ROYAL CASTLES AND PALACES

A CHANGING SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE
Royal castles and palaces are buildings originally constructed for their designated purpose. Buildings that have been constructed for other purposes can however be turned into castles and palaces. This project is focused on the first category. These buildings share a symbolic value being royal castles, and in modern terms they may rather be described as landmark buildings.

Royal castles and palaces can be divided in three categories: 1. Older castles that hold specific importance for the national identity and the development of the nation. 2. Buildings in the autocratic tradition such as Versailles and 3. Pleasure and hunting castles.

A number of royal buildings are still royal residencies, whilst others have partially or completely been converted to museums. In this academic seminar, in addition to the national importance, the exteriors and interiors of the buildings are investigated for their intrinsic symbolic aspects and connotations.
Programme
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11.30 Lunch at Gripsholms Värdshus
13.00 Tour of Gripsholm Castle

14.00 Welcome by Staffan Larsson, Governor of the Royal Palaces
14.05 Opening by Kurt Almqvist, President, Ax:son Johnson Foundation
14.10 Ulf Wickbom, Moderator

Older Castles

14.15 Simon Thurley Dynastic Symbolism in the English Royal Residence
14.30 Per Seesko Frederiksborg Castle – From Royal Residence to Museum of National History

14.45 DISCUSSION
15.05 COFFEE BREAK

Palaces

15.35 Bertrand Rondot The Building of Versailles: a New Model for Royal Palaces
15.50 Elfriede Iby From an Imperial Residence Towards the Schönbrunn Brand in the Global Tourism
16.05 Mårten Snickare Shaping the Center of the World. Hedwig Eleonora and the Imagery at Drottningholm Palace
16.20 Lars Ljungström Messages of the Baroque Palace

16.35 DISCUSSION
16.55 COFFEE BREAK
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**Pleasure- and Hunting Castles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>Magnus Olausson</td>
<td><em>The Chinese Pavilion at Drottningholm – a Royal Hermitage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>Claus M. Smidt</td>
<td><em>The Hermitage in the Jägersborg Deer Park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>Julian Holder</td>
<td><em>'The Promise of Delight'; King George IV’s Pleasure Dome – the Royal Pavilion, Brighton</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>DRINK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gripsholm Castle
BIO: Kurt Almqvist is the President of Axel and Margaret Ax:son Johnson Foundation for public benefit since 1999. He is the founder of Axess Magasin (2002) and of Axess Television (2006) which is part of the Foundation's programme Forum Axess, which started in 1999, as well as editor of the Foundation's seminars and books.
The Royal Pavilion, Brighton
BIO: Dr Julian Holder is an Architectural Historian and Conservationist based in Britain. Education Office of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain he is former Director of the Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies at Edinburgh College of Art, has held a number of academic posts and is currently Lecturer in Architectural History and Theory at the University of Salford.

His career, which began in the Royal Institute for International Affairs (Chatham House), has alternated between working in academia and conservation where much of his work has concentrated on the controversial subject of twentieth century heritage. As the first Casework Officer of the Twentieth Century Society he was instrumental in saving the former Bankside power station now transformed into the Tate Modern – the most popular museum of its kind in the world. He has also worked for the Cinema Theatre Association, CADW (Welsh Historic Monuments), and was for many years an Inspector of Historic Buildings with English Heritage – the U.K. government’s official advisory body on all matters relating to the historic environment.

He is currently an Expert Advisor to the Getty Conservation Institute in Los Angeles and ICOMOS on Twentieth Century Heritage. In his current post, and for many years now, he has been researching Official Architecture, especially the history of the government department known as the Office of Works in the nineteenth and twentieth century’s which began life as the King’s Works in the fourteenth century. Deputy Editor of the peer-reviewed journal ‘Architectural History’ he is the author of several books most recently, (with Elizabeth McKellar), the critically acclaimed ‘Neo-Georgian Architecture 1880-1970; a re-appraisal’ (London, 2016).

SYNOPSIS: The Royal Pavilion, Brighton, is not a royal palace so much as a fantastical piece of colonial, and regal, fantasy, - a ‘pleasure-dome’ in the words of the famous poem, ‘Kubla Khan’ (1816) by Samuel Coleridge - and which took nearly forty years to build. This talk discusses its genesis and development over those forty years and offers an explanation of its peculiarities – Indian on the outside, Chinese on the inside - it is one of the most exotic, extravagant, and perhaps fool-hardy buildings ever created by a member of the British aristocracy. The work of four principle architects – Henry Holland (1745-1806), Peter Robinson (1776-1858), James Wyatt (1746-1813), and John Nash (1752-1835) – as we view it today it is largely the creation of John Nash, who may be fairly judged to have created a ‘promise of delight.’

In 1783, the future King George IV (1762-1830), then bearing the title of the Prince of Wales, visited Brighton, a minor fishing town on the south coast of England. It
was his first visit there staying with his wayward Uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, in a rented house close to the sea called Grove House on The Steine. Expanding leisure towns such as Brighton were becoming popular in the eighteenth century in England for their informal lifestyle, the health benefits of sea-air and sun-bathing…and the looser moral lifestyle. They were perhaps more natural sites of entertainment than the purpose-designed Spa towns of Buxton, Bath, Leamington and Cheltenham. The gently rolling landscape of this region of Britain also made it ideal for horse-riding – a pursuit the young Prince was particularly fond of - £31,000 of his sizeable income once he turned 21 was being spent on stables. Watched over by his ever anxious father, the increasingly unhappy, and increasingly mentally unsound, King George III (1738-1820), this initial stay in Brighton also provided the Prince with an escape from the stultifying ceremony, ritual, and – for a young man of only 21 – boredom of life at court in London. He was already an unconventional and flamboyant figure – tendencies which could more easily be hidden or go unnoticed in a provincial sea-side town such as Brighton with its relaxed informal atmosphere. So agreeable did the young Prince find Brighton – but eighty miles from London by carriage, but a million miles from the world of the court – that he rented the same house for himself and his retinue the following year.

Away from the prying eyes, spies, and gossips of the court during what was referred to as ‘the season’ the Prince could also indulge his considerable sexual appetite in pursuit of various women – especially at this time Maria Fitzherbert – a two times divorce and a Royal Catholic. The town then was a setting for self-indulgence and gratification on a royal scale and in which the Royal Pavilion was a stage-set in which various fantasies and delusions – imperial, colonial, dynastic, and sybaritic (there are many more) – could be played out.

Following his use of Grove House in 1784 he leased a modest lodging house, originally a farmhouse, with shallow semi-circular bay windows, nearby for three years. During these years, he had an illegal, secret, and later denied, marriage to Mrs Herbert in 1785. It was this house that formed the basis of the startling Indian inspired pavilion we see today. How did this happen? George was an aristocrat of keen aesthetic tastes (unlike his father, King George III, who was more interested in farming) and enjoyed using his royal patronage to create sumptuous new palaces and expensive interiors for himself even having a style, the Regency style, named after the period from 1811 until 1820 when he was effectively King – the Prince Regent - whilst his father had become mentally incapable. At this early stage his tastes were very much in accord with those of contemporary French Neo-Classical architecture and design and so it was that he looked to one of Britain’s most competent designers in the French manner, Henry Holland, to enlarge and re-design the old farmhouse into a palace fit for a prince, and future monarch. Holland was busy finishing work on the Prince’s main residence in London, Carlton House (1783-85 - demolished), which like the Brighton house, was a transformation of an existing building, rather than being purpose designed, and whose interiors were as much, if not more spectacular than those in Brighton.
At Brighton Holland transformed the farmhouse into a building called the Marine Pavilion (1786-87) by extending it to the north – and thereby doubling its size, but separated what were effectively two large bow-fronted two storey wings, by the linking device of a large single storey classical rotunda with a shallow dome. Holland was probably looking to invoke contemporary continental examples such as the Hotel de Salm for Prince Frederick III of Germany in Paris, Duke Carl Eugen's Lustschloss Solitude at Stuttgart (1763-67), or even Frederick the Great's palace at Sanssouci, Potsdam (1745-47). If so he failed as the contrast between the vernacular wings based on a bow-front farmhouse (and clad in mathematical tiles – a method of falsifying brick or stone in a cheaper cladding material) and the sophisticated classical rotunda with its shallow dome, tall double-height space, and almost free-standing Ionic colonnade created an odd, and unresolved, tension. Nonetheless the Marine Pavilion continued to form an escape for the prince from his father, London, the world of the court and a hostile parliament for nearly fifteen years. However, a French inspired pavilion was not, perhaps, a wise thing to adopt at the time when the French were cutting the heads of the nobility during the revolutionary years of 1789 to 1794 and the Napoleonic War was raging between 1803-1815. In 1795, when the Prince's sexual philandering was (temporarily) challenged by a necessary marriage to Caroline Brunswick in order to get out of debt, George instructed Holland to extend and re-arrange the Pavilion. Always a place of escape rather than a palace the Pavilion was physically too small to cope with more than a few guests and the service and office buildings too small to support much more than a royal bachelor's lifestyle. This was a perennial complaint about the building such that when George's successor, King William IV (1765-1837), inherited it he considerably enlarged the service rooms, and then in turn Queen Victoria found it too small for her expanding family so stripped it of 143 wagon-loads of interior decorations (which came to Buckingham palace) before intending to demolish it as a holiday home in favour of Osborne House, a more private retreat on the Isle of White, designed between Prince Albert and the London master builder Thomas Cubitt (1788-1855). As we look at the Pavilion today it is important to remember that a great deal of these service and office buildings have gone and that at its most developed in the 1820s almost a quarter of the ground plan was given over to these buildings.

