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ABSTRACT

Clothing, together with other bodily adornments, is a valuable tool for communicating loyalty, identity and status. The coded messages inherent in the interplay between garments, bodies and society play a fundamental role in political culture, and the early modern era was no exception. The example of Mary I of England and her wardrobe choices demonstrates precisely how useful this tool could be. Through examination of previously-unpublished warrants, information from Privy Purse records, contemporary accounts and portraiture, this thesis analyzes the contents of and changes in Mary I’s wardrobe through the course of her adult life. By examining what the queen wore and when, patterns emerge that correlate with important parts of her political strategies. The first queen regnant, Mary used her wardrobe as a vital tool in the construction of her identity and self-representation, and as a means of navigating through the political and domestic upheavals that threatened her authority.
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CHAPTER 1  INTRODUCTION

Mary Tudor, the first reigning queen of England, has been described by historians both contemporary and modern as a less than astute political actor. That popular belief, combined with religious and political works by authors such as John Foxe, has established Mary’s reputation for political blindness, inexperience, and, among the worst of them, obstinate intolerance bordering on barbaric cruelty. Two generations ago, Geoffrey Elton blamed Mary’s “absence of political guile” and “the obstinate wrong-headedness of her rule” for many of the problems faced by the English in the mid-sixteenth century: “[t]he accession of the wrong kind of queen nearly completed the ruin of dynasty and country.”¹ She has fared poorly in comparison with her much-acclaimed younger half-sister Elizabeth, who had the benefit of forty extra years on the throne in order to entrench her supporters, and of being on the winning side when it came to the battles surrounding the Reformation. The layers of propaganda and polemic that have tainted biographies and analyses of Mary over the past four hundred years have turned the mid-Tudor queen into “Bloody Mary,” a nigh-mythological creature of scorn.

When those layers are stripped away, however, and the evidence remaining from Mary’s life is re-examined, a new picture emerges. Recent scholarship has begun to discuss Mary as an educated and careful politician in her own right, willing to use all the tools available to her in order to negotiate the murky pools of politics and international diplomacy during her six years on the throne. Clothing – and associated aspects of material culture – was

one tool which carried particular resonance throughout the early modern era. The prevailing cultural understanding of fashion maintained that garments could exert special force over the body that they contained, and that clothing choices, especially by those in positions of authority, carried particular messages to viewers. Analyses by scholars such as Kevin Sharpe have addressed the question of Mary’s political acumen through examination of her writings and visual representations. Examining Mary’s wardrobe and choices of dress and accessory for particular public occasions and commissioned images opens another lens through which we can understand more about the queen’s multifaceted political strategies.

In a highly visual society, dress was one of the most immediate ways to differentiate one body from another. Clothing formed a legitimate political text, a notion made plain through the existence and enforcement of sumptuary legislation as well as the existence of dress diplomacy, which marked favour through the giving and receiving of textiles and garments. Mary made good use of this system and the customs grown up around the use and exchange of garments. She gave clothing primarily to her subordinates and jewels to her supporters, and received the same as gifts both when her favour was needed and as a symbol of incorporation into a family or household. She received smocks, for instance, from the French as a gift in 1518 upon her betrothal to the Dauphin, an intimate gesture


that marked the beginning of her incorporation into the French royal family. The records of Mary’s jewel house and her privy purse expenses reveal evidence of gifts she gave to supporters and wives of prominent men at court who may be considered part of an extended network of allies. At new year’s 1537-38, for example, Mary gave bonnets and frontlets to members of her personal staff and those of the newborn Prince Edward. Mary Arundell, however, the very newly married Lady Sussex, received a gift of a tablet, an item of gold jewelery, worth one hundred shillings – a gift of far greater value than anything else Mary sent out that year. The earl of Sussex had been a supporter of Mary’s even while she was out of favour at court in 1533, and his new bride was a lady in waiting to Queen Jane and well-placed at court to accomplish favours. Of the forty-eight jewels recorded in Mary’s possession on 12 December 1542, the princess noted seventeen given away as gifts to various recipients around her household and the court.

---

4 Judith M. Richards. Mary Tudor. London: Routledge, 2008. 37; also MPP, folios 82, 82b, 84 for records of gifts for January 1543.
6 MPP, f. 36 - 37
7 Ibid.
9 MPP ff. 136 – 138b.
Wardrobe choices by those in power embodied, shaped, and made visible a lengthy series of negotiations, in the political as well as the personal realms.\textsuperscript{10} The body underneath became what Mary Douglas termed “a primary classification system for cultures,” a form on which expression and material display were shaped by natural and social forces.\textsuperscript{11} Dress and the social codes defining acceptable dress became a kind of disciplinary method, training the body and the eye to act and react in particular and meaningful ways. The style of dress chosen for any particular occasion was a conveyer of meaning both outwardly, to the observer, and inwardly, to the wearer, whose carriage and behaviour could be altered and transformed by the clothing and the social resonance of the garments.\textsuperscript{12} Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources frequently contained commentary on the transformative nature of dress, much of which raised questions of loyalty, nationality, affinity and legitimacy that centred around fashion. Edmund Spenser summed it up best in 1596:

\begin{quote}
[M]ens apparell is comonly made accordinge to theire condicons, and theire condicons are oftentymes goverened by theire garmentes: for the person that is gowned is by his gowne put in minde of gravitie, and also restrayned from lightnes by the very aptnes of his weede... there is not a little in the garment to the fashioninge of the mynde and condicons.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{kuchta}
\bibitem{entwistle}
\bibitem{jones}
Jones and Stallybras, \textit{Materials of Memory}, 3.
\bibitem{spenser}
\end{thebibliography}
In other words, the early modern English mind understood clothing to be simultaneously a public reflection of a person’s inward state of being, and a force which acted upon the wearer to create a new internal identity.

Clothing conveys messages on both conscious and unconscious levels, as human beings experience the world through visual communication. Dress, including the methods by which it shapes the wearer’s body, is one of the first indicators by which a viewer may make assumptions and judgements. While it would be problematic to assume that every sartorial choice is deliberate, and every message conveyed is both overt and consciously understood, those messages are nevertheless present and still potent.\(^\text{14}\) It is in the incongruities – in the circumstances where one choice seems much less statistically probable or culturally mandated than another – that the viewer can most readily infer intention. When the dresser makes extra effort in clothing choices, in circumstances where an obvious and more socially acceptable option is available and avoided, it is fair to interpret such choices as transmitting meaning in an intentional way. Clothing and body modifications involved with dressing (such as corsetry, foot binding, and so forth) are prime locations for the discussion and transmission of power relationships. Size, particularly top-heavy and over-proportional size, generates impressions of power and dominion, a factor that Henry VIII and his children used to good effect.\(^\text{15}\)


\(^{15}\) Ibid., 199.
In the early modern era, clothing was a vital conduit for recognition of status, transmission of familial and household identities, and an integral tool in what Kevin Sharpe calls “the theatre of politics.”\textsuperscript{16} The images constructed for public consumption, including paintings, pageants and other politically-charged appearances, he argues, were part of intricate negotiations with the populace, whose approval and participation were vital to the continued authority of the early modern English monarchy. Following the English victory at Flodden in 1513, Catherine of Aragon sent the defeated King James IV’s coat to Henry VIII, on campaign in France.\textsuperscript{17} The king’s coat was equivalent to sending Henry a trophy of the man himself, the cloth body becoming a stand-in for the physical body of the defeated enemy. Her own clothing became a prize in a battle for royal status a little more than a decade later, when Anne Boleyn and Catherine came into conflict over access to the queen’s barge and the queen’s wardrobe.\textsuperscript{18}

Examining Mary’s writings, rulings and public presentations, Sharpe argues that Mary ended up on the losing side of a battle for control over her own image. The negative representations created by contemporaries, he notes, were overwhelming, and from this he deduces that Mary abdicated some of the responsibility of managing her own image, and allowed others to take up the reins.\textsuperscript{19} Reintegrating dress to the equation, however, supports an argument that challenges that assumption. The act of dressing is itself a sign of conscious activity; every moment and choice in the process is an acknowledgement of

\textsuperscript{17} Maria Hayward. \textit{Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII}. Leeds, UK: Maney, 2007. 11.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 158.
\textsuperscript{19} Sharpe, \textit{Selling the Tudor Monarchy}, 246.
quiet semiotics at work, of decisions to conform or to rebel against expectations. Through the conscious act of dressing, the physical form is transmuted into something acknowledged as a potentially disruptive Other. As Joanne Entwistle argues, the act of dressing demands attention to social norms and expectations during the choosing of garments and the preparation of both garments and body for external viewing. Anything that Mary wore, in other words, whether acknowledged by contemporaries or not, was on her body through either conscious or subconscious acknowledgements of these norms. The question of intentionality is answered, then, by saying that, as far as dressing for public ceremony goes, choices of colour, shape and style are more often intentional than accidental.

Mary’s reputation for lack of political acumen began among her contemporaries. Reports from the imperial ambassador Renard suggested a certain level of naiveté, noting that “the queen is as yet inexperienced in the conduct of public affairs.” Charles V sent letters to Mary and to his ambassadors filled with advice for the new queen. He instructed: “Let her be in all things what she ought to be: a good Englishwoman, and avoid giving the impression that she desires to act on her own authority, letting it be seen that she wishes to have the assistance and consent of the foremost men of the land and, as far as it shall appear requisite, of Parliament itself.” Despite that injunction, Mary displayed a certain amount of stubborness with respect to some decisions, especially in

---

20 Entwhistle, *The Fashioned Body*, 11
the cases of her coronation and her marriage. Until recent decades, depictions of Mary have focussed on her violent treatment of Protestant heretics, her unsuitability for rule and unique position as a Catholic monarch in the midst of a Reformation ultimately won by her religious foes. Thus, historians from England’s Protestant tradition have tended to depict her reign as a momentary digression from the appropriate course of history, and, other than the burnings memorialized so vividly in Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, unremarkable. Combined with Mary’s recorded appeals to her feminine weaknesses and generally harsh opinions of the role of a woman on the throne, accepted wisdom considered “Bloody Mary’s” rule to be a political, marital and religious failure.

A trend in historical scholarship over the past twenty years or so has begun to re-examine that established image of the inept queen, examining primary source documents and older biographies through new frameworks. These historians have uncovered a wide range of scenarios and circumstances in which Mary and her council made appropriate decisions in extremely difficult circumstances, as well as examples of Mary’s careful use of available resources in order to forward her own goals, despite intense opposition. The gender studies explosion in the late twentieth century gave historians a new perspective on female agency. A number of recent studies on the roles of women in households – and

---

22 July 22 1553: Letter from the Emperor to his Ambassadors in England. CSP Spain vol. 11, pp. 109 - 111. “Thus gradually she may bring about a better condition of things, and not only must her chief care be for the kingdom's welfare, but she must manage to make all her people understand that that is her only object.”

by extension, in the complex negotiations of power, status and allegiances – in the early modern era has brought the issue of women’s political contributions to the forefront.24

David Loades’ seminal biography of Mary (1979, and revised in 1991) began the redemptive process. While his vision of Mary remains that of an emotional and unprepared ruler, he grants that it was through Mary’s “iron streak”25 that she was able to win some victories. Loades nevertheless argues for Mary’s direct personal responsibility for the Protestant executions, the “unmitigated disaster”26 that her marriage became, and the financial problems that England experienced during her rule. While he mitigates some of the earlier claims staked by her detractors, his ultimate judgement remains firmly within their camp. Elizabeth Russell’s 1990 article “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins” casts the Queen in a different, more capable light. While Loades emphasizes Mary’s poor judgment calls, Russell reverses some of his assumptions and paints a picture of a craftier and more astute politician. Russell explores some of the ways in which Mary herself made good use of contemporary assumptions in order to see her own will triumph, even though Mary’s unfortunate inability to produce an heir meant the ultimate failure of her plans.27 While not an unequivocal support of the queen, Russell’s paper was one of the first warning shots in a new fight to have Mary’s reign reconsidered and the generally accepted wisdom dismissed.

