**The Wardrobe Goods of Anna of Denmark,**

**Queen Consort of Scotland and England (1574-1619)**

*This article analyses and transcribes an inventory of the wardrobe goods of Anna of Denmark, queen consort of Scotland and England, which was compiled in 1608, and annotated up to and including 1611. The inventory reveals the types of goods that Anna owned, the movement of garments between residences, her involvement in the politicised custom of gift exchange, and the concept of her appearance as a point of diplomacy. Arguing that Anna’s visual appearance was considered and strategic, it further discredits her narrow, and largely negative historiography, which has routinely cast her as a recklessly indulgent and fanciful queen. Anna’s tactical visual emulation of Queen Elizabeth I (1533-1603), pointed use of recognisable pieces of inherited jewellery, and politically significant colours of dress are discussed.*
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introduction

Anna of Denmark, second daughter of King Frederik II of Denmark (1534- 1588), and Sofie of Mecklenburg-Güstrow (1577-1631), was raised in a courtly environment of European splendour and cultural sophistication.[[1]](#endnote-1) By the end of the sixteenth century, Denmark was one of the most affluent countries in Europe, and music, drama, tournaments, and dance formed standard elements within Danish courtly entertainment.[[2]](#endnote-2) Anna’s parents served as powerful models of emulation, as both were well educated, and politically and culturally active, being avid supporters of history, architecture, painting, sculpture, and theatre.[[3]](#endnote-3) In addition, Anna’s younger brother Christian (1577-1648), who acceded to the Danish throne in 1588, was an important and passionate patron of the arts and architecture.[[4]](#endnote-4) The two remained close throughout Anna’s life constantly exchanging letters and tokens, while as the reigning king of Denmark, Christian became an important source of honour, power, and status for Anna.[[5]](#endnote-5)

On 20 August 1589, the fifteen-year-old Anna was married to King James VI of Scotland (1566-1625) in a proxy ceremony in Helsingør (Elsinore), Denmark. Arriving in Leith on 1 May 1590, Anna remained in Scotland for thirteen years before moving to England when James VI inherited the English crown in 1603. While sixteenth-century Scotland was plagued by religious, geographic, and political instability, factionalism, and impecuniousness, England, by comparison, was financially robust and politically stable.[[6]](#endnote-6) As a result perhaps, the most pronounced and conclusive examples of Anna’s cultural patronage are found during her time in England where she repeatedly used social activities, material goods, architecture, and the visual arts for aesthetic and political ends.

Drawing on an extant wardrobe inventory reproduced in its entirety online, this article presents Anna of Denmark as a perspicacious cultural agent, who understood the power and magnificence attached to material goods, and who strategically used her physical appearance as an instrument of Jacobean ceremony and diplomacy.[[7]](#endnote-7) It questions the traditional view of Anna as a wantonly extravagant consort, for, despite the inherent political value of material magnificence, scholars have repeatedly interpreted Anna’s penchant for jewellery and dress as evidence for concluding that she was ‘an extravagant consort’.[[8]](#endnote-8) Historically characterized as a vain, superficial, and insignificant woman, only limited aspects of Anna’s cultural and political influence have received scholarly attention.[[9]](#endnote-9) In particular, her participation in the court masque has been the subject of extensive recent research but, as Maureen Miekle and Helen Payne observe, this focus has obscured the extent of her other cultural activities.[[10]](#endnote-10) As queen consort, Anna was a symbol of the monarchy and was expected to engage with inherited forms of display – sumptuous clothes, jewels, and furnishings – to convey her wealth, status, and honour, which translated to the power and cachet of the Stuart dynasty, and that of her natal court.[[11]](#endnote-11) Further, as Malcolm Smuts persuasively argues, such material goods did not only equate to generic magnificence, but operated as ‘complex visual codes’, which could be used for specific political or personal ends.[[12]](#endnote-12) Throughout her time as queen consort in England, Anna repeatedly used her physical appearance as a visual tool of communication, stressing continuity with the previous reign of Elizabeth I (r.1558-1603), and underscoring her support for an Anglo-Spanish marriage match for her eldest son Henry, Prince of Wales (1594-1612) and, after his premature death, her second son Charles (1600-1649).