However, the re-appearance in 1801 George's mistress, Maria Fitzherbert, caused the Prince to re-think the use to which the Pavilion could be put and Holland produced a design which seemed to cover the ungainly and unbalanced exterior in a filigree pattern of Chinese ornamental design. It is only now, in 1801, that the exotic character of the Royal Pavilion begins to take shape. Chinoiserie, although principally a French import and therefore another dangerous reminder of revolution, was at least not a direct reference to the land of revolution and might have sufficed in transforming the Marine Pavilion into a more fantastical fun-palace for the Prince and Mrs Fitzherbert to play-act in – but rather like the play-acting between Marie Antoinette and Louis XVI….it might have set a dangerous precedent. Although Holland designed a Chinese
Room for Carlton House parading Chinoiserie to the exterior was probably a step too far and was never adopted although as a partner of the great British landscape architect, Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown, and so one who understood the setting of a building the Prince employed Brown’s great gardening rival, Humphrey Repton (1752-1818) to layout new gardens scattered with small buildings in an Indian style in 1805-06. In 1808 Repton published a design for ‘a new palace based on Indian architectural forms’. Neither happened and instead Holland’s assistant, P.F. Robinson, extended the Pavilion’s wings still further and John and Frederick Crace, a new breed of interior decorators, were employed to transform the interior into something akin to a Chinese palace. Now largely lost this original interior boasted a magnificent Glass Corridor off the Pavilions muted entrance hall. Connecting a new conservatory and library by Robinson with mirror glass doors at either end and externally surmounted by pagoda roofs - it was formed of back-lit glazed screens of painted glass set within a Chinese lattice framework. Again it is tempting to see in this creation an attempt by George to follow, if not try to excel, French tastes and the famous Galerie des Glaces in the Palace of Versailles. Or was this, as is sometimes suggested, the beginning of Great Britain looking for a new, and more powerful seeming role now that it had lost its prize colony of America as a result of the Wars of Independence (1775-1783)? Or perhaps mere delusion on the part of the young Prince as to his power and the eventual global reach of the British Empire? Whatever its motives – conscious or sub-conscious – its flippancy and expense, including thirty-nine figure of nodding Chinese men - can have done little or nothing to improve the relationship with his father, King George III. In 1813, Henry Holland having died in 1806, the architect James Wyatt was employed to enlarge the Pavilion still further but both his death in 1813, and the need to economize due to the enormous debts the Prince of Wales (now the Prince Regent since his father’s madness in 1811) had built up led to the appointment of a new architect in 1815, John Nash, himself possessed of a wife said to have been admired by the Prince.

Nash’s transformation of Holland’s building was principally to add two new outer wings to form a Music Room and a Banqueting Room and transform the exterior profile. Both new rooms were lavishly decorated, again by the Crace family, and each surmounted by pagoda type roofs. The exterior is loosely based on northern Indian architecture of the sixteenth century from the Mughal region – with Gothick elements - and delights in minarets, scalloped arches, pagoda roofs, and onion domes to create a picturesque outline sprinkled with flat-headed finials, all gathered around the central dome over Holland’s Saloon. Further so-called onion domes are placed above Holland’s bow-windows - the only surviving reference to the original farmhouse - to strengthen the impression of India in England. Nash had to adapt, rather than start afresh, to give the Prince what he wanted and as a former Director of the building points out it looks as if all the unexecuted designs by Repton for the gardens had escaped and been piled up on the roof! The facades with their bulging lotus-based columns are held together by the types of fretwork screens perhaps originally conceived by Holland, and used internally for the Glass Corridor. Light though they look the domes are structurally innovative, especially the main dome over the Saloon (the only part...
of Holland's work to survive in anything like its original French Neo-Classical form) which had to be supported on a large iron-frame built within the existing structure. The dome – whose covering quickly failed despite its structural integrity - was originally to have been used as a billiards rooms but owing to the Prince's increasing obesity and inability to climb stairs it was divided into four sumptuously decorated guest bedrooms.

As the Prince became King George IV in 1820 he carried with him an unpopularity with his subjects that he had gained through his womanizing, his profligacy, and the amount of money he was spending on his passion for buildings, hospitality and horses. The Royal Pavilion, once an escape, had by this time become almost a public stage on which he could be seen, and scorned and he increasingly spent his time at Windsor castle – safer, closer to London, and more private for this once flamboyant man who had set fashionable tastes. His final years of visiting the pavilion he ordered a long underground tunnel to be built to allow him to get from Pavilion to stables unseen and therefore unridiculed by his subjects. And ridicule may have been appropriate for these stables, designed in 1804-08, and thus predating so much of the Pavilion's exotic architecture are almost as magnificent as the Pavilion itself. Designed by William Porden (1755-1822), who replaced Holland as the Prince's architect, they were so large as to be converted during Queen Victoria's reign to a concert hall, corn exchange, picture gallery, museum, and library. Little wonder his people mocked him and were laughing at him when he thought they were laughing with him – for his horses were housed more magnificently than many of his subjects, and it was maybe the need to balance its magnificence by an equally exotic pleasure dome for people that was the real inspiration for the extraordinary architecture of the Royal Pavilion, Brighton.
Elfriede Iby

From an imperial residence towards the Schönbrunn brand in the global tourism

* *

**BIO:** University studies of history of arts and ethnology at the university of Vienna, specialising in the field of baroque architecture; doctoral thesis on Spanish colonial monastic architecture carrying out extensive research in Spain and South America. Since 1994 engaged on research into Schönbrunn Palace with its construction history and interior decoration of the period of Maria Theresa.

Since 1997 head of research and documentation of the Schloß Schönbrunn Kultur- und Betriebs.ges.m.b.H. as well as chief curator of Schönbrunn Palace and the Imperial Appartements of the Viennese Hofburg.

Fields of research and curatorial tasks:

- permanent research of the construction history, authentical interior decorations and ceremonial functions along 250 years of habsburg residence history
- Responsibility for applied conservation and restauration of the Schönbrunn Palace
- Collection Management

**SYNOPSIS:** Already in the middle 17th century Schönbrunn Palace was constructed as chateau de plaisance for the Emperor's widow Eleonora of Gonzaga; at the end of the century after the big damages during the Turkish Siege of Vienna (1683) Schönbrunn was designed as hunting lodge by the famous baroque architect Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach.

The most important period in Schönbrunn history is the one of the reign of Empress Maria Theresa who commissioned the later court architect Nikolaus Pacassi to transform the hunting lodge into an imperial summer residence (c. 1750). This transformation into a residence demanded to host the imperial court with a high number of court dignitaries, officials and staff. The summer palace with its refurbishing also had to provide an adequate setting for imperial representation and ceremonial purposes. So the palace was divided in different section or appartements for representative and private functions according to the ceremonial guidelines, keeping also the significance of the monarchal order.

The symbolic of Schönbrunn Palace as imperial residence did not change until the end of the monarchy. During the epoch of Francis Joseph and even almost one hundred years later the interior decorations of the maria-theresian epoch as expression of a powerful monarchy were kept or even redesigned. At the end of the long reign of Francis Joseph and due to his advanced age Schönbrunn Palace itself became symbol for conservative attitude, outdated politics and a moribund monarchy. In 1919, one year
after the end of the monarchy, Schönbrunn Palace has been open to the public, mainly for citizens of Austria, a small country, which was left after the end of the Habsburg Empire. A decade later Schönbrunn was used as venue for the first exhibitions to commemorate important rulers of the Habsburg Monarchy: the first one dedicated to Maria Theresa (1930) and another one five years later to Francis Joseph (1935). In the last days of the Second World war (1945) Schönbrunn Palace was bombed as many famous and outstanding sights in many countries which were involved in the war.