26 Ibid., 397.
27 E. Russell, “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins.” Historical Research, 63 (1990), 265.
Judith Richards’ 2008 biography of Mary recontextualizes many of the adverse contemporary opinions which have been used to tar Mary’s record over the past centuries. Richards locates the origins of Mary’s persistent negative reputation in a later sixteenth- and seventeenth-century continuation of the religious wars, as well as later political expedience. By contrast, she paints a portrait of a politically astute queen, one unafraid of appearing weak as long as that ploy gained her victories in the end. Richards’ Mary emerges as a far more forward-thinking and active force in her own life and reign, as well as a potent example for her successor of the possible routes available to a queen regnant in a previously entirely masculine position.28

The Marian church and the English Counter-Reformation are topics that have been the subject of a great deal of critique, alongside criticism of Mary’s general political skills. Writing in response to the common arguments describing the Counter-Reformation as a ‘blip’ or backwards-looking lapse during the general English progression towards a protestant church, Eamon Duffy argues in favour of a carefully planned movement, for which there is ample evidence of forward-thinking and long-term effect.29 His arguments are in line with this new view of Mary’s reign and her goals within that reign, describing a monarch far more capable than both her contemporary detractors and later biographers chose to see.

28 Richards, Mary Tudor, 11.
Taking a different tack, Kevin Sharpe’s new work on Tudor public relations explores various strategies used by the Tudor monarchs to create and convey a set of manufactured public images. He examines a broad series of methods by which the Tudor monarchs generated and reconfirmed dynastic and individual legitimacy, and called upon the support of the populace. He considers Mary the least successful of the Tudor monarchs at controlling her public image, emphasizing her embrace of Spanish imagery and Catholic symbolism as a mistake and a misreading on her part. This appropriation of foreign symbols, he suggests, led to a subsequent construction of Mary as fundamentally non-English and therefore less politically effective than she might otherwise have been.

Sharpe’s theoretical framework is compelling, and he has applied it to a broad range of print materials, among them transcripts of speeches and pageants, portraiture, writing and minted coin. Extending that framework to the one area in which he himself admits that his work is lacking – the field of dress – adds information which challenges his original assumption that Mary’s image was entirely crafted by others.

Mary reached her age of legal majority in 1532 and in so doing, gained control over her own purchases and privy purse. By looking at the wardrobe, privy purse and gift roll records for Mary between the age of sixteen and her death in 1558, as well as commentary from contemporary eye witnesses, it is possible to gain new insight into this vital and immediate aspect of royal self-presentation. Mary’s use of the items of clothing that she owned, her choices in particular public events and her use of the signs and

---

30 Sharpe, Selling the Tudor Monarchy, 2009.
symbols encoded in dress choice offer another entry point by which to examine her understanding of and contribution to Tudor political culture.

The wardrobes of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I have been studied extensively, both with regards to content and context. The foundational text in Tudor costume history is undoubtedly Janet Arnold’s *Queen Elizabeth’s Wardrobe Unlock’d*, which lists and describes the material culture surrounding the last Tudor Queen. The study is based on the 1600 inventory of Queen Elizabeth I’s wardrobe, cross-referenced against privy purse expenses, portraiture and other records of the Wardrobe of Robes, which Arnold combined to give a clear and thorough picture of Elizabeth’s personal dress. Maria Hayward followed up on Arnold’s groundbreaking research six years later with a similar project in her *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, focusing on the wardrobe of Henry VIII and those surrounding the king. Her project briefly touches on but goes into little detail about the wardrobes of Edward VI and Mary I as prince and princess within Henry’s household, though she covers the general aspects of court life with remarkable thoroughness. As with Arnold, however, her focus is on identification and explanation of material culture rather than analysis or in generating connections with political culture to any great extent.

---

A small amount of work has begun on the wardrobe of Mary I, as seen in the unpublished MA thesis by Alison Carter and the resulting published article.\(^{32}\) Her archival research is impressive in its thoroughness; her emphasis remains, as did Arnold’s and Hayward’s, on factual reporting with an eye towards art history rather than touching on political theory. Kevin Sharpe’s work on personal presentation touches only briefly on the high importance of dress and clothing choice for royalty in their public and semi-public lives, reserving his framework primarily for printed and minted materials. The next step is to unite those two areas of study. Mary’s precarious position before and after her ascension to the throne, both as often-disinherited royal daughter and then as Catholic queen regnant of a newly Protestant nation, meant that she had to use all of the resources at her disposal in order to gain the support, the affection and the approval she needed from her court, council and subjects. Mary made careful use of clothing and textile alongside other forms of public presentation and media in her construction of her public image, and in her negotiation of the conflicts which threatened to derail her reign.

Mary’s wardrobe details are not as accessible as those for Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Bits and pieces can be recovered from sets of surviving wardrobe warrants from 1538, 1546, 1554, 1557 and 1558, as well as complementary copies in the Lord Chamberlain’s papers from 1557 and 1558. The warrants and copies are written in English, the account books in a mixture of Latin, English and French. Inventories taken of Elizabeth I’s storehouses

in 1600 also make note of some gowns and materials left from Mary’s wardrobe. Constituting the most valuable source of information available on Mary’s sartorial possessions, the records offer an intriguing glimpse at the processes of caring for the Queen’s garments, as well as her physical person. Annual orders of “one yarde of clothe for necessaries” in October 1557 and 1558, for instance, most likely refer to linen used as a clout or pad during menstruation. Her privy purse records from 1536 – 1544 give some insight into her purchases before coming to the throne, as do wardrobe records from Henry VIII and Edward VI, in which some purchases for the Lady Mary appear. Gift rolls, inventories, and records of the jewel house add further detail, including information on the movement of garments and jewels back and forth between Mary and her subjects.

Portraiture and other images created at the time are a valuable source both for identifying particular items of clothing from the inventories, as well as acting as occasions of public display which may be analyzed with respect to audience and intent. Contemporary chroniclers, letter writers, ambassadors and critics have left documentation of the queen’s clothing as worn to particular events. Some of the accounts, particularly those written years – or in some cases, decades – after the events in question, are suspect in their detail, but can be cross-referenced against purchase and ownership records from the official books in order to gauge their accuracy. Images created by court painters may be counted as public events. These images were designed to be part of Mary’s public image in a way that her personal appearances could not, in that they could be copied and transmitted to

---

33 Reprinted in Arnold, Queen Elizabeth’s Wardrobe Unlock’d.
34 LC 5/31 ff. 75-79, Item 20; LC 5/31 ff. 106-111, Item 23. See transcriptions, Appendix C.
subjects far from her person. These physical creations were more available and, though in a different medium, able to communicate some of the same messages as her physical presence, albeit in a more static way.

Unlike the warrants, her privy purse records as princess indicate a series of items received as gifts, particularly around the new year, and the names of those from whom the gifts were sent. This exchange, similar in some ways to the gifts of jewels that Mary would later turn to as queen, was a means of requesting and granting favours from the princess and careful examination of the records can give the modern historian a sense of when Mary was most in and out of favour with the court, who believed that she could be useful to them, and ultimately, how much that favour was deemed to be worth. The most common gifts by far were needleworked items of linen clothing, specifically “wrought” sleeves and partlets. These were personal gifts, requiring dozens, if not hundreds, of hours of individual labour to complete, and were both visible to the external viewer and worn close to the skin, a place of intimacy against the royal body.

As an underage princess, Mary Tudor was subject to the whims and desires of her father and his purchases in her name. Once in her majority, but still requiring the favour of the king, her choices were similarly constrained by Henry VIII’s preferences and the culture of his court. Upon reaching the throne, however, Mary had access to all the material things that she might desire, and her life became an even more public stage upon which she was able to construct a visual and sartorial identity for herself. Mary’s records between 1532 and her death in 1558 give us a glimpse into the purchasing habits and
private accounts of the lady both as princess and as queen. The changes over the course of time demonstrate the ways in which Mary used the material objects in her personal sphere in order to make powerful statements about monarchy, power and royal privilege.

That the material culture of the time sent messages to those living within and beyond the royal sphere is unmistakable. Every coat of arms, badge, procession, pageant, display and robe carried implicit and explicit messages about the bearers and their self-concept. Heavy symbolism was evident in the choices of robes for coronations and formal audiences, as well as in the heritage and provenance of specific items themselves. The great swords borne during royal processions were as much markers of monarchical privilege as the monograms on court officers’ liveries. Like her grandfather Henry VII before her, Mary took a large amount of personal interest in matters pertaining to her royal wardrobe. Her inventory of the Jewel House (1542 – 1546) is riddled with careful annotations in the princess’ own hand, noting origins of various jewels in her possession, and disposal of many of the same. Many of her jewels were given as tokens to courtiers she esteemed, as well as daughters and wives of the same. They appear to have been given as wedding presents, new year’s gifts, as well as for unrecorded events, which may have been as rewards or tokens to engender future consideration.\textsuperscript{35}

Three major areas of conflict serve as prime examples of Mary’s careful planning and conscious development of her public image and sartorial persona, and which are covered below in three analytical and thematic chapters. Chapter two of this thesis discusses

\textsuperscript{35} MPP, 178 – 201.
Mary’s use of well-established Tudor iconography in order to cement her status as a Tudor heir. Mary’s status as Henry VIII and Edward VI’s successor was a precarious one, and as princess she found herself removed from and reinstated to royal favour on multiple occasions. The first and most vital component in securing the acceptance of her subjects and her place on the throne of England was to reconnect herself to her father’s legacy. This was accomplished through attention to her appearance, through use of symbol, and visual reminders of her father and grandfather’s campaigns of image-making.

Secondly, Mary’s status as the first queen regnant came without benefit of a playbook or possible appeal to tradition. Her sole prior example, Matilda (1102 – 1167, r. 1135 - 1138), was the focus of a civil war that saw her male cousin and then her son inherit in her place. Unlike Matilda, Mary managed a bloodless revolt against her usurper and claimed the throne with the favour and backing of many of the nobles of her realm. Legitimacy was one thing, however; creating the role of a queen regnant, rather than queen consort to a reigning king, was treading on entirely new ground. As Judith Richards has suggested, Mary set the stage for Elizabeth with her examples of public speech, display and dress, inadvertently smoothing her younger half-sister’s path to power through her role as trailblazer. Dress by its very nature reconfigures the body, and Mary’s wardrobe choices played a role in reconfiguring her image and walking that narrow line between wife, mother, and compassionate yet all-powerful ruler. Chapter three examines her integration of masculine silhouettes and articles of dress into her wardrobe as a means of establishing her authority as both queen and king of England.
Finally, the Spanish marriage brought a host of destabilizing concerns to the fore. Mary as married woman was limited by the laws of coverture,\(^{36}\) and yet as queen was bound first and foremost to the service of her kingdom and her subjects. Negotiating those dual identities, both as queen of England and Hapsburg bride, required yet more reconfiguration of Mary’s visible and symbolic identities. She began her reign dressed as a purely English daughter of Henry VIII, and reconfigured that visual identity as a reaction to her failed marriage to Philip of Spain. Her dress choices as seen through her official portraiture offer visual evidence to this shift in strategy, one sign of this confluence of intersecting national desires.\(^{37}\) Chapter four identifies the ways in which Mary applied conceptions of national dress and the distinctions between Spanish and English costume in order to negotiate the shifting circumstances surrounding her marriage to Philip of Spain.

A set of appendices accompany this text, which serve as vital supplements to the arguments presented herein. Appendix A contains a timeline of Mary’s life, including both personally and politically relevant events. The field of costume studies is a technical one and has its own vocabulary, and Appendix B is a glossary of many garment- and textile-related terms. Appendix C has a series of transcriptions of previously unpublished manuscripts from the National Archives, which list semi-annual purchases for Mary’s wardrobe for the years 1545 – 1547, 1557 and 1558. In some cases, these records also list quantities of materials purchased, as well as their prices. These records provide extremely

\(^{36}\)A fiction of English common law under which a married woman’s legal rights, including control of property, transferred to her husband.

valuable primary source data for the contents of the queen’s wardrobe, both before and following her accession to the throne. All figures referenced below can be found in Appendix D.