Traditionally, art historians of the early modern period have placed a primacy on painted portraits, rather than documents as a source of information about current fashions, ownership and taste. On the one hand this makes sense, for in comparison to paintings, there is a paucity of extant articles of dress from the Jacobean period. The expensive fabrics, and the large quantity of valuable embroidery and lace used on royal garments, meant that they were readily reused, recycled, and given away.[[13]](#endnote-13) However, it should be remembered that portraits cannot be taken as reliable accounts of reality, as elements were often embellished, exaggerated, completely fabricated, or omitted. The reliance on painted representations should be questioned, for accounts and inventories are not only more factual, but they also tend to be highly evocative in their descriptions and often provide evidence as to the colours, fabrics, styles, condition, and value of an individual’s clothing. As a result, this article does not aim to definitively match written and visual evidence, but it draws heavily on archival evidence and uses portraits to create a more comprehensive and accessible picture of Anna’s appearance.[[14]](#endnote-14) This approach follows that of many dress and jewellery historians, such as Janet Arnold, Maria Hayward, and Susan Vincent, who use contemporary portraits to provide supplementary information on the grouping, construction, and appearance of certain elements.[[15]](#endnote-15)

the *c.*1608 wardrobe inventory

Important information regarding Anna’s dress is preserved in an undated inventory of wardrobe goods belonging to the queen housed in Cambridge University Library.[[16]](#endnote-16) Compiled by two clerks, annotations in several hands show that the inventory was in constant use from 1608 to 1611, and Helen Payne has linked it to a warrant from February 1608 appointing one of Anna’s Gentlemen Ushers ‘to keep account’ of her robes and ‘have a provident care of them’.[[17]](#endnote-17) Running to twenty-nine folios, the importance of the inventory lies in its very detailed description of the queen’s garments, which convey a material magnificence appropriate to regal status. With a total of 479 entries, the inventory includes gowns, mantles, sleeves, waistcoats, jerkins, petticoats, and bodies (bodices).[[18]](#endnote-18) It reveals a high degree of ornamentation and is very evocative in its account of the types and colours of fabric, the various sorts of lace, the figurative or emblematic nature of embroidery, and the colours of thread. The marginalia is mostly concerned with the movement of garments between residences, which presumably follows that of the queen, and it also notes those garments that were given to Anna, and those the queen gave away, although no values are given for any garment.

The pieces required for full dress, such as hanging and wearing sleeves, bodies, long skirts, short skirts, and doublets are often separately noted. The detailed entries indicate that some garments were intended to be worn together as a unified suite of dress, such as a ‘gowne of white taffeta, the bodies, Sleeves, Skirtes, wrought very thick with Silver Spangle Lace, and bound with Silver bynding lace’.[[19]](#endnote-19) On the other hand, many entries point to the interchangeable nature of the separate pieces, which did not “match”, but were comprised of different fabrics, or different colours, and were therefore more readily suited to being worn in a variety of combinations, such as a white satin gown where the ‘halfe brests waringe & Lynninge of ye hanginge Sleves’ were made of white cloth of silver striped with carnation.[[20]](#endnote-20) As a result, in the following analysis, each entry has been broken down into the individual pieces of apparel in order to try and give a more precise picture of the contents of Anna’s wardrobe. However, the numbers given below can only be taken as approximations, for the two clerks use different terminology making it impossible to know whether briefer entries, listing ‘one gown’ for example, refer to a single over-dress, or whether they refer to a gown complete with sleeves, bodies, and skirts that are not itemised.[[21]](#endnote-21)

Taking all individual articles of apparel into consideration, the Cambridge inventory comprises around 569 pieces.[[22]](#endnote-22) Of this number, the most common colour of dress is white, which accounts for 211 pieces or 37% of the collection. Significantly, this accords with the majority of Anna’s portraits, for the queen is generally depicted wearing garments of white satin. Second to white items of dress is red, with eighty-six pieces of clothing (15% of the total) recorded including a wide variety of hues such as carnation, crimson, gingerline, incarnadine, rose, and the related shades of flame-coloured, tawny, orange, purple, pink, and peach. Of the various red shades, carnation is the most common, accounting for thirty-two of the total eighty-seven articles of red dress (37%). This is followed by tawny, which is also noted by the clerks to be ‘rose colour’, and amounting to twelve garments (14%) of the total, while incarnadine (blood-red or crimson) follows in frequency with nine garments, or 10%.

The prevalence of red and white is interesting, and may have been chosen to highlight the social pedigree and material wealth of the House of Stuart. We know that Henry VII (1457-1509), for example, chose red and white as his colours, for they pointed to the legitimacy and strength of the Tudor dynasty born, as it was, from the houses of Lancaster (red) and York (white).[[23]](#endnote-23) Similarly, the Great Wardrobe accounts reveal that Henry VIII owned a predominance of garments in shades of red, which were not only used during liturgical and state ceremonies, but also featured in the king’s every day wardrobe.[[24]](#endnote-24) Several red shades were extremely expensive to produce (notably crimson and scarlet), and were therefore indicative of financial position, while more generally, as Maria Hayward notes, red was ‘symbolic of royal power and authority’.[[25]](#endnote-25) White garments similarly served as a statement of wealth, for they required ample resources to keep them in pristine condition.[[26]](#endnote-26)

As well as noting the colour of garments, the inventory includes the colour of the lining of 376 items of dress. Here, the two most common colours are reversed with almost half the listed goods being lined in shades of red (46%). Of those 174 garments lined in red, the most popular shade is carnation, which is used for 117 garments (67%). The next most common single colour is white, which lines forty-six garments (12%). More popular than white however, is the use of two or three colours together, which lines fifty-six garments (15%). As far as fabrics are concerned, the most common is satin, which is used in 303 of the total wardrobe goods, or just over half (53%).