In the first post-war years, despite of shortage of experts, skilled craftsmen and materials, great endeavours were made to restore Schönbrunn, and the British forces who occupied the palace frequently gave assistance.

The public effort to restore and to install Schönbrunn as a historic monument and as a touristic national sight of special importance is comparable with that of the cathedral of Saint Stephan in the city of Vienna, both becoming national – the one religious and the other secular - symbols of Vienna and Austria.

Besides the touristic attraction Schönbrunn Palace was also a representative location for ceremonial purposes of the Second Austrian Republic. When the Austrian State Treaty was signed in 1955, a big reception was given in Schönbrunn; also important political meetings like this of the US president J.F. Kennedy with the Russian president Nikita Khrushchev took place in Schönbrunn.

From then on state visits were inseparably combined with festivities at the palace. As the international tourism was more and more increasing the last fifty years, Schönbrunn with its palace and park became Austria’s most frequented tourist attraction and a symbol for Austrian history and culture. Since 1992 administrated by a private company, but still in the possession of the republic, the corporate mission of the company is to preserve and use the complex of Schönbrunn Palace, which since 1996 is on the list of the UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Foundation.

Schönbrunn has even extended its symbolic character, it is now more than a former imperial residence. It is an outstanding national monument, a symbol of Austrian identification, a landmark and brand in the global tourism.
Drottningholm Palace
BIO: Lars Ljungström studied at Stockholm University. (Fil kand, equivalent to BA, 1984. PhD in History of Arts, 2005.) His doctoral dissertation, Magnus Gabriel De la Gardies Venngarn. Herresätet som byggnadsverk och spegelbild (‘Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie’s Venngarn. The Country House as a Building and Mirror Image’), was submitted in 2004 and published in the proceedings of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities (Antiquarian Series). After his return to The Royal Collections, he has been appointed viva voce-examiner for preliminary examinations – an unofficial requirement before submitting a Swedish dissertation – as well as, for the final public defence (at Stockholm University in 2007 and 2010, and at the KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, in 2007). Of extra-mural courses, the Royal Collection Studies (Windsor/London 2007) deserves to be mentioned since it highlighted parallels to phenomena familiar from his research, as well as from his professional experiences.

After temporary employments at museums and galleries in and around Stockholm, he was appointed Assistant Curator in charge of research connected with current restoration projects at the Office of the Palace Architect in 1987. In 1991, he moved on to The Royal Collections as Curator and head of what has since become the Department of Collections and Documentation.

He has curatorial responsibilities for the historic collections of all ten Swedish Royal Palaces. The Royal21(1,4),(997,994)(139,263),(860,950)Collections is in charge of furnishings in historic settings, as well as of the palaces still used as royal residences. Consequently, his tasks range from antiquarian matters to the practical needs of present-day state ceremonies. Among major projects with a strictly historic approach, he has recreated the Yellow Drawing Room at Gripsholm Castle, as decorated and furnished in 1848-9 for King Oscar I, and the furnishings of King Oscar II’s Breakfast Room (c. 1900) at the Royal Palace in Stockholm, works that were carried out in 1992-3 and 1991, respectively. He was the leader of both projects (at Gripsholm together with the Palace Architect).

Although major exhibitions are not regularly staged at the Royal Palace, he has been leader and co-leader of several such projects, notably Karl XIV Johan – en europeisk karriär (‘Charles XIV John – a European career’) shown in 1998-9 at The Royal Palace, Stockholm, Schloss Mainau, Germany and in Oslo successively, Drottning Lovisa Ulrika och Vitterhetsakademin (‘Queen Louise Ulrique and the Academy of Letters’) shown in 2003 at the Royal Palace Library (co-leader together with the former Director of The Royal Collections, Bo Vahlne), Georg Haupt. Gustav III:s hovschattmakare (‘Georg Haupt. King Gustav III’s Court Cabinet Maker’), at the Royal Palace in 2006, and Härskarkonst. Napoleon – Karl Johan - Alexander (‘Staging Power: Napo-
leon – Charles XIV John – Alexander I’). shown in 2010-1, at the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, afterwards rearranged as two separate exhibitions with a joint title, Destins Souverains, at Palais imperial de Compiègne and Château de Malmaison (co-leader in tandem with Magnus Olausson, Head Curator of the Nationalmuseum), In Course of Time – Four Centuries of Royal Clocks at the Royal Palace Stockholm in 2016.

SYNOPSIS: The use of a suburban, semi-detached house is obvious to us all. The purpose of a royal palace is not as easy to grasp, particularly so when we think of the huge palaces built during the second half of the 17th century and in the early 18th – when large parts of Europe were ruled by absolute monarchs.

Of course the palaces were places to live in (or at least places to stay at) and of course they were the venues for court ceremonies, but even that simple answer provokes questions: Why were ceremonies important and what were they meant to express. When you think about it, the very same questions could be asked about the palaces – and at that point, things are definitely not self-evident anymore.

The Royal Palace in Stockholm and the Drottninghola Palace here in Sweden, the Versailles in France, the Schönbrunn on the outskirts of Vienna, the currently resurrected Stadtschloss and the suburban Charlottenburg in Berlin, the summer palaces surrounding Peter the Great´s new capital of Russia and countless other royal palaces around Europe are impressive monuments of a monarchic principle. Nowadays, they are often said to be visual demonstrations of power and glory. That is certainly true, but it is an extremely shallow explanation. The vast palaces were clearly more than a poster advertising the ruler´s limitless power.

An obstacle for us who live in the 21st century is that our frame of references differs drastically from the one that existed when the palaces were built. Much of our mindset is structured according to principles conceived by the Enlightenment, the French revolution and political ideologies of an even later date. That may help us along in a modern society, but it is useless for interpreting political identities of earlier periods. The only way to apprehend the intended messages is to look for the world-view they express and accept that ideas we may find outdated were given truths at the time. After all, the messages addressed an audience three hundred years ago.

We do not even share the concept of common sense. Apart from the odd radical philosopher, scholars up to the end of the 17th century dismissed the existence of a spontaneous sense of reason. Reasoning and statecraft – so they claimed – could only be learnt from the authors of Antiquity. Examples suitable to emulate or quote in different situations were studied and learnt by heart. The only comparable authority was the Bible. At least in a Protestant ambiance like Sweden, the Bible was defined as the literal Word of God, by which He had made the truths about mankind and His creation known.

Court culture was international and highly elitist. The court identity of Western and Northern Europe crossed all political borders. This is not to say, that it was uniform. There were actually several competing and overlapping court ideals, which a monarch
could choose from and combine, depending on personal preferences and political situation at hand, but it was paramount to keep within the repertory of pursuits deemed appropriate for royalty. As always, the intellectual strategies favoured accepted patterns: Originality as such, was certainly not commendable for a ruler.

Splendor and lavish display were not the only valid expressions for a monarch. Still, an Early Modern Court was hardly conceivable without a higher degree of elegance than the subjects could master, because magnificence was inseparable from important notions about society and kingship.

A fundamental view was that the welfare of society presupposed hierarchy and division of labour. Each and everyone knew his station and – ideally – should remain there. In Sweden as elsewhere, society was compared to a body. It remained healthy, only as long as every part and organ fulfilled its own specific task. The body metaphor was widespread and had obvious divine sanction: In his epistle to the Romans, St. Paul described Christianity as the body of Christ, with individual duties assigned to the members, all of them different and all indispensable.

It was not enough to accept the hierarchy of society. Subjects, as well as rulers, were expected – often even required – to visualize their individual status in the outward appearance. In most countries, sumptuary laws regulated what was appropriate moderation for different levels of society. In other words, the appearance of a successful burgher should never compete with the more elaborated display by a member of the aristocracy, let alone that of a king or a prince. It is of course futile to expect laws that restricted the free will of a king, and yet it was crucial that he too should display his role in a visualized society, if the image should be complete. ‘Abundance’ and ‘luxury’, two words that nowadays have more or less the same meaning were used to distinguish a rightful display of wealth from one that transgressed the social order. The latter was ‘luxury’, considered to be harmful to society, sinful and against the will of God.