In restricting analysis to textual documentation and the prescriptive nature of high politics, historians risk excluding a vast pool of data that informed the political culture of the early modern era. Clothing was considered by many not only to be an outward reflection of an inward self, but to play a role itself in the construction of a person and their loyalties. By bringing dress and accessories back into the conversation, historians can open up a new venue through which Mary’s decisions may be viewed, and more thoroughly evaluate her ultimate success or failure as a reigning monarch. As argued in the chapters that follow, Mary, the first queen regnant, used her wardrobe as a vital tool in the construction of her identity and self-representation, and as a means of navigating through the political and domestic upheavals that threatened her authority.
On 1 June 1533, Henry VIII crowned Anne Boleyn as his second queen. Later that same month, Princess Mary, his daughter by Catherine of Aragon and to date his only surviving child, was stripped of her royal status and officially retitled Lady Mary.\(^1\) The Act of Succession, passed less than a year later, formally removed Mary from all consideration as heir to the throne. By July 1536 Henry had executed Anne, married Jane Seymour, and Mary had signed a document submitting to his will. That submission on her part restored her to Henry’s affections – though not to the succession – and to a respected place at court.\(^2\) Her restoration as heir to the throne of England did not take place until 1543, and Henry’s Third Succession Act.\(^3\) Mary’s return as second in line to the throne was not to last, however; on his deathbed her half-brother, Edward, named the Protestant Lady Jane Grey as his heir in Mary’s stead, an act that came as a surprise to many. By the time Mary rallied the lords still loyal to her and rode into London to claim her birthright in the summer of 1553, the frequent changes in Mary’s legal status left many with questions as to the strength of her claim. Mary’s first and most vital task was to establish her legitimacy and her right to rule, despite the triple-pronged problems of her sex, her religious beliefs, and her history of delegitimization at the hands of her closest male relatives.

---

\(^1\) CSP Venice, Vol. 4. 429.
\(^2\) Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 63 – 64 (Wriothsely).
\(^3\) Succession to the Crown Act 35 Hen. VIII c.1
The political climate of England in the sixteenth century, the historian Kevin Sharpe argues, changed on a permanent basis. Henry VIII continued an amorphous policy of partnership, of sorts, one begun by his father Henry VII. Sharpe explains that by appealing to the populace through coded visual, textual and performative means, the Tudor monarchs essentially created a new form of governance, in which the acceptance of the people became paramount.\(^4\) The currency of rule then more clearly incorporated social negotiation rather than oppression and force of arms alone. One theme that ran through those coded dialogues was what Roy Strong describes as a “relentless concern with succession.”\(^5\) In order to establish the consent and obedience of the populace, the Tudor kings had to be accepted – despite Henry VII’s origins as a king primarily by right of arms – as divinely chosen, natural and pre-ordained rulers of England.\(^6\) The way in which the monarch was presented and represented in text, image, pageant and other forms of public life became an intrinsic part of the process of creating and defining authority, rather than reflecting a pre-existing situation. Visual media were the most important formats for this first deliberate and carefully managed propaganda campaign. It was well understood by contemporaries that “[i]nto the commen people thynges sooner enter by the eies, then by the eares: remembryng more better that t[hey see] then that they heere.”\(^7\) By engaging in this new form of dialogue which ran beneath all the monarch’s

\(^6\) Ibid., 42 – 43.
public interactions, a crowned head reaffirmed both royal status and the ability of the monarch’s subjects to contest or accept it. Clothing, the robes and gowns worn on state occasions, for public appearances and portraiture, was one major form of visual currency used by European rulers to mark their status as rulers. Mary was no exception.

For Mary to situate herself within the ruling house of Tudor under these new conditions, simply sitting on the throne with the acceptance of the Privy Council was not enough. As one of a new type of monarch, Mary needed to forge an identity for herself which would be understood as a legitimate successor to Henry VII, Henry VIII and Edward VI. Mary used her personal appearance as one medium for that message, shaping her corporeal self through material means, partially expressed through her choices in clothing. Like her predecessors, and her sister after her, Mary understood that appropriate deployment of material culture was one of the foremost and most obvious ways of creating and maintaining her royal identity. She manipulated choices of colour and silhouette in her own clothing, the liveries of her servants, and the court around her to define herself visually as a legitimate member of Henry VIII’s family. She took the opportunity provided her by the grand public staging of her coronation to mark herself not only as the daughter of Henry VIII but also as the successor to the dynasty of Henry VII, who himself predicated his authority on the rites and popularity of Edward the Confessor. Finally, Mary followed through with Henry VIII’s own sartorial propaganda, which emphasized the power and fertility of a monarch’s body as an assurance of stability.

---
8 Sharpe, Selling the Tudor Monarchy, 84.
9 Hayward KH8, 9.
10 Richards, Mary Tudor, 19 – 20.
11 Sharpe, Selling the Tudor Monarchy, 67.
authority and the likelihood of an heir, the birth of which would ensure the kingdom’s prosperous future.

One issue which Mary needed to address directly was the legacy of Henry VIII’s self-reinvention during the process of the Reformation. Mary was forced to balance her attempts at connection to that legacy for political purposes with a very real problem – while establishing an identity as ruler of England, Henry VIII had incorporated a new mode of sacralisation of the monarch as the head of the church. This went hand in hand with the concomitant disavowal of the See of Rome, a state she was intent on reversing. By presenting her monarchical self as Henry VIII and Edward’s direct heir in every way, she risked lending further legitimacy to the changes they had made which she intended to reverse. The simplest means by which to cope with those inherent contradictions was to take her self-representation further back into the past, to the Catholic founder of their line. Mary emulated her grandfather Henry VII in her choice of colour for her coronation robes, and in the adoption of the Lancastrian red rose as a poignant personal symbol.\textsuperscript{12} In so doing, she fused herself into a tradition of rule that Henry VII had extended back again to Edward II and his own abiding Catholic devotion.\textsuperscript{13} One vital part of all of these efforts were the material possessions and wardrobe items associated with royalty and with the Tudor royal house specifically.

\textsuperscript{12} Richards, \textit{Mary Tudor}, 23. Also \textit{The Great Chronicle of London}: the chapel was “with whyte & grene satyn palid, brawderid Rigth goodly upon every side & end wyth iij grete Rede Rosis.” (Robert Fabyan, A. H. Thomas, and I. D. Thornley. \textit{The Great Chronicle of London}. London: Printed by G.W. Jones at the sign of the Dolphin, 1938. 313.)

\textsuperscript{13} Hayward, \textit{KH8}, 10
Colouring the Royal Palette

Upon Henry VIII’s death, his daughters were given access to a series of his store chambers in order to select goods allotted as a portion of their inheritances. Mary’s choice of furniture, including a cloth of estate, speaks to her understanding of how material culture affected the perceptions of onlookers: from the warehouses of goods made available to her, Mary selected mainly items that she might use both as tools of self-representation and of female authority. All the items chosen, as Jeri McIntyre explains, “highlighted her royal lineage and reinstatement as the next successor to the crown.”

Among those items were a regal canopy made of black velvet and cloth of gold tissue and “enbraidered with M crowned.” This item may have originally belonged to Margaret Beaufort, and could be hung over a throne. Mary also selected two cloths of estate which served a similar purpose, made of crimson cloth of gold, red damask, silver tissue, and fringes of Venice gold and silk. In addition to the cloths she selected three matching chairs sufficiently ornate to serve as thrones beneath those canopies, a means of creating a locus of royal power in the centre of a room. Mary already owned a cloth of the same sort, a red and gold velvet canopy, paned with swags of red silk and cloth of gold, which had been provided for her in 1519 to denote her status as heir. She received a second in 1536 with her reinstatement to her father’s favour, but which included

---

15 Ibid., 52.
16 Ibid., 53., also Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 85.
18 Hayward, *KH8*, 311.
embroidered arms of Anne Boleyn as one of the decorative motifs. By later claiming her father’s recognizable cloths of estate as replacements, Mary ensured that those persons who entered her official presence would not forget her place in the Tudor lineage, regardless of the machinations of the court. The colours of the canopies, regal reds and golds and blacks, were standard colours of power in the Tudor court. This fact, together with their placement over the thrones, would have immediately impressed upon the observer the status of the woman sitting before them.

Gold, black, red and purple were colours associated with royal power in the early modern court. While spending prodigiously on his wardrobe, Henry VIII ordered basic black most frequently of all of the colours. Black also appears consistently through the clothing records for Mary both before and after her accession. Black was in high fashion in the early late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, having been favoured by Burgundian duke Philip the Good, whose court set the styles for most of Europe for decades in the late fifteenth century. Black also provided an excellent backdrop for the jewels and ornaments that Mary I and Henry VIII preferred. Beyond the formal colours of royalty, Henry VIII’s court was known for wearing “fresh colours,” including yellow, green, blue, golds and browns, and all shades of red. True purple was reserved for the royal family under Henry’s sumptuary laws, while violet variations were accessible to the

\[19\] Ibid., 312.
\[20\] McIntosh, Heads of Household, 54.
\[21\] Hayward, KH8, 121.
\[22\] Ibid.
\[23\] Ibid., 11 & 121.
rest of the populace, an arrangement which formalized purple’s long-standing cultural association with royalty.\textsuperscript{24}

The association of the colour purple with royal status dated back to the ancient middle east, where it was usually reserved for the exclusive use of figures in positions of royal power.\textsuperscript{25} That association continued through the sixteenth century, when purple robes were part of the set of clothing mandated for English coronations. John Seton’s 1553 book of verse dedicated to Queen Mary separates her from the lords of the land through that colour coding, proclaiming “Vestibus ornentur satrapae squallentibus auro, Sapphiro & niteat purpura chrysolitis” (Let the satraps [i.e., nobility] be clothed in filthy gold / Let her glow in purple, sapphires, and topaz).\textsuperscript{26} The distinction between gold – a colour associated with power and wealth – and the even more powerful purple, is telling, and placed Mary firmly above and apart from the court. Sumptuary legislation enacted in 1533 and again in 1554 reserved the use of purple silk exclusively to the royal family, a further reinforcement of a pre-existing cultural code.\textsuperscript{27} Records show that Henry VII owned and wore purple in excess of what was required for ceremonial occasions, making

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 121.
\textsuperscript{25} Isaac Herzong, Ehud Spanier. \textit{The royal purple and the biblical blue: argaman and tekhelet : the study of Chief Rabbi Dr. Isaac Herzog on the dye industries in ancient Israel and recent scientific contributions}. Bet ha-sefarim ha-le’umi veha-universita’i bi-Yerushalayim. 1987. 9. Specifically, “Tyrian” purple.
\textsuperscript{27} 24 Henry VIII c 13.; 1 and 2 Philip and Mary c 2.
it a colour strongly associated with his personal rule. Mary purchased twelve purple gowns and five purple kirtles and sets of sleeves in 1554, her first full year on the throne, a number which vastly exceeded quantities she had purchased before, and which was not to be matched again in her lifetime.

Red was a prestigious and ceremonially important colour, which the English associated with authority, power, and wealth. The use of red textiles for both livery and church decoration during coronations indelibly linked the colour to the perception of legitimate authority, as well as to that of wealth, and the extremely high prices commanded for kermes red, or ‘crimson in grain,’ further restricted access to the colour. There is some suggestion that red was interchangeable with purple for ceremonial purposes; thus, Henry VII’s festival ordinances dictated four major feasts where the king could wear either purple or red velvet, and Maria Hayward suggests that this is an indication that the two colours were symbolically synonymous. This seems unlikely, however, for red, even the pricy red dyed in grain (kermes), was allowed to wider groups of people than purple within English sumptuary legislation. The former, by Henry VIII’s Act of 1509, was permitted to anyone over the rank of knight. While both colours denoted power, they were of different types – familial membership as contrasted with social status – and were viewed in different ways.

---

28 Hayward KH8, 121, 130-132.
29 E101/427/11 f 34, E101/427/11 f 38.
31 Hayward, KH8, 131.
32 1 Henry VIII c 14.
While all human cultures ascribe meaning to colour, the use of colour to generate specific reactions in observers is not a purely culturally-based phenomenon. Recent studies of human cognition and optics have confirmed theories that human beings are neurologically programmed to interpret colour display and respond to those displays in predictable and physiological ways. Berlin and Kay’s classic study of 1969 indicates a biological and evolutionary basis for the importance of colour in human society, one which sets the stage for the use of colour as a vital component of any symbol system. Western European culture in the early middle ages was no exception to this rule, and various colours were identified as appropriate and inappropriate for use by various social groups in continental and English sumptuary legislation. Colour bespoke status in many ways, and for Mary colour was a means of proving herself both as a member of her own family and as the rightful monarch.

