Emperor progressing with palm leaves in his hand. And here again Jones's architecture attempted to evoke the same magical, ideal world of masque, for he had also used palm to signify peace and equate the capital with the holy city75 in the unperformed masque Neptune's Triumph for the return of Albion (1624), (in which Charles was to be directly personified as 'Albion').

Jones's Cathedral attempted to provide a permanent, sacred setting for the monarch cast as the living image of divine prototypes, a Jewish King, Pagan Emperor and Christian Prince. As such, the whole architectural scheme spoke of the duties incumbent upon the congregation as citizens not only of an earthly but also of a heavenly city, the celestial temple frequently evoked

---

75 See Orgel, S., The Illusion of Power (1975), p.73: "Jones's island is covered with an arbor, as the text requires; but it is an arbor of palms, not a banyan tree...the choice of palms can hardly have been accidental. The all-powerful Neptune's island bears emblems of peace; the returning prince appears beneath the branches that heralded Christ's entry into Jerusalem. The association of James's pacifism with the peace of God, and of his capital with the holy city, formed an important part of Jacobean official imagery from the very beginning of the reign".

292
by the congregation in hymns. Ultimately, the City of London and its temple might thus be seen to merge, traced through such magical transformations in masque to the promise of *Revelations*,

"And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God,...having a wall great and high; having twelve gates, and at the gates twelve Angels; and names written thereon, which are *the names* of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel:...And the building of the wall thereof was Jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto pure glasse...And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof...And the nations shall walk amidst the light thereof: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it".

---

76 See Kantorowicz, E., *The King's Two Bodies* (1957), p.83 n.103.
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