In 1721 the German philosopher Christian Wolff gave a systematic account for the top range of this value system in his book Vernünfftige Gedancken von dem gesellschaftlichen Leben der Menschen. The entire approach was by then under attack by the budding Enlightenment. Wolff was fighting a rearguard battle, but with great pedagogic clarity:

Likewise: Since everyone should eat and drink according to his station, dress and dwell accordingly, a king and ruler must eat and drink in keeping with his majesty, and dress and dwell accordingly. Furthermore, the royal table must surpass all other tables in the number and cost of its dishes, the sumptuousness of his clothes outshine the clothes of others and the palace where he resides exceed all other buildings in size and beauty. Therefore, nobody should be allowed to emulate the ruler in one or other of these respects. The common man, who relies on his senses and has a limited ability to reason, is unable to grasp what the majesty of a king is: but by things that catch his eyes and move his other senses, he will get an admittedly imprecise, yet clear notion of the majesty, i.e. of power and strength. From this it may be concluded that a numerous court and court ceremonies are not superfluous, all the less blameworthy. However, as
one ruler is not as powerful as the next, the first one must spend less on his court, his
table, his clothes and his palace.

At the bottom of it all was a remark by Cicero, who claimed that an impressive and
beautiful house with many guests will increase the dignity of its owner, but that he
would turn himself into laughing-stock, if the house was to be disproportionate to his
merits.

Put in less eloquent ways, various sources from the 17th century make the same con-
nection between palaces, court and the ideal society. In a treatise on kingship, written
by Louis XIV of France for the education of his son, the Grand Dauphin, the impor-
tance of a visualized monarchy is emphasized: “Since our subjects cannot penetrate
into things, they usually judge by appearances…” The Grand Dauphin´s tutor, Bishop
Bossuet, made a similar point in terms of foreign policy: “Expenses of magnificence
and of dignity are in their way no less necessary [than fortifications, arsenals and mu-
nitions] for the sustaining of majesty in the eyes of peoples and foreigners.” In other
words, if a king´s greatness is judged by the splendor of his court, the upkeep of author-
ity presupposes that he compare favorably to rulers abroad. One of Sweden´s leading
diplomats during the mid 17th century, Baron Schering Rosenhane, brought the same
principles to bear on country houses a few rungs down the social ladder: “…because
if it looks bad and paltry when a distinguished man builds small and insignificant
houses, it is no less unwise and presumptuous if he aims above his station and tries to
emulate the castles and palaces of great lords.”

Obviously, the palaces were to express the ruler´s siren majesty, but magnificence
was not only about power and dignity. Rosenhane gave a first hint about mental and
moral dimensions, when he prescribed that the country house should be built so that
the owner´s descendants would recognize not only his conditions, but also his mind
and temper. A tract celebrating the statutes of the Swedish nobility, issued in 1627, pro-
vides a crucial lead to the meaning of that rather puzzling statement:

And yet, one must acknowledge the truth that although riches cannot ennoble
anyone by themselves, they are indeed powerful means by which virtuous deeds can be
accomplished and particularly Magnificentia, a virtue of such nature that other noble
virtues receive greater gleam and light from her brightness, like a mirror that sparkles
in sunlight.

That Magnificentia belonged to the virtues is important. Of course physical objects
cannot be virtuous, however appealing, but they can reveal the care and attention of a
virtuous patron (or so the author, Ægidius Girs, and other contemporary writers main-
tained). Magnificence was indeed thought of as a moral quality. Normally it appeared
in tandem with Generosity, or Liberalitas, which Aristotle had proclaimed to be the
typical virtue of the high-born.

Virtue is a notion that has lost much of its significance. When we talk about moral,
it is usually based on a common sense of justice, or in other words we deal with it in
terms of right and wrong. To most of us, ‘Virtue’ sounds vague and reminiscent of
prim Victorian attitudes. Again it is a question of different perspectives. Three or four
hundred years ago the Latin term Virtus covered a much broader meaning, familiar to those around the court. Virtus means ‘virtue’, but also ‘bravery’, ‘ability’, ‘merit’, even ‘heroic deed’. It covered the core ethics of an active life and was subdivided in a series of well-defined different ‘virtues’.

Magnificence and Generosity were repeatedly associated with building projects and patronage of the arts. This was also based on a pattern from Antiquity. In this case, it is one of the minor classics, Cassius Dio, who turned the creation or remodeling of buildings into an attribute of good government. The conclusion was obvious: beautiful buildings, appropriate for their purposes, added to the nation´s reputation and contributed to a greater good. The famous Florentine architect Leon Battista Alberti claimed precisely this in his book De re aedificatoria, which remained a standard textbook for architects right up to the 19th century, and he was far from alone. Again, there is an echo in Rosenhane´s requirements for the ideal country house. He stressed that the building should be pleasing in the eyes of foreigners, thus indicating that achieving beauty and a certain amount of grandeur was a civic duty.

Before moving on, one more thing should be said about virtues. When Ægidius Girs claimed that Magnificence highlights and enhances other virtues, he actually described the crowning virtue from Aristotle´s Ethics, “Greatness of Mind”, or Magnanimitas. It was not a mistake on Girs´ part. In the 16th and 17th century, Magnificentia and Magnanimitas were sometimes so closely associated with one another, that Magnificence became the visible sign of both. This, clearly, adds a deeper meaning to royal splendor and impressive palaces. The outward appearance was a sign of the ruler´s virtuous and resolute spirit – and by extension, the virtuous and resolute character of the entire nation.

Two state portraits of Dowager Queen, Hedvig Eleonora of Sweden illustrate how the ideas connected with palace architecture were put to use as a message. This portrait type was created by the painter David Klöcker Ehrenstrahl in the 1670s or 80s. It is known in a number of versions and must have been repeated over a long time, considering the discreet, but noticeable aging of the Dowager Queen´s face. She sits in a chair with the crown beside her, and a view of Drottningholm Palace in the background, partly obscured by a column. The view was not painted by chance: Some time after Ehrenstrahl´s death in 1698, his nephew and successor David von Krafft updated the prototype. The armchair was moved from right to left and positioned a bit more frontally, while another section of the palace appears in the background. The only essential difference from a symbolic point of view is that Hedvig Eleonora by then had ended her official mourning after 40 years as a widow and therefore wears a gold embroidered dress and the royal coronation cloak. When the coronation cloak was introduced, the crown became redundant and could be removed without disturbing the message.

The column and the fluttering drapery were standard props of portraiture and a painterly formula. The remaining attributes are not many. The black dress, worn until 1700, speaks of a mourning widow, faithful to the memory of her husband. The crown, later substituted with the coronation cloak, is the obvious token of her status. The arm-
rest in the foreground was another marker of royal rank, since court protocol regulated who was allowed to sit in the presence of a royalty. This leaves the palace façade as the sole attribute of Hedvig Eleonora’s deeds. For those who had no opportunity to visit Drottningholm and experience its full magnificence, the portraits conveyed a glimpse that bore witness to the dowager queen’s majesty, her magnanimity and her judicious patronage. By showing that she mastered the codes of proper royal pursuits, she made a statement intended to enhance her reputation.

What about power, then, would not that be equally important as part of the message? All members of a Royal House were influential – that goes without saying – so when the Dowager Queen visualized her status, she gave more than a hint of power. But power came in many degrees and the power of a dowager was informal, completely depending on her personal relations with the ruler. Hedvig Eleonora did have a very strong position within the Swedish royal family, but even so, there was a limit to the political wisdom of displaying informal power, not least since Drottningholm outshone the summer palaces inhabited by her son, Charles XI.

Power could not be the dominating message. In the first place, Drottningholm was to express Hedvig Eleonora’s elevated identity in society and her personal merits.

In a hierarchic society, most people who saw the palace would not ever meet to the person who resided there and yet their loyalty and awe was essential. The Baroque palace was more than a building. It was calculated to be the mirror image of its master or mistress and represent the greatness of the country. It was to confirm the order of society and God’s plan for mankind. At the end of the day, the palaces above all had an intricate political meaning with many layers.

When the intellectuals of the Enlightenment turned away from the authority of Antiquity and put greater faith in reason, this entire system was undermined and lost credibility. Starting in the 1760s the process escalated under the pressure of a financial crises, which made the economy of the western world shrink gradually for decades to come. Those monarchies that clung to the old principles met with more or less grim disasters between 1789 and the 1860s. Other managed to develop along with society and renew their relevance in times of change. For those countries – and Sweden is one of them – the royal palaces maintain their role as a symbol of the present, while at the same time being monuments of the past.