While her father lived, Mary wore the colours he preferred, those which visually integrated her into his court. After his death and that of her brother, Mary used colours that had previous strong associations with her father and her grandfather in order to make visual connections between them and her own corporeal self. Her warrants and eyewitness accounts of key events during her life each provide evidence for that deliberate use of colour as a tool for reinforcing her legitimacy and the impression of

royal continuity. Once reinstated to the court in 1536, Mary and her ladies sought her father’s approval for the colours she purchased and, more significantly, wore when in his presence. Mary’s requests for Henry’s opinion on her wardrobe choices suggest a strong desire on her part to appear conciliatory and interested in her father’s attention and approval. A letter dated from the spring of 1538 indicates that such overtures were not entirely welcome; despite an initial rebuff, Lady Kingston made a second attempt on Mary’s behalf to wring an opinion out of the king, as she described to the Earl of Southampton in a letter:

I have sent to know the king's grace's pleasure, whether my lady's grace should leave wearing of black this easter, or no. And his grace's answer was, that she might wear what colour she would. ...my lady's grace desireth you now to be a suitor to my lord Privy Seal, to speak to the king's grace for her wearing her white taffety edged with velvet, which used to be to his own liking whenever he saw her grace.36

As Henry’s daughter, Mary’s appearance reflected on the king and on his household when she appeared in public, and while she suffered periods of deprivation and loss of income to her household, Mary made attempts to maintain her wardrobe in the style that her father preferred. A wardrobe warrant from the last year of Henry’s reign notes a series of “translations,” mostly of sleeves but in several occasions of gowns, as they were altered from one style to another: french to “venysyane,” for instance, or “for the translatyng of thre payre of sleves to make them frenche.”37 Altering old sleeves to

current styles, possibly as the old ones wore out in places, enabled Mary to keep up her display of wealth and status even through relative levels of deprivation. Once she became queen, Mary’s wardrobe accounts show only new gowns and sleeves made for her use.

Mary’s choice of colours changed over the course of her life. Before becoming queen, she tended to order gowns in either straight black, or in bright colours. Her privy purse expenses from the 1530s show purchases of fabric in white, black, murreye, yellow, purple and crimson. In the 1540s, murreye disappears and her fabric purchases become more luxurious, in line with Mary’s status as the keeper of a royal household in Wales. At this stage the privy purse records include garments made from carnation silk, cloth of silver and cloth of gold, yellow, crimson, black and white. These accord neatly with the colour palette that was in favour in England at the time, as noted by Stephen Vaughan during Henry VIII’s reign: “They [Belgian court ladies] be but counterfeits to our dames, so that whites, yellows, reds, blues and such fresh colours [of fabric] go from hence [Brussels] straight into England [to be sold there].” By 1544, restored to the line of succession and once again presented to potential suitors at court, Mary appeared in “a petticoat of cloth of gold, and gown of violet coloured three-piled velvet with a headdress of many rich stones.” The portrait of Mary painted by Master John that same year

38 Hayward, KH8, 11, citing L&P, xix. li, 751
Carter suggests that violet in this case refers to murreye velvet, though yardage in both purple and murreye appears separately in Mary’s privy purse records prior to 1544. (See Carter, Mary Tudor's Wardrobe of Robes, 15, and MPP folios 42b, 46b) Violet is more properly referred to a blue-purple, as in the Italian violettoviolato/violetino, quite
shows her in cloth of gold lined with red velvet, trimmed with costly jewels (see Figure 2, Appendix D).

While her father lived, Mary constrained her clothing purchases to reflect his tastes, and by extension, to forge a visual relationship with his public body. In order to be acknowledged as a Tudor, Mary had to look like a Tudor. Only a small handful of wardrobe records for Mary survives from these years, but between those and extant privy purse records of textile purchases, it is possible to assemble a general overview of the colours being purchased for her use, as seen in Table 1, below. Mary’s purchases fall neatly in line aesthetically with Henry’s choices of colour for his own wardrobe, omitting only the green and russet, the former which he primarily purchased for his hunting clothes.⁴⁰ They also accord with the colours of garments that Henry had purchased for her different from the warm reddish-maroon colour associated with the mulberry/murreye shades. (see John Florio. *A Worlde of Wordes* (1598). Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972)

Violet itself was not accorded the same status as royal purple, however, as can been seen through its use by the “cytyzyns” of London when ceremonially welcoming returning royalty, as noted in the time of Richard III: “In the Begynnyng of thys Mayers tyme and the sixth daye of November the Mayer w[ith] hys brethyn clothid in scarlet, and the Cytzyns upon the number of vC well housid & clad In violet mett w[ith] the Kyng beyond Tannington” and Henry VII on multiple occasions: “upon the xxvij day of august the kyng was Ressayvid Into London, The Cytzyns byng then agayn clothid in violet.” (See Thomas and Thornley, *The Great Chronicle of London*, 235, 238. See also Henry VII, on 22 December 1494, the mayor of London and “his brethyn” greet the king’s return in red, the commoners wearing violet [248]) That, then, gives three colours with different emphasis and meaning, within the same basic range, ‘purple’ the most closely affiliated with royal status and rank.

⁴⁰Hayward, *KH8*, 112.
during her mid-teens, suggesting that even once Mary gained control over her own assets, her choices were made with an eye towards her father’s preferences.

Table 1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Henry's purchases for Mary (age 15)</th>
<th>Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Purple, black, crimson, white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535 - 1536</td>
<td>Black, carnation, crimson, green, russet, white</td>
<td>White, black (yardage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537 - 1538</td>
<td>Black, white, red, russet</td>
<td>Murreye, black, yellow, purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538 – 1539</td>
<td>Black, white, crimson, russet</td>
<td>Crimson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540 - 1541</td>
<td>Yellow, crimson, black, white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541 - 1543</td>
<td>Carnation, white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543 - 1545</td>
<td>Black, white, purple, crimson</td>
<td>White, black, crimson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black, purple, crimson, tawney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colour symbolism encompassed multiple levels of cultural significance, including religious and artistic custom, and operated on a number of intersecting levels. The use of personal and household colours as a means of identification, first on the battlefield, then in the tournament and in social life, included an aspect of propaganda and political messaging which was remarkably effective in a largely illiterate society. Heraldry itself,

---

41 Hayward, *KH8*, 98.
44 Hayward, *KH8*, 120.
a visual display of arms, badges, symbols and encoded signs, appeared in the early
twelfth century, and the first recorded use of an emblazoned shield – that of Henry II
carrying a shield purportedly emblazoned with the arms of William the Conqueror, in
1170 – involved a dramatic use of the imagery of arms for legitimization of royal lineage
and power. The extension of heraldic colours into the production of livery and ribbons
to declare membership in particular households or affinities drove home the visual
connection between colours and power bases. Wearing a lord’s colours was a
powerfully intimate means of declaring support, service and belonging. All members of
the royal household had colours of their own, originally assigned at a young age and later
chosen and displayed in the colours of their servants’ liveries and other draperies.

Henry VII dressed his household, his men, and his buildings in “the Kyngys lyvery as
white and Grene.” The colours of the House of York in general and Elizabeth of York
in particular had been “blew... & murrey or purpyll,” those of Henry, Duke of
Richmond were blue and yellow, and Mary as unofficial Princess of Wales dressed her
household in blue and green. At the time of her accession, Mary ordered livery for the
members of her household in shades of red, as noted in multiple warrants of the wardrobe
of robes: “for three yardes of rede clothe to make him a coate and two yardes of velvett to

46 Ibid.
47 Ibid., 95.
49 Ibid.
50 “Cloth delivered to the Princess's servants, councillors' servants, and others; viz., to five
of the lady governess's servants in the Princess's livery of blue and green,” *Certain
necessaries provided for the use of my lady Princess's household and accounts.* L&P.
garde the same for lynyng making and embrawdering of our letters all of our greate Guarderobe.” Carter suggests that his influence was responsible for the changes in the colours worn by the officers of Mary’s household. Other evidence, however, suggests an earlier influence on her decision. Despite originally keeping the same personal colours as his father, Henry VIII purchased red coats for men in his household between 1522 and 1548, rather than white and green. Prior to that, he had dressed them in tawney livery for regular occasions, gold and black velvet for special occasions such as public jousts, and he regularly clothed his favourites in white. Red and white became the standard colours for his household, and remained strongly associated with Henry’s official favour.

On 3 August 1553, Mary entered London to take possession of the city, and brought with her a large group of liveried guards. These were divided into three groups, each dressed in a different set of livery, each corresponding to a specific Tudor ruler: “reseduw departyd [at Aldgate] in gren and whyt, and red and whyt, and bluw and gren, horse and speres and gaffelyns.” This display, a mixture of Henry VII’s green and white, Henry VIII’s red and white, and Mary’s own colours of blue and green, served to highlight the continuity between the monarchs in question, their co-operating and symbolically co-
existing households, and to root Mary’s blue-and-green-coated footmen in a tradition that had been laid down two monarchs before. 57 This demonstration of familial continuity at the pivotal moment of public transition served to presage her later changeover to red liveries for her household, and generate a conscious connection between the courts of Henry VII, Henry VIII, and now her own.

Once she became queen, Mary’s other purchases shifted in spectrum to reflect her new role not as princess-suppliant, but as monarch in her own right. Her wardrobe warrants from April 1554 show an explosion in the quantity of purple textiles and garments purchased for her use. From three recorded examples of purple gowns in the previous decade, the April 1554 records reveal thirteen separate examples of purple gowns, kirtles, or yardage enough to make one of those items, a proportion of purple items that is not again repeated. 58 This one-time increase in the purchase of a colour reserved for royal apparel marked her transition into her new role, and the changes she made in order to fill that role visually. Mary’s arrival in London on 3 August 1553 was made wearing a purple gown, 59 a description later elaborated upon by the chronicler Wriothesley:

[A]t her highnes comminge, which was in rich apparell, her gowne of purple velvet French fashion, with sleues of the same, hir kirtle purple satten all thicke sett with gouldsmithes worke and great pearle, with her foresleues of the same

57 Records from 1525 show that the wardrobe provided livery in green and blue damask for the members of Mary’s household, which included not only footmen, but her launderer, gentlewomen, and four officers of the wardrobe. Hayward, *KH8*, 311. Also see Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 49.
58 E101/427/11 ff 34
59 Letters from the Ambassadors in England to the Emperor: Mary enters London. CSP Spain, Vol. 11. 151. The CSP translation calls this outfit “violet velvet, her skirts and sleeves embroidered in gold,” which may well be a mistranslation from the original.
set with rich stones, with a rich bowdricke of goule, pearle, and stones about her necke, and a riche billiment of stones and great pearle on her hoode.\textsuperscript{60}

The purple velvet served to mark Mary and set her apart, not as one of multiple claimants to the throne, but as already a queen. Cloth of gold, cloth of silver, black, blue, murreye and tawny all make an appearance as well in the 1554 warrant, in smaller quantities. This move towards new colours is connected with her new and pioneering role. A similar pattern is evident in the fall warrant of that same year, with black and purple garments making up the bulk of Mary’s outer wear, together with a replenishment of her red satin undergarments. Murreye and yellow appear briefly in a grand total of three garments, two kirtles and a pair of sleeves, but Mary’s palette for 1554 was overwhelmingly rich, dark, and vibrant, the cloth of gold and cloth of silver offset against the lush black, purple and crimson velvets and satins.

Henry VIII chose to have himself painted in similarly vibrant colours, the striking reds, golds, silvers and blacks of his official portraits creating as much of an impression as the broad composition and bulk of the man himself.\textsuperscript{61} The three known portraits of Princess Mary painted during Henry’s life show her wearing his colours of preference. A miniature attributed to Lucas Hornebolt dated to between 1521 – 1525 depicts the young princess in a black gown that appears to be velvet, decorated with a cloth of silver billiment and pearls (see Figure 1, Appendix D), as does a similar portrait from around the


\textsuperscript{61} See Holbein’s Henry VIII and the Barber-Surgeons, Henry VIII (c. 1540), the Whitehall Mural, etc.
same time, by an unknown artist (see Figure 18, Appendix D). The more famous Master John portrait of 1544 shows Mary in an exquisite French-cut gown in cloth of gold, with red velvet sleeve turnbacks and matching French hood. The biliments on gown and hood are cloth of silver to match her foresleeves, and her jewelled girdle and necklaces match the ruby and pearl decorations on those biliments (see Figure 2, Appendix D).