In addition to noting the types and colours of the fabrics in Anna’s wardrobe, the inventory describes 262 garments that are embroidered or brocaded. The entries note if the decoration is figurative and often record whether it is carried out in gold, silver, or single, or multi-coloured threads of silk. It should be noted that the visual effect can be very similar, and the major difference is in the means of production with brocade being a woven patterned fabric, whereas embroidery is executed using a needle and thread on a fabric ground.[[27]](#endnote-27) In the inventory under discussion, brocade is more commonly referred to as ‘flowered’, such as a hair-coloured (brownish-grey) satin gown ‘brocated or flowered alover’ in gold, silver, and coloured silks.[[28]](#endnote-28) Similarly, the language used to describe brocaded garments often points to the woven nature of the decoration, as in ‘One gowne of white flowred Sattine’, as opposed to an ash-coloured gown noted to be ‘embrodered all over… in flowers and branches’.[[29]](#endnote-29) That said, it is often difficult to determine whether a garment is adorned with embroidered or woven designs, for the terms ‘works’, or ‘wrought’ are commonly used, and their exact meaning remains unclear.[[30]](#endnote-30) As such, the figures below should be taken as an approximation.

The 262 entries that record embellishment are taken from a total of 466 entries (56%) in the inventory, which does not include the thirteen entries listing coronation robes.[[31]](#endnote-31) Embroidered garments are much more common than brocaded items, accounting for 66% (173 pieces) of the total number. An additional nine garments are described as ‘raised’, which refers to the use of padded embroidery (Figure 1), and a further nine garments feature both embroidery and brocade.[[32]](#endnote-32) Of those 173 articles of embroidered dress, the vast majority - 100 pieces or 58% - do not have a specified design or pattern. This number includes fifty-one garments that are described as being ‘striped’ with silk or metal thread as in a white silk grosgrain gown ‘striped with gould’, or a purple satin gown ‘Striped with orrenge colour green and white silck’.[[33]](#endnote-33) This ‘stripe’ most likely refers to a type of lace which was really braid applied in ‘strip[e]s’, or lengths of embroidered fabric. Examples can be found in a ‘nighte gown of Carnation Chynay Taffatye Striped with Silke Lyke a bone Lace with Flowers of white wachett carnation and purple silk’, or a white silk grosgrain gown noted to be ‘Stripte with plaets of Silver & cords of gold and silver green and orenge Silke, Lyke a bone Lace’.[[34]](#endnote-34) A pictorial depiction of this type of embellishment is found in Anna’s *c*.1617 portrait where scarlet ‘strip[e]s’, edged with silver-gilt thread, are laid diagonally over the bodice and down the sleeves, while the shoulder wings are laid with silver-gilt braid in squares (Figure 2). Furthermore, the scarlet ribbons attaching the jewellery to the bodice and standing collar in this portrait are a careful colour match, and the inventory includes eight and a half yards of ‘carnation ribbon’.[[35]](#endnote-35)

While the majority of embroidery is unspecified in terms of pattern or form, there are sixty-five garments (37%) with figurative embroidery executed in gold (silver-gilt), silver, and coloured silk threads and the devices include, amongst others, stars, suns, clouds, flies, birds, half-moons and feathers, fountains, ‘esses’ (the letter ‘S’), flowers, and butterflies.[[36]](#endnote-36) One gown is embroidered with ‘flames like fire, and a hand and a hammer’.[[37]](#endnote-37) This curious pairing is an emblem reminding the viewer that they must suffer the continual blows of fortune and ‘evil fame’ before being considered ‘precious’ in God’s eyes. It was used to illustrate mottoes such as ‘Till God hath wrought us to his Will / The Hammer we shall Suffer Still’, and ‘True Vertue, firme, will alwayes bide / By whatsoever suffrings tride’.[[38]](#endnote-38) An extant piece of an English-made satin petticoat from *c*.1600 in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum testifies to this intricate level of embroidered detail, and features a collection of highly emblematic motifs including an armillary sphere, shooting arrows, jagged thunderbolts, a lion, two storks, an obelisk, and a winged cherub's head surmounted by a flaming heart (Figure 3).