Identities will always resonate with the collective notions of the beholders, now as well as three hundred years ago.
The Chinese Pavilion at Drottningholm
Magnus Olausson

The Chinese Pavilion at Drottningholm –
A Royal Hermitage

*
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SYNOPSIS: The Chinese Pavilion is one of the few Chinoiseries that date back to the 18th century. It has always been something of an odd bird in the Swedish landscape, just a stone’s throw away from dark conifer forest. It is also in sharp contrast to the nearby baroque garden. In the Chinese Pavilion and its surrounding garden, there was no structured order like that in a great pleasure garden, one based on the principle of submission. The location of the first Chinese Pavilion appears to be a random choice, as was that of its successor, which followed ten years later, but was scarcely the result of a whim. Even to this day, the Chinese Pavilion gives the impression of being well thought out. The buildings, together with their interiors and surrounding garden, are characterised by a series of encounters. Nature is contrasted with art, west with east. This royal construction was an artistic experimental environment in a time of change, with the rococo facing off against nascent neoclassicism and a fanciful older sense of exoticism challenged by a younger version that aspired to be authentic.

During the first fifteen years of the Chinese Pavilion’s existence, starting with the surprise party celebrating the birthday of Queen Louisa on 24 July 1753, the construction underwent a series of more or less dramatic changes. Its proportions were originally unassuming, but in the new building they were on a grander scale. The site still retained its secluded sense of intimacy. Until the late 18th century, the pleasure garden fences and gateway constituted a boundary. The construction was otherwise closed off.

Who designed the first Chinese Pavilion? If one is to believe King Gustav III, it was his father, Adolf Fredrik. Others insist it was the head of royal parks, Carl Hårleman. However, he died in February 1753. Most likely this royal birthday gift was the result of teamwork between the king himself, the minister of fun, Carl Gustaf Tessin, and perhaps also the new head of royal parks, Carl-Johan Cronstedt. Adolf Fredrik too seems to have played just as important a role in designing the small, rather special pleasure garden. Preserved maps and drawings made by the king provide evidence for this. However, he was assisted by Carl Fredrik Adelcrantz, who likewise designed the new Chinese Pavilion, built in 1763-67. Gustav III also showed great artistic interest in the building, which he had loved since his childhood. One could easily think that the Chinese Pavilion has remained untouched since then. But as early as the 1840s, the curved galleries in the main building were given a makeover. That was typical of the new monarch, King Oscar I, of the House of Bernadotte. He chose to put his personal mark on two other settings of a decidedly Gustavian nature – the King’s Pavilion at Haga and the Crown Prince’s apartment at Gripsholm. This could be considered a way for Oscar to assert his legitimacy and at the same time make peace with the unseated House of Hollstein-Gottorp. After the building’s 20th century restorations, most of these additions have disappeared, and today the Chinese Pavilion appears to be an entirely 18th century Chinoiserie.
BERTRAND RONDOT

THE BUILDING OF VERSAILLES:
A NEW MODEL FOR ROYAL PALACES

*BIO: Curator at the musée national des châteaux de Malmaison et Bois-Préau between 1993 and 1995, Bertrand Rondot was then appointed at the musée des Arts décoratifs in Paris, as head of the 17th-18th Centuries Collections Department where he worked on the new display of the museum’s galleries. He was as well in charge of the collections of the musée Nissim de Camondo. He has been working at the château de Versailles since 2007 as chief curator for furniture and works of art. He curated among others the exhibitions “Discovering the Secrets of Soft-Paste Porcelain at the Saint-Cloud Manufactory, ca 1690-1766”, in 1999 in New York, “Marie-Antoinette and the Petit Trianon”, in 2007 in San Francisco, and « Le château de Versailles raconte le Mobilier national – Quatre siècles de création » in 2011. And in 2016 the exhibition “Marie-Antoinette, a Queen in Versailles” in Tokyo.

SYNOPSIS: It is a paradox, but the place that would soon be considered as the archetypal seat of monarchy, the palace of Versailles, was originally nothing more than a humble hunting lodge. The place did not have any roots in dynastic Bourbon history or any significance as a landmark in national history. It is solely through the vision of king Louis XIV that it became the symbol of French monarchy and elsewhere.

Though the work took more than twenty years to be completed and that it went through changes, it followed from the very beginning principles that would become intangible for any royal residence throughout Europe. First the change of scale: the hunting lodge built by Louis XIII in the 1630’s had been enriched lavishly by Louis XIV in the 1660’s with mainly the additions to the original building of guilt ornaments on the roofs and marble ancient busts on the façades. At the time the main work was carried on in the gardens, under the architect gardener Le Nôtre. But this was still a private residence for the king, where he could act as a noble man. A totally new scheme was planned with architect Louis Le Vau in 1668 to change the scale of the place by building the Enveloppe on the garden side in a new Italianate style and a decade later to complete it by the building of two huge wings embracing the central part and creating the very peculiar façade on the gardens, stretching over 600 meters.

The search for symmetry guided the king and the architects as a principal that would not stand compromise. Therefore, from the core of the palace, the Marble Courtyard, any addition would be symmetrical. This not only gives its beauty and clarity to the space and architecture, but is also a metaphoric idea of the clear organization of the court and the state. The move of the king’s bedchamber at the very center of the composition in 1701 marked the achievement of it. Symmetry does not mean equality. The
strength of the meaningful architecture is reinforced by the progress in richness both in the courtyards as well as inside the palace. This creates a tension towards the heart of the palace, the royal apartment and the great Gallery. The meaning of the spatial divisions is reinforced by the message of the décor; though the figure of Apollo, chosen as an emblem by the king, is widely spread, it tends to be supplanted by direct political imagery, culminating in the Hall of Mirrors, completed in 1684, entirely devoted to the deeds of the king.
BIO: Per Seesko, born 1983, historian, Ph.D., is a curator at the Museum of National History at Frederiksborg Castle, Denmark. He received his master’s degree (2009) from the University of Southern Denmark, Odense, where he also defended his Ph.D. thesis (2015) on Danish cathedral chapters after the Reformation (c. 1536-1660). He has also worked as a teaching assistant at the University of Southern Denmark and as a researcher at Odense City Museums, before moving on to the Museum of National History in 2016.

SYNOPSIS: Frederiksborg Castle, now home of The Museum of National History, lies beautifully surrounded by forests, parks, lakes and channels on three little islands in the small town of Hillerød on northeastern Zealand. Built in the early 17th century by King Christian IV (1577-1648), its red brick work and sandstone ornaments are typical of the late Nordic renaissance style influenced by architects from the Netherlands, which characterized his reign. In 1859, a fire destroyed the interior of most of the main castle on the northern island, though some of its most important rooms, the chapel and the audience hall were spared. Others, such as the great hall or “Dance hall” and the “Rose”, the knight’s hall, could be recreated based on paintings and sketches. The outer walls were left standing, and the buildings on the other two islands were also left unharmed by the fire. Overall, the modern day visitor is left with a great impression of what the castle must have looked like in the early 17th century. Some of the buildings even go back to the second part of the 16th century, to the building phase under Frederic II (1534-1588), which predated Christian IV’s new castle.

Geographically, Frederiksborg is situated 30 kilometers north of Copenhagen, on northeastern Zealand. About 20 kilometers further north is the historically important market town Elsinore with its castle, Kronborg, guarding the entry to the Baltic Sea through the Sound. Northeastern Zealand has historically been a landscape characterized by the strong presence of the Danish monarchy, and since the 16th century, when Frederiksborg Castle was established, the crown has been the greatest landowner in the region. Besides the renaissance castles Frederiksborg and Kronborg, it is also home to the baroque palace of Fredensborg not far from Frederiksborg, and many smaller palaces with a connection to members of the royal family.

Surrounded by the vast forests of the region, Frederiksborg was ideally situated for hunting. Nevertheless, its importance to the Danish monarchy would since rise beyond that of a mere hunting seat. The castle became a royal residence, where generations of king’s would spend much of the year with their family and court and entertain foreign visitors. From the late 17th century, it would also become the stage of the most
important ceremonies of Danish absolutism. In the age of romanticism, it acquired the status of a national historical monument, before becoming a royal residence once again. Finally, after the fire of 1859 and the subsequent restoration process, the castle was opened to the public as a museum in 1878.

**Frederic II – from noble manor to royal castle**

Following the Danish Reformation of 1536, the estates of two great landowning monasteries to the north and west of Hillerød (Esrum and Æbelholt) became crown lands. When in 1560 King Frederic II acquired the nobleman Herluf Trolle’s manor Hillerodsholm, renamed Frederiksborg after its new royal owner, it thus became the center of a large area of uninterrupted crown lands, which were to a large extent covered by forests and woodlands. Just north of the castle was the “Lille Dyrehave” (Small Deer Park).