By 1557, after both her marriage to Phillipp II and her subsequent failed pregnancy, Mary’s wardrobe colours had changed. The lack of surviving inventories or warrants from 1555 and 1556 make it impossible to date this shift precisely, but it is evident by April of 1557. Russet made its first appearance in April 1557, a colour described as “a dusky, reddish-brown, or ashey-grey.”62 Murreye vanished, and the bulk of the wardrobe items appearing in the 1557 warrants were what by now had become Mary’s standard colour palette: black, russet, and purple. White appeared only for kirtles and sleeves, never as an outer gown, while the bulk of her undergarments remained crimson. The same palette appeared in the 1558 warrants and inventories.

At the same time, however, Mary purchased garments in far more vibrant colours for others in her employ, including “a ffrench kirtel for the Ladie Katherine Graie of yelowe Satten raised,” kirtles for Lady Jane Semor in both cloth of silver and yellow velvet, and outfits for both her fools, Will Somer and Jane, in crimson, yellow and green.63 Along with russet and black velvet given to some of her ladies as wedding gifts, Mary ordered

63 LC 5 / 31 f. 107, item 24; ibid., Item 29; Ibid., Items 32, 33, 38.
yardage in yellow, green and blue, and gave cloth of silver and orange velvet to Lady Anne Somerset, enough to make a gown. Sir William Petre’s purchases for his daughter Thomasine’s trousseau in February 1559 included garments in colours more commonly associated with the earlier Tudor court: red, black, and white. One russet kirtle appears in that list, but the darker colours otherwise preferred by the queen are not included.

Collectively, this suggests that Mary’s preference for the darker, more sombre palette was a personal choice, not one in which she necessarily encouraged emulation. While, as their portraits attest, many women in the court did copy the queen’s later choices, Mary did not herself follow a widely popular fashion shift.

Table 2 Mary’s gowns by colour and year of purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538/39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul, 1546</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec, 1546</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 1554</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 1554</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 1557</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept, 1557</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 Ibid., Item 17.
Table 3  Mary’s kirtles & sleeves by colour and year of purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bla</th>
<th>Rus</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Crim</th>
<th>Mur</th>
<th>Pur</th>
<th>CoS</th>
<th>CoG</th>
<th>Whi</th>
<th>Yel</th>
<th>Taw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538/39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul, 1546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec, 1546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 1554</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 1554</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 1557</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept, 1557</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar, 1558</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 1558</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bla = Black; Rus = Russet; Car. = Carnation; Crim = Crimson; Mur. = Murrey; Pur. = Purple; 
CoS = Cloth of Silver; CoG = Cloth of Gold; Whi. = White Yel. = Yellow; Taw = Tawney.

Henry VIII’s assumption of the role of head of the Church of England required a certain amount of what Hayward terms sacralisation of the self. He dressed in such a way as to
elevate himself through his glorious presence, his garments in some ways echoing the richly decorated vestments of the bishops. As one contemporary remarked, Henry’s “robes are the richest and more superb that can be imagined.”66 His self-decoration proclaimed his status and accumulated power, elevating himself above all other men, effecting a form of sacred space around his self. This self-presentation is seen in surviving images of Henry as well as in his clothing records. The classic portrait by Holbein, which hung in Henry’s privy chamber, was described by an eyewitness in 1604 as depicting Henry “as he stood there, majestic in his splendour... so lifelike that the spectator felt abashed, annihilated in his presence.”67 The colours he wore were colours of power and of the church, the reds, golds and purples of royal potency mirroring the colours of the robes worn by bishops and priests during the celebrations of particular holiday masses.68

This was one context in which Mary did not follow in her father’s footsteps. Rather, she chose to appear in her official portraits in more subdued colours, and in garments nowhere near the level of richness and complexity described in her wardrobe warrants and in contemporary descriptions of her public appearances. Far from the exquisite embroidered gowns of purple and gold satin with gold sarenets puffs listed in the warrants,69 the dark velvet gowns she wears in her official portraits are notably austere. She seems to have drawn a distinction between the clothing appropriate for public display

66 CSP Venice, 1509 – 19, 1287.
67 Karel Van Mander, 1604, quoted in Sharpe, Selling the Tudor Monarchy, 137.
69 E101/427/11 ff 38, Item 36.
and confirmation of royal status, and that appropriate for immortalization in paint. Vives, the director of Mary’s childhood educational program, held strong views regarding dress and comportment and their reflection on the internal self. He drew strong connections between “modest external appearance” and internal sobriety and moral worth, counselling the avoidance of clothing and accessories which were too luxurious or extravagant.  

In choosing these dark gowns for her official record, Mary was making another statement, this time in repudiation of her father and his tendency towards aggrandizing self-display. While her parliament robes and purple robes for official public functions marked her as queen, the sober black, russet and murreye gowns in her portraits desanctified and returned her physical form to a more earthly stature. Through this choice, Mary linked herself back to Henry VII, a Catholic Tudor whose legitimacy had itself depended on the support of the papacy. Removing herself from Henry VIII’s sacred space meant reconnection with her identity as servant of the church, a humble and sombre persona meant to immortalize the queen less as an authority over men’s souls, a state which many at the time found difficult to accept or comprehend, and place her self-representation within a category already available to onlookers: the pious Catholic defender of God. By using imagery that drew upon that used by Henry VII, and even beyond that by her great-grandmother Margaret Beaufort, whose wardrobe records and

---


71 Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, 67.

portraits show her to have worn black almost exclusively. Mary was able to maintain her symbolic legitimacy without conceding her father’s appropriation of the sacred.

**Purple Velvet, Cloth of Gold: Redesigning the Coronation**

Mary’s use of symbolism connected to her grandfather and his semiotic decisions is reflected in one of the other grand transitional moments in her career, that of her coronation. In her clothing choices for that most pivotal of moments in her career, she chose to emulate Henry VII rather than either of the two more recent Tudor monarchs. Early modern politics were similar to those of the modern day, in that the art of the image was the art of persuasion. Sydney Anglo and Roy Strong bring that into focus in their respective discussions of Tudor pageantry and art, and to their examinations of how the two modes of information transmission affirmed, strengthened, and in some cases created legitimacy. A monarch’s coronation involved a lengthy ritual which included the removal of clothing, the anointing of the royal body with holy oil to mark it as different and set apart, and the redressing of the altered body in robes which reflected the monarch’s new status. Investiture, the act of regarding a new monarch in robes that announced that changed status to the world, was a moment of physical, legal and spiritual transformation. The robes were made of the finest materials available, decorated with

---

73 Hayward, *KH8*, 84 – 86.
gems and trims that immediately conveyed the impression of royal wealth.\textsuperscript{76} The royal body was believed to be fundamentally changed by the process, the monarch’s putative ability to cure scrofula dependent on the anointing of the king’s hands with holy oil during the ceremony.\textsuperscript{77} The coronation service took place in a ritual space that served as a crucible into which the heir to the throne entered, and a monarch emerged.

The work of Victor Turner and Clifford Geertz in symbolic and interpretive anthropology defines the concept of liminal ritual space. This is a middle stage in ritual passages in which a person leaves a previously held social and cultural position, transitions through a rite or trial of some form, and emerges on the other end in a changed and publicly acknowledged new social position as a result of the experience. That middle section, in which the initiates are no longer members of their previous identity group but have not yet received the new status accorded to them by the rite, is called the liminal phase. This stage represents a period of social disorder for the initiate, created through the dislocation of standard cultural structures. That disorder is finally reconciled by the application of a new set of constraints that define the initiate as a member of a new class, with a new status within their community. In the case of the English coronation, an heir travels to a new location, and is divested of garments in an act which strips the individual of their former self. The ‘no-man’s land’ of the middle stage, when the subject is no longer heir but is not yet monarch, is marked by semi-nudity, the total loss of sartorial identity. Getz calls this type of ritual moment "time out of time: a special place," a threshold moment

\footnote{Ibid., 131.}
when the physical being is transformed. The heir’s body is cleaned and sacralised through the washing and anointing, and is then transformed into a monarch through the formal act of redressing. The act is a form of rebirth, a transition out of a previously held status, passing through a state of uncertainty and change – that liminal state – and re-emergence in a new form, a butterfly from the chrysalis that is Westminster.

Mary’s coronation in 1553 was arguably the most symbolically important moment of her reign. The two days of ritual marked the second public appearance in which her rights to the kingdom were publically proclaimed, as well as the moment of her investiture. The regulations and rules for the coronations of English monarchs were set down in a thirteenth-century text known as the Liber Regalis, updated in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when Henry VII and Henry VIII revised Richard III’s Little Devise. The list of mandated regalia in the regulations included a dalmatic – a short tunic – placed over the monarch’s shirt after the anointing, followed by “a long tunic wrought with figures in gold before and behind.” Stockings or buskins were put on the monarch’s feet, then spurs, a symbol of knighthood, were added to the footwear. A sword was girded on, as well as a pair of bracelets, then the whole ensemble enclosed within a mantle. Sets of formal robes made up the basic regalia for both monarchs and consorts, and there were significant differences between the requirements for the two.

81 Ibid., 7.
The monarch was required to wear one outfit for the procession from the Tower to Westminster Hall for the overnight vigil, a second for the next morning’s progress to Westminster Abbey for the investiture, and a third for the procession out again to meet the populace. The regulations for the monarch’s first processional outfit stipulated a kirtle furred with miniver, a tabard furred with miniver, a hood furred with miniver and a cap of estate, finished with a mantle furred with ermine.\(^{82}\) Ermine was restricted to royal use, and served as a potent symbol of wealth and a reminder, alongside the purple robes and cloth of gold, of the status of the wearer. Miniver, the pure-white lesser version of ermine, was officially restricted to the use of the nobility and was likewise used almost exclusively for the royal family and for official robes of state.\(^{83}\)

 Consorts were required to wear white robes for the procession to Westminster, with the furring apparently optional.\(^{84}\) Henry VII’s requirements for Elizabeth of York were as follows: “and as for her array for her body, shee must bee in her sircote of white damaske, or white cloth of gould, with a mantle of the same poudred with ermines... shee must bee bare harded and bare visaged till she come to Westminster.”\(^{85}\) Consorts were not required to change clothes during the ceremony; the only requirement for their garb was that the gown and kirtle worn by the consort had to be of a style able to be partially unlaced at the front during the anointing, and then relaced.

---

\(^{82}\) Hayward, *KH8*, 43, from Worsely’s wardrobe book.

\(^{83}\) 24 Henry VIII c. 13.

\(^{84}\) Hayward, *KH8*, 43.

Mary confronted two issues when it came time to make decisions about her coronation. There was no precedent for her to follow; as the first queen regnant to be crowned in England, there were aspects of the process that she needed to redesign, and she had to consider carefully the nature of the message she would send with each new choice. Her sex posed one of the major problems in this endeavour (this aspect is more fully explored in chapter three). The other was that of her legitimate descent. The coronation afforded Mary an excellent opportunity to display her solution: while her status as queen regnant made constructing the ceremony more complex, it was also the perfect venue to make another public visual declaration of her status as the Tudor heir. Mary chose symbols, clothing and colours which would instantly identify her as the sole and rightful ruler of England, which drew on some of her grandfather’s tropes as well as those used by her father and half-brother before her.

As the first Tudor monarch to be crowned and the ruler responsible for the update of the Liber Regalis into the Little Devise, Henry VII eschewed his reputation for austerity on his day of triumph. On 29 October 1485 he travelled from the Tower of London to Westminster for his vigil, wearing “a long gown of purple velvet furred with ermines.” He rode bare-headed beneath a canopy, his horse decorated with a caparison made of cloth of gold. He was bathed at Westminster, for which his accounts list an order of “Flemyshe clothe, for the bath at Westm[inster],” and when he rode out again on 30 October 1485, he wore a garment with a long train, carried by the earl of Oxford. While

---

87 Ibid., 11.
the colours of those second day’s robes are not described, Henry VII’s accounts for the event list only two trained mantles, one set of “robes of crymsyn veluet for the king, agenst the parliament, a longe mantelle with a trayne,” which belonged to his new set of parliamentary robes, and the “long mantelle of purpulle veluet, with a trayne furred w[ith] ermyns powdred.” One reference to a “long mantelle w[ith] a trayne of crimsin saten w[ith] menever” most likely refers to the second layer for his parliament robes, a requirement for any monarch.