In relation to Anna’s body of portraits, however, it is notable that the queen is consistently depicted wearing garments of brocaded fabric with an all-over pattern, rather than elaborate naturalistic embroidered designs that could have had a symbolic significance. An example of this is found in Anna’s portrait from around 1612/14 (Figure 4) for, as Valerie Cumming notes, ‘both bodice and skirt are made from Italian brocaded silk’.[[39]](#endnote-39) Karen Hearn adds that the pattern is that of ‘twigs and peacock feathers’, which would have been ‘appropriate symbols’ for Anna since the ‘bird was sacred to Juno, wife of the King of the Roman gods, Jupiter’.[[40]](#endnote-40) In addition, Juno would have offered an important parallel to Anna, for they were the daughters, sisters, wives, and mothers of gods/kings.

While the majority of the 262 decorated garments are described as being garnished with needlework or embroidery, there are fifty-six brocaded or ‘flowered’ garments. The majority of these (forty-four garments or 78%) are woven in unspecified designs while the remaining twelve feature figurative works that include branches, flowers, esses, and diamonds. An example of brocaded fabric is seen in a half-length portrait of Anna from 1614, where the queen is shown wearing a white satin gown brocaded all over in gold (gilt-silver) thread, and green and red silk thread in flowers and botanical flourishes (Figure 5). The latter are most likely those referred to in the inventory as ‘flowers and branches’, since branches could also mean patterns.[[41]](#endnote-41) The words ‘flowers’ and ‘branches’ are relatively common in the inventory and have at least two meanings each. ‘Flowers’ are used to designate both the literal appearance of flowers, and to indicate brocade, while ‘branches’ is used to describe naturalistic branches, and also to refer to designs or patterns. For example, one ash-coloured gown is noted to be ‘Imbroyered alover with black and orenge Coler Silkes in braunches or Flowers Lyke esses’ while a silver gown is described as being ‘Stripte with orenge colour, and flowered with wachett and Carnation Silkes’, and a petticoat embroidered with ‘wylde beastes byrds Flowers and fruits’.[[42]](#endnote-42)

In addition to costly embroidery or brocade, Anna’s clothes are adorned with a staggering quantity of various types of lace. The compilers of the inventory took considerable care in noting the type, colour, and location of lace on the queen’s apparel, amounting to 878 references within the inventory. This exactitude is related to the high cost of lace, and it would have been important to have a record of the type and quantity belonging to the queen. The most frequently cited type of lace is bone (bobbin) lace which adorns 146 pieces of dress, or 17% of the total entries. Bone lace is built over a parchment pattern that is pricked with fine pinholes, which serves to outline the design and hold completed ‘stitches’ and surrounding threads tight. The individual threads being plaited, woven, or twisted together, are delineated by means of weights or bobbins, which were originally made of bone, hence the name.[[43]](#endnote-43) In the early seventeenth century, strips of bone lace were often used as trimmings to edge garments, or were laid across fabric as seen in the half-length portrait of Anna from 1614 (Figure 5). Here, gold (silver-gilt) bobbin lace is apparent over the shoulder wings, ‘laid down right’ the sides of her bodice, and along the edges of the button fastenings that extend down the arms.[[44]](#endnote-44) In addition to painted representations, there are surviving examples of bone lace trimmings from the Jacobean period. The collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum, for example, contains the Layton Jacket that was made in 1610 and a pair of gloves from *c*.1603-1625, both of which feature trimmings of silver-gilt bobbin lace, and a well-preserved example of a woman’s linen nightgown with bobbin lace trimmings and inserts.[[45]](#endnote-45)

Following bone lace in terms of quantity is purle lace, which features on 126 garments in the inventory (14% of the total) which, by the mid-sixteenth century, as Santina Levey asserts, denoted ‘a narrow detached needle-lace edging’.[[46]](#endnote-46) It is worth noting that while bone lace is specifically identified, there is no mention of needle lace. The absence may be accounted for by the identification of purle lace as a needle lace, and it is also possible that the numerous entries where the lace type is not noted, as in a white satin gown with ‘a white Satten Lace about the Skirts’, may well have been needle lace although it remains unknown.[[47]](#endnote-47) While sections of lace are often noted to be enhanced with spangles, purles, plate, or bugles, there are also fifty-four garments in the inventory that do not mention lace, but are garnished with twists, plate, purles, owes, bugles, or spangles, or in various combinations of the six, which would have been applied by means of needlework.[[48]](#endnote-48)

Interestingly, there are 200 references to decorated seams. Ten of these refer to decorative embroidered bands or guards, but the remaining 190 entries document lace inserts, such as a white satin gown ‘bound & Laid in each Seame with Silver passement Lace’, or a dove-coloured white taffeta gown ‘Layd in each Seam with ii Deare colour black and Silver Dyamond purle laces’.[[49]](#endnote-49) There is a distinct possibility that these are in fact ornate embroidered inserts, for Levey notes that these commonly ‘resembled bobbin lace’, and she concludes that ‘it is not surprising that such seams have been accepted as lace’.[[50]](#endnote-50) Extant English-made examples are in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, including a woman’s jacket with embroidered seams in insertion stitch, and a woman’s linen waistcoat with bobbin lace insertions (Figure 6).[[51]](#endnote-51) Further types of lace-like decorative braiding and trimmings, often listed in the inventory as ‘lace’, but appearing on only 5% or less of the total number of garments, include bias binding, chain, cloud, compass (as in circular), diamond, galloon, heart, laying, open, parchment, passemaine, and worm. The majority of these likely refer to the shapes or motifs formed in the elaborate knotted structure, more akin to bobbin lace, and are perhaps better grouped under the collective term of *passementerie*.[[52]](#endnote-52)