Frederic II had experienced princely hunting during his stay with his brother in law, duke Augustus of Saxony in 1557, two years before his coronation. On that occasion too, hunts were part of the festivities for the guests in Copenhagen. Frederic seems to have preferred a kind of hunting where the quarry was gathered in a restricted area, but where he could then show his courage and strength by killing the animals with hand weapons such as sword or spear, although he also owned fine pieces of firearms for hunting. The quarry in the forests surrounding Frederiksborg was reserved for the royal hunts, and here as elsewhere Frederic was eager to protect the royal hunting grounds. He set up fences around the deer park to the north of the castle, and the peasants living nearby were forbidden from owning more than one dog. The penalties for poaching were harsh, and in some cases, the king seems to have regarded violations as a personal offense. The young king’s interests in the natural world also showed itself in the menagerie of exotic animals he would keep at the castle, and in his commitment to the royal studs, which laid the foundation for what would later become the famous Frederiksborg horses, which were for centuries used by the kings for both riding and carriage horses.

We don’t know much about the manor of Hillerødsholm taken over by Frederic II, but we do know that he soon undertook an ambitious building program. He had a channel dug from Store Gribso lake 8,5 kilometers to the north, to raise the water level of the lake around the manor, also allowing for a water mill to function, and he immediately set out to renovate and extend the manor, to make the place worthy for king and court. The earliest known depiction of the castle, Hans Kniepers painting form 1585, now here at Gripsholm Castle, shows features from this earliest royal building phase at Frederiksborg, some of which can still be seen today. Besides the hunting party in the foreground, Hans Knieper’s painting clearly shows the situation of the castle on three islands with the main castle on the island to the north, the church on the central island, and a group of other buildings to the south. While nothing is left of the main castle, and while the church was replaced by a chapel in the main castle during the next important building phase half a century later, the two towers guarding the passage from the southern to the central island, still stand today. Their iron wall
ties tell us that the towers were built in the year 1562, and the letters going round them form Frederik II’s German motto: “Meine Hoffnung zu Gott allein”.

The other buildings on the southern island are from Frederik’s time as well, with the stable wings creating a straight passage towards the gateway leading to the town of Hillerød. In 1562, we hear of a church at Frederiksborg, also visible on Knieper’s painting, and as work progressed, the number of people living around the castle grew with the large number of workers and artisans employed. All these people would of course need a church, but in 1585, Frederik made it clear, that only those who served either king or court would be allowed to worship in the chapel of Frederiksborg on the central island. This would change during the reign of Frederik’s son, Christian IV, and as a whole, the town of Hillerød, which did not have market rights, can only be said to have prospered as a result of the presence of king and court.

Around 1580, also still during the reign of Frederick II, a miniature palace, “The Bath House”, was finished, just to the north of the castle, on the edge of the Deer Park, and it still survives today. It would, be used for informal gatherings and festivities, and, as the name indicates, for bathing, for instance after a long day of hunting.

Christian IV’s renaissance castle
As for the rest of the castle that we see today, Frederic’s son King Christian IV built the main castle on the northern island and most of the buildings on the central island. Christian was himself born at Frederiksborg in 1577, and seems to have become attached to the place. He was only 11 years old when his father died in 1588, but he did not wait long after his own coronation in 1596, before he began the building program, replacing the old Frederiksborg with a new, magnificent castle. Built in a Nordic renaissance style, it drew on inspiration from the Netherlands, but added older and local features.

When work began around 1599, the architect responsible for the overall design of the new castle may have been the king’s Master Builder, Hans van Steenwinckel the Older, who had come from the Netherlands in 1578, but we do not know with certainty, and he already died in 1601, so in any case, he would not see the plans fulfilled. A renaissance villa, “Sparepenge” (“Money Savings”), replacing an older house of the same name, was built for the royal household during the construction phase, and step by step, the old buildings were replaced by new ones. The demolition of the old main castle as well as the church followed in 1602, and gradually new buildings were raised on the central and northern islands during the following first two decades of the 17th century.

The main priorities were the buildings replacing the old castle on the northern island. Three wings with towers and spires rising above red brickwork and sandstone ornaments were erected before 1608. The central and eastern wings held the apartments of the royal family. In the west wing, a new chapel replaced the old church on the central island. Built in two stories with a gallery in the style of German Lutheran palace chapels, it was probably finished in 1617 in time for the celebration of the centenary of the Lutheran reformation. The orthodox Lutheran king’s motto being Regna
firmat pietas, Christian actually also had a new church built for the inhabitants of Hillerød in the years around 1620, but as it collapsed after only a few years, they were allowed to use the castle's chapel as a parish church. Here, besides the silver altarpiece and pulpit made in Hamburg, they could admire the rich ornamentation of the gallery, walls and ceilings, with hosts of angels, biblical, allegorical and ancient mythological figures surrounding a series of Latin quotations of scripture on black marble plates. On the top pieces of the pews were the symbols of all the kingdoms, duchies and counties that made up the coat of arms of Christian's realm. Above the church, the great hall or Dance Hall, stretching the length of the west wing, was decorated with tapestries from the Netherlands, showing Christian's coronation in 1596 and his victories in the Calmar War fought against Sweden 1611-1613.

Stepping out from the west wing again, the celebration of the Danish monarchy and the use of figures from ancient history and classical mythology continues in the decoration program of the main courtyard. Here, the pediments above the windows were embellished heads of prehistoric Danish kings and Roman emperors, and a magnificent marble gallery was added to the central wing towards the end of the building process, displaying a pantheon of Greco-Roman Gods. The individual sculptures and reliefs were made in Hendrik de Keysers workshop in Amsterdam, but the design of the gallery, should probably be credited to Hans van Steenwinckel the Younger (1587-1639) who was, from 1619, when his brother Lorenz died, the king's Master builder. A low structure known as “The Terrace” closed the courtyard off with an open colonnade on the fourth side. On the outside of the terrace wall, another gallery of Greek or Roman Gods stood on each side of a gateway crowned by the coats of arms of King Christian and Queen Anne Cathrine of Brandenburg. Here, a bridge flanked by statues of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar, connected the main castle with the rest of the castle area.

The overall design of Christian IV's castle placed the structures of the main castle and the central island across the bridge along a central axis stretching from the massive barbican or Prison Tower (1620) towards the private apartments of the King and Queen in the central wing of the main castle. On the central island, a house for the noble castellan stood on each side of a Neptune Fountain symbolic of the king's vision of himself as ruler of the seas. The Neptune Fountain was made in Prague by the sculptor Adrian de Vries, who had also worked for the German emperor. The individual figures were carried off to Sweden after the Danish defeat in the war of 1658, and today they are at Drottningholm Palace. The fountain which we see today was recreated in 1888 at the initiative of the founder of the Carlsberg Breweries, J.C. Jacobsen.

The peace treaty of 1658 was a catastrophe for Christian IV's son, Frederic III who lost the Danish provinces east of the Sound, Scania, Halland and Blekinge, then an integral part of Denmark. With these territories, now part of modern day Sweden, Frederic not only lost a sizeable part of his kingdom, but also lost the advantage of controlling both sides of the Sound. To this should be added the loss of territories in Norway, under the kings of Denmark for centuries. Nevertheless,
Frederic had to receive Charles X August for a banquet at Frederiksborg, captured in one of the illustrations of Samuel von Pufendorf’s work on the history of the victorious king of Sweden.

Absolutism – from baroque magnificence to romantic vision
In the wake of the wars against Sweden in the later 1650’s came a coup d’état in Denmark in 1660. Like his predecessors, Frederic III was elected by and had ruled together with the noble council of the realm. Now, power was made hereditary, and the kings were to rule as absolute monarchs.

Plundered by Swedish forces, Frederiksborg had suffered badly during the wars. Nevertheless, the castle would remain an important place to receive foreign guests, princes or diplomats, and would even gain new functions, which firmly established its role at the most important royal residence during early absolutism.

It started badly though. The year 1665 thus saw the destruction in a fire of the castle’s audience hall built by Christian IV half a century earlier. The fire also devastated the privy passage leading to the audience hall, but left the rest of the castle unharmed. Ironically, these rooms were left unharmed by the devastating fire in 1859. A few decades later, Frederic’s son, the young king, Christian V, seized the opportunity to refashion the audience hall and privy passage in a baroque style worthy of the new absolute monarchy. His leading architects and artistic advisor, Lambert van Haven, returned from travels to Italy and France with new ideas, and transformed this part of the castle into a celebration of Christian V and Danish absolutism.