The other underlayer items that Henry wore on his process to Westminster likely included the four items made “of the same veluet,” as the long mantle: a furred hood, a kirtle, a surcote and a cap of estate. These warrant entries corresponded exactly to the items required for a monarch’s robes, as the stylish surcote replaced the long-outdated tabard in the original listing. Henry VII’s tailor made him a pair of dalmatics, one white and one red, for part of the redressing during the anointing process, as well as a linen cap and pair of linen gloves. Piecing it all together, Henry VII rode to Westminster in purple velvet robes, decorated with gold and silk. He left his vigil the next day and entered the abbey in his parliamentary robes. During the ceremonies at Westminster he stripped down and was redressed in ritual robes of red and white, including “a cote of

---

88 Ibid., 29, Item 25.
89 Ibid., 27, Item 10.
90 Ibid., Item 9.
92 Ibid., 27 Item 6, Hayward, KH8, 44.
93 “holaunde clothe, for gloves for the king...holaunde cloth, for a coif for the king.” Campbell, Materials For a History of the Reign of Henry VII. 9.
94 “the gold weing iiii vncs...and the silke weing ii vncs di” Ibid., 12.
crymsyn satyn, luned w[ith] white fustian\textsuperscript{95} and the two layered dalmatics mentioned above. The omission of fur on these ritual garments may suggest a level of intimacy to the proceedings, as fur was commonly used for outer layers and buskins, but not for underclothes. Leaving the abbey, he once again appeared before the populace in his purple robes, potentially replacing some of the velvet underlayers with a “longe gowne of purpulle clothe of gold”\textsuperscript{96}

Table 4  Coronation robes of the Tudor Monarchs (to 1553)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Henry VII</th>
<th>Elizabeth of York</th>
<th>Henry VIII</th>
<th>Catherine of Aragon</th>
<th>Edward VI</th>
<th>Mary I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procession to Westminster Hall</td>
<td>Purple velvet</td>
<td>White cloth of gold</td>
<td>Cloth of gold, purple velvet</td>
<td>White cloth of gold, purple velvet</td>
<td>White cloth of gold</td>
<td>White cloth of gold, white velvet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anointing</td>
<td>Red and white dalmatics</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Red and white dalmatics</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Red dalmatic</td>
<td>White dalmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procession out from the Abbey</td>
<td>Purple velvet</td>
<td>Red velvet</td>
<td>Red satin</td>
<td>Red velvet</td>
<td>Red satin and purple velvet</td>
<td>Purple velvet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Henry VIII retained the purple theme for the first day of his coronation, adding the vibrant reds and golds which so typified his personal look. For his vigil on 21 June 1509, Henry “wore a doublet of cloth of gold of damask satin under a long gowne of purple velvet, furred with powdered ermine and open at the sides.”\textsuperscript{97} He wore a pair of tunics for the anointing, one white and one red, and his hose were red instead of Henry VII’s black.

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 27. Item 5.  
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 28. Items 16 & 17.  
\textsuperscript{97} Hayward, \textit{KH8}, 43.
On the second day, he left Westminster wearing “a Coote of Crymesyn Satyn... a sircote cloth of crymysyn Satyn furred with meyver pure...A grete mantell of Crymysyn Satyn furred with pure menyver.” Catherine of Aragon arrived in purple and left in red as well, both furred with “powderid ermyns,” and “[a] payr of Sabatons couered in crimesyn cloth of Golde lyned with Crymseyn Satyn garnysshe with Ryban of venyce golde.”

Edward VI eschewed the typical colour coding, opting instead for white velvet and cloth of gold for his opening procession. This probably reflected his status as a minor, which differentiated him from the adult kings who preceded him. It also colour-coded him as a consort rather than as a king in his own right, perhaps a nod to the regency of his council of protectors. His accounts list

A riche gowne of cloth of golde and all ovuer Imbrodered with damaske with a square cape furred with sable... a gyrkyn of whit welvit wrought with venis Syluer garnished with precios stones as Rubyes dymondes and Treulove of perles... a doblet of whit welvit according to the Same Imbrodered venis Silver garnisshed with like precios stones and pareles... a whit velvet cape garnished with Lyke precios stones and pereles... a payre of buskins of whit velvit.

The “gentlemen pensions” who assisted in the ceremony were dressed in red damask, and on the coronation day itself Edward donned his parliament robes:

A Robe of crimson velvet with a long Trayne, furred with powdered Ermynes throughout. A Surcoat of the same, furred with mynver pure, the Coller, Skirts

---

98 LC 9/50 ff. 217r-218r
99 Ibid., 44
100 Quoted in Hayward KH8 44
101 Hayward KH8 45 – CoA MS I7, f.63v
102 Ibid.,
and Sleevehands garnished with Ribbons of Gold, with Two Taberds, Four fingers broad, with a Hood, likewise powdred, which were called his Parliament Robes, wearing on his Head a Capp of Blue Velvett.\textsuperscript{103}

He was stripped down during the ceremony itself and redressed, “apparelled in a Coate of Crimson Satten, open and buttoned before and behind, on the Shoulders and the Elbowes, with a Coyfe of Gold on his head,”\textsuperscript{104} anointed, then given a linen coif and a pair of linen gloves to wear to cover the marks of the holy oils. The new young king was then dressed in “a Robe of crymsyn Saten with a Longe trayne furred with poudred ermysns” and “a syrcote of the same furred with mynvur puere with ij Taberdes of the Same edged with pouderyd ermysns iiij fyngeers brode.” These were accompanied by “a hode of crymsyn Saten furred with powdered ermins as face as yt was tourned downe around a boute his neke.”\textsuperscript{105} Finally, he added “a surcote of Purple Velvet furred with Ermynes, etc a rich Cronne was also sett upon his Head.”\textsuperscript{106} His council’s choices for his apparel retained the grandeur of the past, but also signalled a break in tradition. Edward was in his minority, and was being presented formally by his council as such.

Mary retained aspects of Edward’s colour scheme for that first procession, dressing in the traditional colours for a queen consort, as Elizabeth I would do after her. Otherwise, however, she took up Henry VII’s styles and palette for the event, blending the requirements for female dress with the ceremonial requirements and defined colours of the masculine robes. Witnesses to her post-coronation procession described her purple

\textsuperscript{103} Hayward, \textit{KH8}, 45. Leland, \textit{Collectanea}, IV, 322-23.
\textsuperscript{104} Hayward, \textit{KH8}, 45, 69.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., 45 – 46.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., 46.
gown in such as way as to make it sound very much like a female version of the robes worn by her grandfather, Henry VII:

She sate in a gowne of purple veluet, furred with powderd ermins, hauing on hir head a kall of cloth of tinsell, beeset with pearle and stone, and aboue the same vpon hir head a round circlet of gold, beeset so richlie with pretious stones, that the value thereof was inestimable, the same kall and circle being so massie and ponderous, that she was faine to beare vp hir head with hir hand, and the canopie was borne ouer hir chariot.107

Mary wore robes made from cloth of gold for the pre-coronation procession, which are likely the robes depicted in an illumination on her 1553 Michelmas roll (see Figure 3, Appendix D). No coronation portrait of Mary survives, but given the proximity of the illumination design to the event and the similarities between the image and contemporary descriptions of the robes, it seems safe to make the identification. Elizabeth I ordered Mary’s coronation robe recut and translated for her own use in 1559, as was common for inherited garments, and Elizabeth’s coronation portrait wearing the recut and reassembled robes displays the textiles used in greater detail (Figure 4, Appendix D). According to records in the Lord Chamberlaine’s paper, this outfit consisted of “a Robe of white clothe of Golde Tisshewe conteynyng one mantle & one kirtle furred with powdered Ermyns with one mantell lace with buttons and Tassels of white silke and gold with hokes & annelettes of silks and gilte for the same kirtle.”108 The cloth was woven with a pattern of Tudor roses and fleur de lis.109 These robes matched in fabric and basic cut the robes

108 LC 5/32 f219, Quoted in Carter, Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe, 25.
109 Hayward, KH8, 46, LC 5/32, f. 237.
required for a queen consort, the white cloth of gold replacing the purple velvet robes worn by two of the previous three kings.

Mary followed tradition for the ceremony itself, arriving in her red parliament robes lined with ermine and changing to a white dalmatic during the service of anointing. After the ceremony, Mary redressed in “A robe of purple velvett conteyning kirtle, surcote over, & a mantle with a Traine ffurred w[ith] powdered Ermyns, a mantle Lace of Silke and gold w[ith] buttons and tassels of the same, & Riban of venice gold w[ith] annelettes of silver and gilte for the same kirtle.” This process and the garments match those used by Henry VII, down to the triple diadem with which she was crowned while in her transfiguratory and vestment-like silk dalmatics. Henry VII’s garments included “a longe gowne of purpule veluet furred withe ermyns powdered... a longe mantelle of purpulle veluet, with a trayne furred w[ith] ermyns powdred... a hoode of the same veluet furred... a kirtill of the same veluet... a surcot overt of the same veluet... a cappe of astate of the same veluet.”

By dressing herself as had her grandfather, rather than following the lead of her father and brother, Mary was making a statement regarding the kind of queen she intended to be, and binding herself to the legitimate, Catholic line of succession. Just as her grandfather had used references and allusions to the imagery and the reputation of
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111 LC 5/32, 197 – 199.
Edward the Confessor, Mary called upon imagery instituted by Henry VII to reaffirm her faith, her intentions towards the kingdom, and her permanent place in the line of Tudor monarchs.

**Sacred and Symbolic: Reimagining the Body Natural**

Despite the excitement of the coronation, Mary needed to maintain that connection to her lineage and to her predecessors’ campaign of representation throughout the first years of her reign. Henry VII’s tactics had worked wonders as far as asserting his right to rule, but it was Henry VIII’s assumption of all forms of power, religious and secular, that left the greatest impact on the minds and memories of his people. Mary needed to continue to tap into the crush of popular acclaim that she received at the beginning of her reign. At the core of Kevin Sharpe’s interpretation of this effective dynastic formula rests two main arguments. First, Henry VIII managed, mainly through his employment of Hans Holbein and his use of official portraiture, a full reimagining of the royal body as sexual, fertile and generative. The familiar images of Henry VIII stand in powerful contrast to those of his father and pre-Reformation images of himself, painted primarily in three-quarter view and from the shoulders up. The later Holbein paintings depict Henry VIII in full and arresting stance, his hands, clothing and posture all directing the gaze of the viewer to his groin and the promises of fertility and masculine power associated with that area of his body. Secondly, Sharpe argues that Henry VIII, through the process of the Reformation, internalized the conscience of the kingdom in the body of
the king, instead of in the heart of the church. As supreme head of the Church of England, Henry VIII created himself as the divine stand-in, the living representation of God on earth. Bishop Gardiner explained: “And yt he maye worthily be taken for the headde of yt churche still / he representeth the office that he occupieth in Goddes stede.”

Both changes in the ideology of kingship caused a problem for Mary upon her accession. The stability of her rule depended upon the population accepting her as a legitimate heir to Edward and the Henrys, which required a certain amount of conformity to the new playbook. Yet how could she emphasize phallic power and religious supremacy as a Catholic woman, intent on reconciliation with Rome? She needed to strike a balance between the grandeur required of formal royal presence and the necessary desacrilization which would remove her from consideration as the spiritual head of the English church. Mary adopted one of her father’s most striking strategies in response to these dilemmas, reforming the boundaries of her physical body to forge herself into a proper Tudor ruler.