One other type of adornment noted in the inventory is buttons. These form both a decorative and functional element, and can be found on the wings, down the wearing and hanging sleeves, on the breasts of gowns, and ‘about’ the skirts. Despite the number of locations where they could be sewn, buttons are uncommon and only appear in fifty-three articles of raiment, or 9% of the total inventory. This is expected though, for buttons were easily detachable and often valuable, which saw them being used between garments when necessary and stored separately.[[53]](#endnote-53) This practice might also account for the absence of clothing in the inventory that is decorated with precious stones or aglets, for out of the total 541 entries, not one piece is embellished with gems, pearls, or aglets, and only three pieces feature seed pearls.[[54]](#endnote-54) However, this is consistent with the majority of Anna’s painted portraits, which in contrast to portraits of Elizabeth, do not show the queen consort attired in fabrics that have been sewn with gemstones or pearls.[[55]](#endnote-55) This is presumably indicative of the change in fashion that can be readily observed between the ornate surface decoration of Elizabethan garments and the comparatively simple elegance of the Caroline period. Evidently, rather than having fabrics embellished with precious stones, the Jacobeans favoured their display in jewelled pieces such as necklaces, brooches, and bracelets. Certainly, there are very few references to the condition of the garments indicating that the majority were either new, or still in good condition, and ready for immediate use. While terms such as ‘old’ and ‘worn’ are readily listed in documents from the Jacobean period, they are uncommon in the Cambridge inventory.[[56]](#endnote-56) Interestingly though, a list of twenty-eight farthingales ‘taken 23 March 1607’ [old style], is appended to the back of the inventory, which are noted to be ‘past hir majesties wearing’ and ‘cast’ to Somerset House.[[57]](#endnote-57)

dress for masquing

Further information about the type of dress that Anna wore during masque performances can be gained from the Cambridge inventory, which has not been cited in the secondary literature. Two entries specifically list ‘maskinge gowns’, which, along with marginal notations concerning date and location, can be directly associated with two masques – *Tethys’ Festival* (1610) and *Love Freed from Ignorance and Folly* (1611). The first of the masquing garments is described as ‘One maskinge gown bodies seagrene taffeta Imbroydered alover withsmale Silver Spangell Lace in works, skerts white cloth silver Imbroydered alover with gold Spangell Lace’, which the marginal notation indicates was needed on ‘6 June 1610’.[[58]](#endnote-58) While no location is noted, both the preceding and following entries in the inventory were required at Whitehall at the same time, which suggests that the masque garments were also sent to Whitehall. This is further confirmed by the fact that Anna, and thirteen of her ladies, performed Samuel Daniel’s masque, *Tethys’ Festival*, at Whitehall Palace on 6 June 1610, and the choice of sea-green would have been appropriate for Anna playing the part of Tethys ‘Queen of the Ocean and wife of Neptune’.[[59]](#endnote-59) The second masquing costume listed in the inventory is described as:

One maskeinge gowne of Satten, ye bodies Jaggs and tagges of white Sattne Imbroydery verye riche with gold purle plaett and owes, ye skerts of grasse greene satten Imbroydered with Silver owes alover Cutt rounde belowe with peakes and scollops and edged with a Silver frenge Linde with greene Sarcenett,

which was required at Whitehall on 3 February 1610 [ie. 1611].[[60]](#endnote-60) Again, this directly correlates with another masque – Ben Jonson’s *Love Freed from Ignorance and Folly* - that was performed by Anna, and ten of her ladies, at Whitehall Palace on 3 February 1611, although Barbara Ravelhofer asserts that this gown was worn by Anna in *Tethys’ Festival*, the dates do not relate.[[61]](#endnote-61) Furthermore, Daniel’s description of Anna’s ‘habit’ in Tethys’ Festival does not match either gown in the inventory, being noted by the playwright as having ‘boddies of sky-colored taffataes for lightness […] halfe skirts of cloth of silver imbrodered with golde […] The long skirt was wrought with lace, waved round about like a River, and on the bankes sedge and Sea-weedes, all of gold’.[[62]](#endnote-62) As such, while it is not certain who wore the masquing garments, or if they were even worn at all, the matching dates would suggest that, at the very least, they were intended for use specifically in the context of the masque. It is also possible that these were not new articles of dress, but had been inherited from Elizabeth and refashioned for Anna’s purposes. Certainly, this had been the case for Anna’s first court masque, *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses,* when warrants were issued to allow the removal and use of Elizabeth’s garments from the Tower of London.[[63]](#endnote-63) Significantly, spectators were able to recognise them as such, for Dudley Carleton (1573-1632) declared the female performers ‘beholden to Queen Elizabeth’s wardrobe’, before adding that Anna’s gown was ‘not so much below the knee but that we might see a woman had both feet and legs’, which suggests that the clothes had been altered for the performance.[[64]](#endnote-64)