Christian V’s reign was characterized by his attempt to win back the provinces ceded to Sweden during his father’s reign, and by initiatives to consolidate absolutism in the realm. These ambitions are mirrored in the very interesting pictorial programme of the Audience Hall. The largest painting shows the king dressed as a Roman imperator, surrounded by his three sons, including the crown prince and future monarch Frederic (IV), while a series of portraits on all four walls show his predecessors from the line of the house of Oldenburg, thus stressing Christian hereditary claim to power. Above these portraits by the French court painter Jacob d’Agar are depictions of Christian’s victories in the so-called Scanian War, fought in the years 1675-1679 to reconquer the Scanian provinces from Sweden, which, in spite of the Danish victories pictured here, proved impossible. In the ceiling, finally, are allegories of the four known continents – the king had possessions in all of them – and of Christian’s motto: “pietate et justitia” – piety and justice.

Audience seekers would arrive at the audience hall through the privy passage, a magnificent picture gallery with stucco ceilings by the Dutch sculptor Jan Wilckens van Verelt, lined with allegoric paintings mostly bought by Lambert van Haven in Italy and the Netherlands, and by portraits of the king’s sons.

The most important room and center of the Danish absolutism celebrated in the audience hall however would be the chapel of Frederiksborg, which gained a special significance during the reign of Christian V. Christian was eager to secure the loyalty of the Danish nobles to the monarchy through personal ties. To this end, he instituted
the titles of baron and count, and in 1671, he created the Order of Dannebrog, named after the Danish flag, to go along with the older Order of the Elephant. In 1693, he chose the chapel of Frederiksborg as the meeting place of both royal orders of chivalry. On the gallery just above the altar, a throne was placed, with the coats of arms of the individual knights displayed around it. Perhaps even more important, the chapel was also chosen as the place where the absolute kings would be ceremoniously anointed. Before the altar on the ground floor of the chapel, the king would place the crown on his own head. Power was not transferred to him with the coronation, it was already his, from the moment his father had drawn his last breath. The first anointment took place in 1671 – the last in 1840.

Christian V’s interest in Frederiksborg and its surroundings did not stop with its role in the ceremonies of absolutism though. As a crown prince, he had travelled to England and France, where he had been introduced to par force hunting. In France, he had been taken for a royal hunt in the forests of St. Germain by Louis XIV. After Christian had succeeded his father to throne, he introduced this kind of hunting in the forests north of Copenhagen and around Frederiksborg too. From around 1685, he established special networks of roads centering on eight way junctions for par force hunting of red deer in Gribskov to the north, as well as in Store Dyrehave to the south of the castle. In these hunts, a single stag was chased by dogs and riders through the terrain until it was too exhausted to run any further, at which point the most prominent member of the hunting party, for instance the king himself, would kill the stag with a short sword, a “Hirschfänger”. The special network of roads would allow the hunting party to move more easily in the pursuit of the deer. The hunting took place from August to November each year, and in his journals, Christian would methodically note the size of the antlers, where the deer was killed, and for how many hours it ran. A symbol of his love of hunting, a statue in the form of a stag being chased by dogs, made by the French sculptor Abraham César Lamoureux and sadly now lost, was moved from the small Jægersborg palace to a position in the lake below the windows of the castle in 1686. In 2015, the hunting landscape, which the king thus helped create on Northern Zealand, was admitted to the UNESCO World Heritage list.

Christian died in 1699, but his son, Frederik IV, would also leave his mark on the landscape around the castle. He had travelled a lot and been to both France and Italy twice, and it may be what inspired him to have a new baroque garden established on the slopes north of the castle across the lake. Utilizing the terrain, the architect, Johan Cornelius Krieger, let cascades of water fall over four terraces, which were also adorned with statues in a classical style, fruit trees and straight cut hedges, symbolizing man’s control of nature. The cascades were in symmetry with the central axis of the castle across the lake.

Frederiksborg was still also a place of political and diplomatic significance. It was...
here, in the same year that the work on the baroque garden was begun, that the peace
treaty after the Great Nordic War was signed in 1720, putting an end to centuries of
wars between Denmark and Sweden. To make room for the garden however, Frederik
IV had the villa “Sparepenge” opposite the castle torn down. The building materials
were used to build the palace of Fredensborg, also designed by Krieger, only 10 kilo-
meters away on the shores of Lake Esrum. Celebrating the newly signed peace treaty
(the name means “the palace of peace”), Fredensborg was built in a baroque style
more in keeping with the fashion of the early 18th century, than Christian IV’s old
castle in Hillerød.

Nevertheless, both Frederik and his son Christian VI still enjoyed coming here in
the summer. Christian modernized the interior of the main castle and made some ad-
ditions to the exterior too. He even had a small Chinese pavilion built in the garden. It
was pulled down after only 20 years however, and with more modern alternatives, such
as Fredensborg just up the road, Christiansborg palace in Copenhagen and Frederiks-
berg just outside the capital; royal visits to Frederiksborg became less frequent. As the
only absolute monarch, Christian VII (1749-1808) was even anointed in Copenhagen
rather than at Frederiksborg, though his successors would respect the established tra-
dition, and return to Hillerød for the ceremony. Constitutional monarchy, catastrophe
and restoration

The last king to be ceremoniously anointed in the chapel of Frederiksborg was
Christian VIII in 1840. Upon his death in 1848, his son, Frederik VII, soon abstained
from ruling as an absolute monarch, and accepted the public demand for a constitu-
tion, which was signed the year after, in 1849.

As a constitutionally bound monarch, freed from many of his governing duties,
Frederik VII moved his residence to Frederiksborg. Here, he was less bound by the
ceremony of court, and could pursue his interest in archaeology and history, as well
as his interest in hunting and especially fishing. On an island in one of the small lakes
of the Lille Dyrehave, just west of the baroque garden, he had a small cabin built in a
Norwegian style.

Frederik’s move to Frederiksborg mirrored a growing public interest in the proud
castle of his great predecessor Christian IV, with whom he seems to have identified.
Artists painted it as a romantic castle from days gone by, and writers hailed it as a sym-
bol of the nation’s past.Adding to its status as a monument of Danish History was a
collection of portraits of historically important men and women, kept at the castle sin-
ce 1812. N.L. Høyen, a professor at the Copenhagen art academy, who was given the
task of organizing the portrait collection, would, in keeping with the romantic ideals of
the age, encourage his students to choose historical building and monuments as motifs
for their paintings. A preferred motif would be the old castle of Frederiksborg with its
towers and spires, and its memories of the nation’s former glory.

Having been restored to its status of a royal residence however, disaster would strike
the castle just a decade later, while the king was staying at the castle in December 1859.
Frederik kept a collection of archaeological artefacts in the castle. He had it moved
from the audience hall, which was not heated, to a chamber on the third floor of the
main castle. On the night of December 17, a fire, which had started in exactly this room was discovered, and quickly spread to other parts of the castle. Only the outer walls of the central and eastern wings of the main castle were left standing. In the west wing, the great hall was destroyed too. Miraculously, most of the chapel as well as its furnishing were saved, and the baroque Audience Hall was saved as well.

The destruction of the castle in the fire came as a shock to the public, and was regarded by many as a national catastrophe. After some discussion, it was decided to rebuild the castle, rather than let it stay as a ruin. Soon, funds for the reconstruction and restoration of the ruined parts of the castle were being raised through nationwide collections, contributions from king and parliament, and even a national lottery.

In 1864, the church was ready for use again, and the great hall above it as well as the Rose on the ground floor, could be recreated based on paintings and sketches. But there was no obvious answer to the question how the rest of the many rooms destroyed in the fire should be restored. In 1877 however, the founder of the Carlsberg Breweries, Jacob Christian Jacobsen, who had already contributed generously to its restoration, came up with the idea of a museum of national history. Jacobsen was inspired by his visits to the picture galleries of Gripsholm and Versailles in 1855, while Ferdinand Meldahl, the architect responsible for the restoration, could draw on his knowledge of German castles restored in a romantic “gothic” style during the 19th century. The result was a series of chronologically arranged rooms, presenting Danish history through depictions of important historical events and portraits, as well as decorative arts and objects of historical value from the period represented in each room.

The Brewer’s offer must also be seen in the context of the defeat Denmark had just suffered in the second Schleswig war of 1864 against Prussia and Austria, resulting in the loss of the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Jacobsen summed up his idea of a museum, open to the public, as follows:

“Living with the memories and mementoes of the past arouses and develops a nation’s sense of history and strengthens its consciousness of the part it has itself played in the general cultural development of mankind. In turn, this fosters a recognition of the obligations which this heritage imposes upon the present and coming generation. This form of consciousness and recognition cannot help intensifying a nation’s self-esteem and moral strength – things which a small nation like ours definitely needs.”