Henry VIII changed European masculine dress in a dramatic way that is still immediately recognizable today. He was an athletic man to begin with, and he chose his clothing to reflect that athleticism and hyper-masculinity. Not for him the brooding scholarly look,
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with its long robes and dark colours, that his father favoured. Instead of the long, linear silhouette of the early Tudor years, Henry VIII moved the emphasis up and outward, bulking out his already broad shoulders, changing his shape to present an ever more authoritative and physically domineering figure.\(^\text{115}\) He was (and is) notorious for his codpieces, those projecting symbols of aggressive masculinity and generative prowess. He dressed in outfits that built upon one another with combinations of shades of the same colour in fabrics of differing textures and weights,\(^\text{116}\) forging himself into a larger, subtly differentiated wall of man. The wide stances of Henry’s legs in his post-1540 portraits balance out the broad shoulders created by his clothing, radiating power and majesty (see Figure 5, Appendix D).\(^\text{117}\)

Henry VIII took up space with his clothing in a new and powerful way. His own broad shoulders were emphasized and exaggerated by the wide shoulders, puffed sleeves and open necklines of the gowns and jerkins that he favoured. The heavy textiles used for the gowns draped with a fullness that created a new body shape for him, rather than emphasizing the shape which already existed underneath. The overwhelming effect of his presence was one of physical strength, the triangular build generated by the broad shoulders and slim legs that extended beneath the knee-length pleated bases emphasizing everything that was the cultural standard for masculine power. Edward took advantage of this testosterone-laden image of masculine rule, dressing in miniature versions of his father’s clothing and being painted in the same priapically-emphasized stance as his

\(^\text{115}\) Hayward \textit{KH8}, 3, 95.
\(^\text{116}\) Ibid., 97.
\(^\text{117}\) Sharpe, \textit{Selling the Tudor Monarchy}, 70.
father before him\textsuperscript{118} (see Figures 5 & 6, Appendix D). Mary, who took the throne as both unmarried and a woman, could not exercise that option. To present herself as sexually powerful would be to remove herself entirely from the roles appropriate to women. Her body had to become something other than Henry’s and Edward’s; she could not be seen as sexually aggressive, nor, given her emphasis on Catholicism and the asceticism drawn from Henry VII, as sexually inclined. What she could draw upon was her generative potential, combined with a tight restraint on sexuality that nevertheless emphasized her power in an iconically female way.

Henry’s broad shoulders and strong upper body were an inaccessible trope for Mary, but the means by which he filled up physical and psychological space in a room – large garments, of solid construction, emphasizing the importance of the strong body beneath – could be, and were, repurposed. Rather than draw attention to her upper body, Mary closed it off. She added high partlets to her gowns which drew up her shoulders and covered her bosom. Pairs of bodies become disassociated from petticoats in the 1550s, the vests which supported the underskirts becoming garments of their own, designed to restrain and constrain the bust and stomach. Pairs of bodies in red satin make their first appearance in Mary’s records in 1554 and are treated as individual garments as opposed to the “upper bodies” always described in the warrants in connection with petticoats and farthingales.\textsuperscript{119} Janet Arnold notes the distinction, explaining that the term “bodies” in the latter half of the century “refers to both the stiffened inner garment and the upper part of

\textsuperscript{118} See portraits of Edward VI by Unknown Artist, 1547; Hans Eworth c. 1547; Guillo Stretes, 1547.
\textsuperscript{119} E101/427/11 f 34 Item 3; E101/427/11 f 38 Items 2, 31, 34.
a woman’s gown fitted close to the body, what we would now describe as a bodice.”

These restraining garments, paired with structured bodices of kirtles, armoured the female torso at the same time as they encouraged a straight and regal posture.

As the bodice closed up, the skirts reopened. The Spanish farthingale, a garment first brought into England with Catherine of Aragon, took hold in fashionable circles beginning in the 1540s and continuing through to the 1590s. Mary had herself painted wearing one in 1544, one of the earliest images of the farthingale worn in England. The earliest known textual reference is from a record of purchases from the wardrobe of Princess Elizabeth, in 1545: “vii virg. Satten de bruges crimsen pro una verdingale,” a fabric quality and quantity corresponding to entries in both Mary’s wardrobe and privy purse records over the next decade, and to the 6 2/3 ells cited as necessary for the article in Juan de Alcega’s pattern book of 1587. Farthingales lifted the skirts out in circles equidistant around the legs of the wearer, doubling or tripling the amount of space taken up by the female body. Like Henry VIII’s legs creating the inverted triangle that filled the bottom of his portraits, Mary’s farthingale served to broaden her own form to fill the frame, taking up space and edging the viewer out. The only portrait in which her skirts do not take up the maximum amount of allotted space is her wedding portrait with Philip of Spain, and even then the full skirts and the dramatic contrast of her gold kirtle

120 Arnold, *QEU*, 360.
122 E101/427/11 f 34, Item 16. also Hayward: “Mary’s own accounts for 1546 include an entry ‘for making a vardingalle of crimsyn satin’.” Hayward, *KH8*, 162, and E101/424/7, f. 6r.
draw the eye towards the Queen, especially when compared to the slim white legs painted for her groom (see Figure 7, Appendix D).

The first mention of farthingales in Mary’s surviving records appears in July 1546, in a warrant for her clothing purchases in Henry VIII’s final year on the throne. The purchase is recorded as “a vardingalle of crimsen Satten,” a colour which would carry through all of her farthingales and petticoats.\(^{124}\) The next reference dates to April 1554, when two ‘round’ (untrained) farthingales made from red satin and trimmed with red velvet were ordered for her use.\(^{125}\) One undescribed farthingale and "haulfe a farthingale" are additionally delivered for her use on that same warrant. Farthingales became more common over the course of the decade. Mary’s warrants record one ordered between October 1553 - April 1554, then three between May - October 1554, but then none at all are listed for 1557 and 1558. There are some upper bodies ordered in those years, in the red fabrics which strongly suggest they were undergarments, but since upper bodies and pairs of bodies are listed as distinct items in the earlier warrants, it would be incorrect to conflate them in the later versions.

The horizontal emphasis created by the use of the farthingale reflected and emphasized the importance of the lower body for the expression of female generative power, the direct counterpart to Henry VIII’s phallic focus. Rather than the shoulders and genitals representing strength and stability, it was the exaggeration of the hips that made observers fully aware of the wearer’s female power and potential. Like the aggressive

\(^{124}\) E101/424 7, f. 9, Item 42.
\(^{125}\) E101/427/11, f. 34, Item 2.
nature of the broad-shouldered gowns, the farthingales removed easy intimacy and
closeness as an option. The wearer was isolated within a bubble constructed for herself,
rendered physically unapproachable and thereby setting herself apart socially and
hierarchically from the teeming masses. Persons present at the beginning of Mary’s reign
described a change in the wardrobe of the court, one that the French Ambassador, de
Noailles, described intriguingly as an abolition of “superstition” in clothing. He
particularly noted the width of the sleeves worn by the court ladies, and the jewels with
which they now adorned their gowns “a la française.”126

The choice of sombre, dark colours for Mary’s gowns and vibrant cloths of gold and
silver for her kirtles, combined with the conical shape of the farthingales, made for an
interesting result. Her jewelery, the gold chain girdles and the jewel at her throat,
likewise drew lines across her body which intersected over the point of split skirt. When
worn together, the front-split skirts created an arrow, a brilliantly displayed triangle
pointing directly at Mary’s abdomen, the source of her own reproductive potential. Akin
to the codpiece of which her father and brother were so fond, Mary employed her
clothing, the shapes generated by the internal architecture, and her choices of colours to
draw attention to where she needed it most at the outset of her reign, her role as mother
both of England and of the future heir to her throne. Mary used this maternal imagery in
her speeches and writing, most famously on 1 February 1554, following the Wyatt
rebellion: “a prince and gouernor may as naturallie and as earnestlie loue subiects, as the

126 Antoine de Noailles, 1553. Archives des affaires estrangeres. Registre des copies des
dépêches de MM. de Noailles, t. I et II, (in one) p. 125, as translated by J.M. Stone, The
History of Mary I., Queen of England: As Found in the Public Records ... Sands & Co,
1901. 247.
mother dooth hir child. Then assure your selues, that I being your souereigne ladie & quéene, doo as earnestlie and as tenderlie loue and fauour you.” The unspoken emphasis carried out by her clothing choices served to emphasize her dramatic and emotionally-weighted point.

Through colour, fit and careful attention to the symbolism of the moment, Mary was able to use the vocabulary of her clothing in an attempt to draw both conscious and subconscious links for viewers between herself and her patrilineage. Her use of the symbols varied depending on the audience to which each appearance was directed: first at Henry and the court as a sign of self-inclusion and belonging, then at the population of London and the ambassadors to declare her role as the true successor of Henry VII, and through the architecture of her gowns to present her body as the corporeal manifestation of royal power and dynastic potential. In her clothing choices Mary positioned herself as a member of an ongoing dynasty, a legitimate descendant of kings who had won the acceptance of their people, and the potentially fruitful mother who would one day continue the Tudor line. That maternal aspect of her representation, necessitated by her sex, gave rise to a host of other issues centered around Mary’s gender, which the queen was forced to confront directly early in her reign.

CHAPTER 3  DAUGHTER, WIFE, KING: THE MASCULINE AND FEMININE NEGOTIATED

Mary’s efforts to define herself in the context of her lineage took a few different forms, the symbols she drew upon changing as she played to different audiences. As a child and young adult she sought approval from her father and his court, and then as queen she required it from her own court and her people. Through careful application of colour and silhouette in her wardrobe, at her coronation, and in the livery for her household, Mary drew a visual line between herself and her predecessors which reinforced her right to rule. As a queen of England in her own right, however, Mary I confronted a series of problems that had not challenged her father or brother. While she addressed the question of her legitimacy early and comprehensively, her gender continued to be a focal point for complaints, polemic and legal adjustments for the duration of her reign. This chapter explores Mary’s attempt to reconcile the divergent roles and requirements of a kingship with those of consort, queen and wife.

Women’s options with regards to gendered identities in the early modern era were tightly restricted and closely linked with their marital status. A woman might be a maiden, a wife, a mother or a widow, each with its own legal and social ramifications. Queen Regnant was not a role on that list. Mary needed to pick and choose from the available roles to build a new definition of female power, one which could be acceptable to the populace without relinquishing any of her hard-won authority. Unlike her younger half-sister, who sidestepped the problems posed by male headship and coverture and chose the
part of the perpetual virgin, Mary attempted to straddle two separate and not entirely compatible definitions. In some circumstances, notably her coronation, Mary chose to blend aspects of the masculine and feminine within her own person. In others, including official portraiture, Mary had herself portrayed as a Hapsburg bride and a devoted mother to England. That lack of a clear direction, a sense of playing both sides, left her a target for her critics, who were able to parlay that weakness in Mary’s public image into a series of strikes aimed against her rule.

Mary’s coronation typified her approach to the problem of her sex as well as becoming a forum perfect for the dramatic exposition of her lineage. In addition to her manipulation of the colours and symbols of her father and grandfather’s coronation and reigns, she drew upon a series of tropes that later became standard fare for her, as she assumed the roles of king and queen. Mary arrived in the robes of a queen consort, but engaged with the ritual as a king. When she presented herself to her people following the coronation, it was as though the very feminine princess of England had been transformed into a king herself, a new version of Henry VII come back to rule. While her choice of colours and actions during and after the ceremony created links in the minds of viewers to male rulers, the robes she wore on her arrival and the cut of her clothing remained firmly rooted in the feminine realm. Mary drew on recognizably successful tropes in order to secure her power base. She was a reigning queen and ensured that she maintained her personal power rather than give it away to Philip, but she did so through a combination of tactics that drew upon both feminine and masculine archetypes. In trying to work within the constraints of both worlds, however, Mary failed to be a complete success in either.
So much has been written in the past few decades about gender and the early modern monarchy that it is difficult to address all the ways in which these issues have been discussed. The last decade in particular has seen a resurgence in interest in the mechanics of a female-led court, albeit with the bulk of modern analysis focussing on the much longer reign of Elizabeth I. Generalized western academic assumptions about the standard nature of male governance led earlier historians and biographers of Mary to emphasize the lack of male presence in her privy chamber as a surrender of “real” power to the men on the Privy Council. This interpretation, one espoused particularly by David Loades, reduces Mary’s royal influence to signing bills passed by her male counsellors, her female privy chamber staff allowing her limited covert access to the inner workings of court politics.¹ Judith Richards has addressed a number of these concerns, as has Anna Whitelock, noting the redirection of political power and intimacy during Mary’s reign from the Privy Council to a particular sphere of intimates, proof of which can be seen in the ascension of ladies of Mary’s household.² The women of Mary’s chamber had access to the body of the queen in a new and important way, and were able to move petitions, requests and information back and forth through pre-existing networks of female association and familial affiliation.³ These women, Mary included, were as politically apt

as their male counterparts, and were able to draw upon allies and kinship networks in order to achieve political goals in much the same way as were men.\textsuperscript{4}

Although writers like Regina Schulte persist in attributing the necessary changes made for a female monarch to Elizabeth’s accession,\textsuperscript{5} it was the changes made during Mary’s five years as queen which set the groundwork for the female monarchs who followed her. Elizabeth famously played on the masculine nature of her virginal, non-maternal body, a construction which began with Mary, though she did not carry that image through to its obvious and marital conclusion. Suggestion of Mary’s ignorance of matters of statecraft is shortsighted, overlooking the sheer strength of will and political acumen which it must have taken for Mary not only to survive her years out of the king’s favour, but to emerge with enough support through her personal networks to take London from Jane Grey and her supporters.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Mary’s tactics tended towards the visual, a lesson learned from her father and grandfather and one which fit the climate in which she had been raised. The lessons imparted in texts such as Vives’ *Education of a Christian Woman*, which Catherine of Aragon commissioned specifically for Mary’s education in 1521, emphasized feminine modesty, silence and obedience.\textsuperscript{6} It is perhaps partially because of this that there are few examples of Mary’s own writing beyond her

\textsuperscript{4} McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State*; see also Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*.