By wearing Elizabeth’s clothing in a courtly and/or theatrical setting, Anna was able to directly absorb some of the cachet associated with the deceased queen. Discussing the important role of clothing in gift-exchange during the seventeenth century, Susan Vincent has persuasively argued that a worn piece of apparel not only cemented a relationship with the original wearer but also conferred part of their identity.[[65]](#endnote-65) Importantly, when the original wearer was a member of royalty, this became even more acute. Pointing to the therapeutic power of the royal touch, as evidenced by the continued ritual of touching for the King’s Evil (scrofula), Vincent suggests that not only did royal raiment hold some residue of the original wearer’s identity, but was also possessed with some of their thaumaturgic abilities.[[66]](#endnote-66) Thus, in consciously choosing to wear some of Elizabeth’s (now) unfashionable clothing, Anna gained some of the Tudor queen’s regal prestige and power. This would have been visually apparent, for Elizabethan modes of dress – principally the drum farthingale – came to operate as shorthand for the Tudor queen during the Jacobean period.[[67]](#endnote-67) Pointedly, it was a style of dress that Anna continued to favour throughout James’s reign. For example, writing of an audience with Anna on 22 December 1617, the Catholic priest Horatio Busino (*fl*.1617-1621) recalls that ‘Her Majesty’s costume was pink and gold with so expansive a farthingale that I do not exaggerate when I say it was four feet wide in the hips’.[[68]](#endnote-68)

the movement of garments

The few references to the condition of garments in the Cambridge inventory suggest that this selection of goods was, at least, relatively new or well preserved, and ready for immediate use. These garments were also readily transported between royal residences, and marginal notes in the second hand typically record the location and date of items, such as, for example, a white taffeta nightgown lined with crimson taffeta recorded as ‘10th September 1608 Hampton Courte’, which likely indicates that the nightgown was required by Anna at Hampton Court at that time.[[69]](#endnote-69) The dates detailed in the inventory provide some insight into the movements of the queen, and show that between 1608 and 1611, Anna generally spent the September/October months at Hampton Court before moving to Whitehall for the Christmas/New Year period. April and May were spent at Greenwich and the summer months show an increase in movement between Basingstoke, Nonsuch, Holdenby, Woodstock, Greenwich, Theobalds, and Whitehall. Anna’s principal London residence, Somerset House, is only mentioned twice due to its being under construction during the time of the inventory.[[70]](#endnote-70) Interestingly, the inventory testifies that the nine gowns Anna owned with ‘ye hangeinge Sleves of ye Spannishe facon [fashion]’ were all required by the queen between mid-April and mid-May 1611. Eight of the gowns were required at Greenwich, and one green velvet gown with Spanish hanging sleeves was needed at Whitehall on 20 April 1611.[[71]](#endnote-71) As Arnold elaborates, Spanish hanging sleeves were large, round sleeves that enclosed the upper arms and had a narrow wrist.[[72]](#endnote-72) It is possible that an example of these sleeves is seen in Anna’s hunting portrait by Paul van Somer from 1617 (Figure 7). The right sleeve has been unbuttoned and hangs loosely behind the queen; it has a narrow band, of lace or braid, at the base that would have cinched the sleeve at the wrist.

The wearing of Spanish fashion in April/May 1611 is likely to have been connected to the possibility of Anglo-Spanish marriage alliance. The match was being hotly discussed at court at this time with the Venetian agent, Antonio Foscarini, reporting to the Doge and Senate, on 21 July 1611 that ‘her Majesty inclines to the Spanish Infanta, of whom she thinks very well’.[[73]](#endnote-73) Indeed, it is well documented that Anna supported a Spanish marriage for both of her sons. Beyond her own Catholic convictions, Anna’s investment in the match was threefold: of all the European powers, the Habsburgs were possessed of a pre-eminently illustrious lineage; as an extremely wealthy kingdom, the Stuarts could hope to gain a larger dowry from Spain than that offered by Savoy, Tuscany, or even France; and thirdly, Anna was exceptionally proud of her own Habsburg connections, repeatedly reminding foreign emissaries of her Austrian connections: in 1515, Anna’s cousin Christian II of Denmark (1481-1559) had married Isabella of Austria (1501-1526), sister of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V (1500-1558).[[74]](#endnote-74)