The king approved the plan, and the government accepted the generous offer, on the condition that the state should have no financial obligations. This was achieved, by the inclusion of the museum as a separate division of the Carlsberg Foundation, which it still is today, and the museum was founded in April 1878.

Both Jacobsen and Meldahl had imagined that the royal family could still also use the furnished rooms on special occasions, though not for habitation. And although this happened occasionally in the early 20th century – the German emperor Wilhelm II and the French president Fallieres were both invited to dine in the great hall, in the years 1907-1908 – the castle’s future was as a museum. Frederik VII would be the last king to actually live there.

The castle nevertheless retains some of its ties to the Danish monarchy even today.
The reigning monarch’s portrait and those of her closest relatives are still displayed alongside those of their predecessors in the great hall. The chapel is still the home of the two royal orders of chivalry, as the shields of knights, past and present, line the walls of the chapel as well as the castle’s staircases. As late as 1995, the wedding of the younger son of Queen Margrethe II, Joachim, took place in the chapel too. Perhaps most importantly however, the collections and exhibitions of the Museum of National History, as well as the impressive walls of the castle itself, continue to tell the history of Danish monarchs and the kingdom they ruled, from (at least) the sixteenth century to the present day.
Drottningholm Palace
MÅRTEN SNICKARE

SHAPING THE CENTER OF THE WORLD
HEDWIG ELENORA AND THE IMAGERY AT
DROTTNINGHOLM PALACE

* 

BIO: Mårten Snickare is professor of art history at Stockholm University, and he has published extensively on the ritual and performative use of baroque art and architecture. Together with Professor Peter Gillgren he has edited the anthology Performativity and Performance in Baroque Rome (Ashgate 2012). Snickare has also taken an interest in the concept of baroque, and in baroque tendencies in contemporary art and visual culture. He has participated in a number of exhibitions on that topic, most recently Barockt at Kulturhuset, Stockholm (2014). Currently he is undertaking research on Swedish colonial history as it has been visualized and materialized in art and other images as well as through collecting and display. Snickare has been a research fellow at Yale University (2005-06), Clark Art Institute (2010) and Humboldt Universität zu Berlin (2012).

Publications since 2012 (* = peer reviewed):
*Mårten Snickare and Peter Gillgren (eds), Performativity and Performance in Baroque Rome, Ashgate, Farnham, 2012


”Body, Movement, Space. Baroque Revisited”, in: Louise Birch Sorensen and Liberty Patterson (eds), Show Time. Choreography in Contemporary Art (exhibition catalogue), Gl Holtegaard 2012, pp 60-69


"The Path, the Walk, the Image", in: August Eriksson, The Walk, Skreid 2016


Mårten Snickare and Malin Hedlin Hayden (eds), Performativitet. Teoretiska tillämpningar i konstvetenskap, SUP 2017 (in the press)


SYNOPSIS: Hedwig Eleonora was the daughter of Frederick III of Holstein-Gottorp and Marie Elisabeth of Sachsen. Her marriage to Charles X Gustav in 1654 aimed at securing an alliance between Sweden and Holstein-Gottorp against Denmark, their common enemy. When the king died in 1660, Hedwig Eleonora was twenty-four. She survived her husband by more than half a century, seeing her son, Charles XI, and her grandson, Charles XII, ascending the throne. Her formal political power was limited, but her importance for the continuous maintenance of royal power and magnificence should not be underestimated.

Culture and the arts was the queen's foremost arena. She made herself the absolute center of the Swedish art world, gathering enormous collections, commissioning art and architecture, and recruiting artists, architects and actors from all over Europe. Drottningholm Palace became her magnum opus. Commissioned in 1662, it was erected and decorated by a motley crew of artists and craftsmen from Germany, Italy, Netherlands, France and Sweden under the command of the queen and her architects, father and son Tessin. At the death of the queen in 1715 the interiors were still unfinished. However, even in its incomplete state, Drottningholm was the most grandiose palace of its time in Sweden.

In my paper I discuss and interpret the rich baroque imagery of the palace, together with the court performances staged in its halls, as a continuous negotiation
of the position of the Swedish royalties and the Swedish kingdom in Europe and the world. As a member of a new dynasty, ruling over a young nation, it was important for Hedwig Eleonora to create and sustain an image of rightful power, martial glory, cultural sophistication, and ancestry. Artworks and performances at her palace abounded with allusions and references to cultural, diplomatic and martial encounters with other European courts and countries, but also to commercial and colonial enterprises on the four known continents. The guests at the palace, be they members of the Swedish elite or representatives of foreign courts, shouldn't have any doubts that Sweden was at the center of the world, and that Hedwig Eleonora and the royal family was at the center of Sweden.
The Hermitage in the Jägersborg Deer Park
The Hermitage in the Jägersborg Deer Park

BIO: President of The Danish National Society for the Preservation of Ancient and Historic Buildings.

B in Naestved (Denmark) 1944, eldest son of Carsten M. Smidt, M.D. (d 1996) and Ingrid Mørk née Jacobsen. Married 1970 with Ulla, née Meng-Lund, daughter of paper mill manager Georg Meng-Lund (d 1979) and Maria née Lysek (d 1985). 1 s, 1 da, 6 grandchildren (the 3 of them french, because the d is married to a frenchman)


Consultant for the advisory architect for the Royal Danish Palaces and Castles, professor Vilhelm Wohlert 1975-84; director, The Bergia Foundation 1990-96.

Member of the board, The Danish Society for Architectural History 1987-2007; member of the board, The Society for the Publication of Danish Monuments 1988-; member of the working party of DOCOMOMO Denmark 1996-; president of The Society for History, Literature and Art 2001-; member of the board, Lizzie and Ejler Ruge Art Foundation 1997-; member of the board, Round Tower [built by king Christian IV 1637-42 as an observatory and connected with the former Library over the Trinity Church, Copenhagen, which is now an exhibition hall] 2000-2007; Chairman of the board, The Plessen Selsø Foundation 2007- [occupied with the old manor house of Selsø].


Recreations: topography, history, heraldry, genealogy and classical music, especially opera.
SYNOPSIS: The Hermitage is the Hunting Lodge of King Christian VI of Denmark. It was built in the 1730s by the architect Lauritz de Thurah, a Royal Architect of the Danish Court and one of two leading architects of the mid 18th century.

The Hermitage was the successor of a more modest, timber-framed building from the 1690s which served as a small lodge for the King when he needed a rest after the par force hunt in the surrounding Deer Park. Even the primitive lodge had a so-called Hermitage-table, so the king and his few guests could eat without listening servants. The architect had no direct model for a modern hunting lodge so he had to invent his own construction. Nevertheless it is possible to point out certain paradigms. The famous Hermitage-table had to be reconstructed in the end of the 1730s, but ten years later it was abolished. Still people are talking about the invention.

The delicate interior of the Lodge is even today an extraordinary sight. It was a few years ago restored and some exterior details reconstructed. Through excavations in the archives part of the interior has been restored to its original state.

The Hermitage is today considered a masterpiece of Danish late Baroque Architecture.
Windsor Castle
BIO: Dr. Simon Thurley is a leading Historian and Curator. Between 2003 and 2015 he was chief executive of English Heritage, The government's national heritage agency for England, previously he ran the Museum of London and before that was Curator of the Historic Royal Palaces. He is now Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Historical Research and Professor of the Built Environment at Gresham College. Other appointments include non-executive director of the British Library and trustee of the Andrew Lloyd Webber Foundation. His books include The Building of England, Men from the Ministry, Hampton Court Palace: a Social and Architectural History, Whitehall Palace and most recently Houses of Power, the Places that made the Tudor World. He is an honorary member of the Royal Institute of British Architects and the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors and in 2012 was made CBE for services to heritage. He lives in an 800 year old house in Norfolk with his wife, the historian Anna Keay, and two children.

SYNOPSIS: From the early middle ages particular royal residences became associated with reigning sovereigns and their families. This association of place and royal blood was often closely associated with a change in regime or the establishment of a new regime. In this way certain royal residences became forces of legitimization as well as places to live in and rule from. In the very long history of the English Monarchy for some residences this process has repeated itself over and again, the paper will give many examples but will make a case study of Windsor, one of the residences currently used by the monarchy and the one that bears the name of the reigning house.
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