Furthermore, there is precedent for Anna strategically showcasing her support for Spain through visual means. She harnessed her first court masque, Samuel Daniel’s *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, performed at Hampton Court on 8 January 1604, as an occasion to demonstrate visible favour to the Spanish. Writing to Monsieur de Villeroy on 23 January 1604/05, the French Ambassador Christophe de Harlay, Comte de Beaumont (*c.*1570-1615), reported that Anna wore ‘a scarf and a red streamer’ to honour the Spanish ambassador, Juan de Tassis, Count of Villamediana (1581-1622), who was similarly attired in red.[[75]](#endnote-75) Later, during the *Masque of Beauty*, in 1608, Anna again fashioned her physical appearance to indicate Spanish favour. This time she wore the jewelled collar inherited from Mary Tudor (1516-1558) that was adorned with the ciphers ‘P’ and ‘M’ that Philip II (1527-1598) had given to the Tudor queen – a pertinent reminder of the previous Anglo-Spanish marriage.[[76]](#endnote-76) Throughout the protracted marriage negotiations for Prince Henry, Anna’s decision to wear certain fashions would have enabled her to silently showcase her position and favour.

gift-giving and exchange

In addition to information concerning the level of adornment for the royal body, the inventory shows that Anna occasionally gave away pieces of clothing from her own wardrobe. In giving away articles of dress to household members, Anna was following an established tradition that had continued under Elizabeth and Mary I. Regrettably though, as Arnold and Payne point out, it is impossible to ascertain whether these were given as a mark of favour or as recompense for service.[[77]](#endnote-77) It was also common for queens to provide gifts to their chamberers on the occasion of marriage, and this was a tradition that Anna continued. When she did give away apparel, the recipients were almost exclusively drawn from her household. For example, between December 1609 and July 1610, Anna gave Jane Meautys (1580/81-1659), one of her Ladies of the Bedchamber, four elaborate gowns from her wardrobe. The previous year, when Jane married Sir William Cornwallis (*d*.1611), Anna bought her a ‘jewel of gold, set with diamonds’ from her jeweller, George Heriot (1563-1624), for £60.[[78]](#endnote-78) Meautys was not the only attendant to benefit from Anna’s munificence, and the queen gave quantities of her clothing to other members of her Chamber staff. One piece of clothing was given to the following women: Audrey Walsingham, Lady of the Bedchamber and Keeper of the Robes (*d*.1624); Bridget Annesley, chamberer of the Bedchamber; Dorothy Speckart, chamberer of the Bedchamber. The following women received two articles of dress: Thomasine Carew, Lady of the Privy Chamber; Dorothy Silken, a Danish gentlewoman of the Bedchamber; Susan de Vere, Countess of Montgomery, Lady of the Withdrawing Chamber (1587-1628/29); Elizabeth Carey, Lady of the Privy Chamber and Keeper of Charles, Duke of York; Lady Dorothy Eyre, Gentlewoman of the Bedchamber; and Bridget Fenslowe, who I have been unable to trace. One woman, Jyngell Silken, a Dutch gentlewoman of the Bedchamber, was given three gowns.[[79]](#endnote-79)

While most women received only one or two gowns, Elizabeth Shaw (later Murray, Countess of Annandale), a Scottish Gentlewoman of the Bedchamber, was given five gowns, a white satin doublet, and a black satin skirt, while the Scottish Jane Drummond (*c*.1585-1643), Groom of the Stool and Anna’s principal lady-in-waiting, received four gowns.[[80]](#endnote-80) The inventory does not provide any evidence as to the method of selection, and while it does not specifically state whether items of apparel were new, the annotations suggest that the majority had already been used by the queen. For the most part, the pieces of dress registered as gifts are listed as being previously required at a royal residence, presumably in accordance to Anna’s wishes. For example, an elaborate dove-coloured taffeta gown striped with black and white silk and adorned with lace was required at Whitehall on 11 December 1608. Later, on 8 December 1610, the same garment was given by the queen to Bridget Annesley.[[81]](#endnote-81) Of the thirty-eight garments given away, only five are without records of prior locations.

Anna did not only act as a fount of largesse though, and the receiving of lavish items, or smaller, more personalised gifts from subjects was a custom that carried on from Elizabeth’s reign. By the close of the sixteenth century, Elizabeth regularly received pieces of clothing or jewellery rather than the more traditional gifts of plate or money.[[82]](#endnote-82) This practice continued under Anna. The number of courtiers who gave Anna fabrics, carpets, or apparel as New Year’s gifts indicates the queen’s passion for clothing and interior furnishings. White satin petticoats, elaborately embroidered in gold, silver, and coloured silks, which would have been hugely expensive, were regularly given to Anna as New Year’s gifts. In 1608/9, for example, she received petticoats from Lady Margaret, Countess of Nottingham (*c*.1591-1639), Mary Gargrave, one of her Maids of Honour, from her Lord Chamberlain, Robert Sidney, Viscount Lisle (1563-1626), from Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk (1561-1626), King James’s Lord Chamberlain, and even from King James himself.[[83]](#endnote-83) As skirts, or under-skirts, petticoats were meant to be seen and they are often depicted in portraits of the period, such as Anna’s carnation-coloured fringed petticoat that extends below her closed skirts in the portrait by John de Critz (1551/2-1642) from *c*.1605 (Figure 8). Importantly, a very rare example of a carnation silk satin petticoat, dating to 1610-20, survives in the collection of Glasgow Museums (Figure 1).[[84]](#endnote-84) Elaborately embroidered with figurative devices including pansies, daffodils, carnations (pinks), honeysuckle, acorns, leaves, peascods, strawberries, thistles, birds, butterflies and hearts, all set within an arabesque of curling stems, and further adorned with metal plate, twists, and spangles (oes); the intricate nature of the design, and the choice of forms, accords directly with the petticoats listed in the inventory. While the vast majority of those belonging to Anna were of white satin, there are some of carnation silk, but they are, unfortunately, too vague for a definitive match, such as the entry for a ‘peticoate of carnation Satin, embroydered all over with Silver purle plate and owes, witha faire border of hartes and sundrie devises’, or the ‘peticoat of Carnation Satin, embroythered all over very richlie, with gould and Sylver purle and green Silke, with Slippes and branches’.[[85]](#endnote-85)

Petticoats were often extremely expensive, being richly embroidered and edged with costly lace. While the description of the embroidery on Anna’s petticoats is often minimal, some are recorded in great detail, such as an exceptionally decorative petticoat described as being:

Imbroydred alover butt moste Fayrest in a border 3 quarters deepe with riminge workes of venice gold and purle with 12 broad squares of the Foresayd gold with severall Devices in eache square Intermixte withDyvers Sorts of fruits Fowells & fyshes: with a gard one eache Syde the border with Imagerie [imaginary] worke & fowles.[[86]](#endnote-86)

A further idea of the sumptuousness of these garments can be ascertained from the fact that in 1609, King James gave Anna a petticoat that cost a handsome £100, which equates to around £16,500 in 2015.[[87]](#endnote-87) OR

… King James gave Anna a petticoat costing £100, which was extremely expensive considering that the average knight only earned between £100 and £200 per annum at this date.[[88]](#endnote-88) On 17 June 1610, Anna gave the plush-lined petticoat that she had received from the Earl of Leicester, splendidly embroidered with a seascape and birds, wild beasts, rocks, and a variety of fruit, to her sister Elizabeth, Duchess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1573-1626).[[89]](#endnote-89) At New Year 1609/10, Anna again received embroidered white satin petticoats from Lisle and Suffolk, and one from her son Henry, Prince of Wales.[[90]](#endnote-90) Anna continued to receive material goods as New Year’s gifts throughout her time as queen consort with Lady Cheney giving her a piece of ‘Spanish purple taffata imbrodered with Venice gold & silke’, and Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery (1590-1676) giving her an embroidered sweet bag in 1616/17.[[91]](#endnote-91) These examples of gift-exchange underscore Anna’s penchant for material furnishings and apparel, which came to be seen as appropriate gifts for a queen.

While no extant items of dress have been definitively linked to Anna of Denmark, we are fortunate that documentary evidence of her clothing survives, and, together with painted representations, can assist in the reconstruction of her appearance. The inventory of Anna’s wardrobe goods that was compiled around 1608, and annotated until around 1611, provides detailed insight into the colours, fabrics, decorative techniques and style of dress favoured by the queen. The costly fabrics and copious amounts of embroidery and lace confirm that Anna consistently projected an image of affluent majesty, which was vital in the communication of political power in the period. Indeed, the appearance of the English queen consort is frequently mentioned in ambassadorial dispatches, where she is conflated with the magnificence and splendour of the English Crown.[[92]](#endnote-92) In addition, the inventory shows that Anna was a woman who clearly understood the inherently political value of gift-exchange, giving articles of dress to her female chamberers and family members. In giving away new and worn pieces of dress, Anna fulfilled her duty to engage in royal largesse. This served to maintain the loyalty of subjects and key networks of interdependence that were the very foundations of Jacobean court culture. When the queen consort died on 2 March 1619, John Chamberlain (1553-1628) touched on her material magnificence for the last time, stating that her,

[…] jewells are valuablie rated at £400,000 sterling, her plate at £90,000, her redy coine 80,000 Jacobus peeces, 124 whole pieces of cloth of gold and silver, besides other silks, linnen…and so for all other kindes of hangings, bedding and furniture aunswerable.[[93]](#endnote-93)

Importantly, Chamberlain measured this enormous material wealth in political terms, stating that ‘for quantitie and qualitie’ it was quite ‘beyond any Prince in Europe’
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