\textsuperscript{6} Vives, *Education of a Christian Woman*, 12.
proclamations and the reported texts of a handful of speeches. The visual, then, was what was left to become one of the primary records of her self-representation, and a means through which her methods can be reexamined.

Attempting to walk the line between feminine and masculine self-representations was not a simple matter in the early modern era, and has not become much simpler since. Contemporaries described women who attempted to negotiate the realm of political involvement in ways that were deemed too masculine as un-women, “of a gallant and true Masculine Spirit.” Women in positions of direct personal power, despite their unprecedented number on mid-sixteenth century thrones, were still seen by contemporary authors as anomalous: no longer truly female, and still somehow less than male. The aspiring lady’s sexuality was called into question, as was her sanity and fitness for the position. Mary’s unenviable task upon her accession was to negotiate with those cultural attitudes, and somehow divine two separate selves: the political monarch, masculine by societal expectation, and the female queen. It was unthinkable for female power to be used in the same way as male authority. Female power was considered permanently tinged with sexuality, women relegated to pursuing status through marriage and extramarital sexual relationships. Mary’s choice, then, was not to court danger by imitating the forms of male authority in their entirety, but to negotiate a compromise.
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While presenting herself visually as a combination of masculine and feminine strengths, she used belief in her innate female weakness to win far more concessions than she might otherwise have managed through threat of force alone.\textsuperscript{12}

The concept of the monarch existing as two conceptually separate bodies existed prior to Mary’s accession, but as of the mid-sixteenth century the distinction became even more vital.\textsuperscript{13} All of Henry VIII’s heirs disrupted the tradition in their own ways: Edward through his youth and his sisters through their sex. Once Henry VIII died, the king was no longer sharing the body of a generative, potent, masculine form; rather, the masculinity previously inherent in the concept of monarch in England was subsumed within the physical bodies first, of a minor, and then following him, of two women. Mary took on both sides of this body politic/body natural, by attempting to draw boundaries around her dual existence as England’s monarch and her roles as wife and future mother.\textsuperscript{14} This dual identity as king and queen was understood at the time. When Mary sent Elizabeth to the Tower in 1554, Elizabeth appealed to her sister on the basis of an old promise of clemency, reminding her of the “olde sayinge that a kinges worde was more than a nother mans othe.” There was no mention here of the word of a queen, suggesting that, to Elizabeth at least, they were acceptable as one and the same.\textsuperscript{15}

While Mary was the first official queen regnant of England and in that place set a great number of precedents which others would later follow, she did not have to reinvent the wheel. Other powerful women had ruled parts of Europe before her time, both officially and unofficially, and two of those were among Mary’s direct ancestors. Both Isabella of Castille and Margaret Beaufort wielded immense power, in fifteenth and early sixteenth century Spain and England respectively, and both manipulated the same gendered tropes that Mary herself would later draw upon to carve out her place in a primarily masculine world. Mary’s mother, Catherine of Aragon, drew upon some of the techniques used by her own mother when choosing her modes of self-representation for specific events and appearances. Mary had access to a wealth of information about her grandmother and great-grandmother, including records remaining from Margaret Beaufort’s household, estates and the authority with which she managed them all. This information, together with the stories of Isabella of Castile with which she was also undoubtedly familiar, and the curriculum designed for her by her mother and Vives, provided Mary with a solid foundation upon which to construct her own ideal pattern of rule.

Margaret Beaufort was not a queen, having given up her own claim to the English throne in favour of her only son, Henry VII. She acted and was treated as a queen dowager in many ways, however, even to the extent of signing her name in her later years as “Margaret R.” She broke new ground in her role as king’s mother and advisor, especially with regard to female access to political power. Her participation in diplomatic
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16 Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 19. These included exchequer accounts, wardrobe inventories, and household accounts which detail the provisions she made for her staff and household. See also Hayward, *KH8*, 84 – 85.
negotiations on Henry VII’s behalf and her role in arranging royal and aristocratic marriages cannot be overstated.\textsuperscript{17} Marriage was many women’s key to the halls of power, and by engaging in matchmaking Margaret ensured that her influence would spread. Her own publicly declared chastity and separation from her fourth husband, Thomas Stanley, enabled her to take on the status of \textit{femme sole} which allowed her to manage her own property and affairs.\textsuperscript{18} Beaufort’s style was to claim power only as regent or in the name of her son. She used Henry’s name to prevent resistance to her actions, which could be otherwise construed as threatening. This displacement of responsibility, both legal and social fiction, allowed her to take on power without the attendant political risk of being considered improper or overreaching.\textsuperscript{19}

Isabella of Castile, mother of Catherine of Aragon and queen of Spain in her own right, was required to defend her rights not by prevarication or obfuscation, but through force. In many ways, she had as much to prove as her granddaughter later would. Isabella needed to prove her claim to the throne of Castile not because of her gender, for she was competing against her niece for the title, but owing to her place on the collateral rather than the direct line of inheritance to the throne.\textsuperscript{20} Mary was always in the direct line for the throne of England but faced similar dangers none the less. Both women needed to win the hearts and minds of their people in ways that were not entirely necessary for previous queen consorts and male rulers on the throne by right of birth. Mary and Isabella’s

\begin{itemize}
\item[18] Ibid., 32-33.
\item[19] Ibid., 36.
\item[20] Ibid., 48.
\end{itemize}
struggles more closely relate to those fought by Henry VII and Margaret Beaufort in that all three strove to create a public acceptance of their rights to rule. Margaret herself had no overt personal powers that could be taken away by marriage, but Isabella – and Mary after her – both held tightly to their rights as reigning queens in their marriage negotiations. Both refused to cede powers of governance to their husbands, retaining ultimate royal powers for themselves – at least on paper.\textsuperscript{21}

Mary used a combination of her foremothers’ methods in order to achieve her goals. She manipulated the impressions of men around her rather than resort to stereotypically masculine or bullying techniques such as those employed by her father during negotiations. Jansen suggests that Isabella deployed her image as wife to greatest effect during her reign,\textsuperscript{22} while she deployed various masculine images, she did not rely exclusively on that technique. Incorporating attributes linked to the image of the obedient and pious woman, virtues which Jansen lists as “piety, chastity, silence, self-sacrifice, and modesty,” Isabella succeeded in enforcing her own will and desires.\textsuperscript{23} By playing the role of an appropriately deferential woman, Mary, like Isabella before her, could arrange matters according to her own will through backroom means and still avoid the censure of a population already unsettled by the notion of a reigning queen. She threw herself upon the mercy and advice of others, called herself weak, used intermediaries including

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 21.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 22.
Mistress Clarentius to pass messages under cover of plausible deniability, and ended up, in many cases, with the end result which she had originally desired.\textsuperscript{24}

Mary was thirty-seven when she took the throne; once she had been crowned, finding a husband and getting about the business of producing a Catholic heir was of paramount importance. She was, by most accounts, extremely interested in Philip of Spain as a prospective husband. Any problems which might come along with a foreign spouse seemed to pale beside those inherent in elevating one English family or faction above the others by choosing a local husband. Mary had once been betrothed to Philip’s father Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, but now her mind turned towards Charles’ son and heir. Some of Mary’s councillors rejected the idea of such a match in favour of a domestic marriage, to the point of organizing a delegation to persuade her otherwise.\textsuperscript{25}

While Mary’s choice had some domestic support there was also a growing tide of opinion against the marriage, unrest which culminated in the Wyatt rebellion of 1554. Mary’s response at a guildhall meeting in February of that year showed the face of a queen who was willing to be gentle and conciliatory, whose entire focus seemed to be pleasing her people. In her speech, she stated:

\begin{quote}
I am not so desirous of wedding, neither so precise or wedded to my will, that either for mine owne pleasure I will choose where I lust, or else so amorous as needs I must haue one. For God I thanke him (to whome be the praise thereof) I haue hitherto liued a virgine, and doubting nothing but with Gods grace shall as well be able so to liue still. ... And certeinlie if I either did know or thinke, that
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{24} Beem, \textit{Lioness Roared}, 81 – 82.
\textsuperscript{25} On 16 November, 1533. Richards, \textit{Mary Tudor}, 147. Also see Beem, \textit{Lioness Roared}, 83.
this marriage should either turn [...] to the danger or losse of anie of you my 
louing subiects, or to the detriment or impairing of anie part or parcell of the 
roiall estate of this realme of England, I would neuer consent therevnto, neither 
would I euer marrie while I liued.26

Her assertion that she would bow to her councillors’ will and thereby deflect 
responsibility for her choices back onto her parliament, was strongly reminiscent of 
Margaret Beaufort, and not unique to the guildhall speech. Two days before her 
coronation in 1553, Mary knelt before her privy council and declared that

she had entrusted her affairs and person ... to them [the privy council] and 
wished to adjure them to do their duty as they were bound by their oaths ; and 
she especially appealed to her Lord High Chancellor, reminding him that he had 
the right administration of justice on his conscience.27

Private papers, meanwhile, demonstrated the machinations occurring behind the queen’s 
apparently conciliatory and submissive public face. While Mary had publicly deferred to 
the better judgement of her subjects and councillors, she had privately empowered her 
Mistress of the Wardrobe and closest confidante, Susan Clarentius, to act as an agent to 
arrange the marriage with Philip of Spain. Clarentius had been a member of Mary’s royal 
household since at least 1536, and was known to have influence over Mary.28 As such, the 
Mistress of the Wardrobe was a frequent target of campaigns and bribes to help move 
suits along. John Bedell, part of the Dudley conspiracy in 1556, wrote to his wife, asking 
her to "Move mistress Clarenceau for me" in order to obtain a pardon.29 Letters reprinted

26 Queene Maries oration in Guildhall in a solemne assemblie, 1 February, 1554. 
27 Letter from the Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 30 September 1553. CSP 
Spain, Vol. 11, 259. 
28 Hayward, KH8, 312. 
29 S.J. Gunn. “A Letter of Jane, Duchess of Northumberland, in 1553.” English 
Historical Review, 1999. 1268. See also CSP Spain Vol. 11, p. 231, 327, 344, as well as
in the Spanish Calendars of State Papers outline the progress of the marriage negotiations, with Simon Renard, the Spanish ambassador, filtering the bulk of his communications through Mistress Clarentius. On 6 November 1553, Renard wrote to the emperor: "(Mrs.) Clarentius has made known her decree, and supports our cause to the utmost."\(^{30}\) Clarentius did more than simply act as a supportive voice for the plan, as further letters make clear: “But as such negotiations [regarding the Spanish marriage] as were on foot were being conducted through a woman... namely Mrs. Clarentius”\(^{31}\) By 8 March, 1554, a scant month after Mary’s guildhall speech, Renard wrote again to the Emperor:

> And your Majesty understands that his Highness, on arriving here, will have to present a few rings and other trifles to the Queen's ladies, and more substantial tokens to the three chief ones, named Clarentius, Sturley and Russell, who have always stood firm for the match and are the Queen's most intimate confidents[sic].\(^{32}\)

The planned payoff to Mary’s ladies illustrates their importance in political matters, as channels which circumvented the official realms of the male privy council.

Others in the queen’s household played vital roles in contemporary politics through similarly unofficial venues. Her hoser, for example, was a writer by the name of Miles

---

\(^{30}\) Simon Renard to the Emperor, 6 November 1553. CSP Spain Vol. 11, 344.


\(^{32}\) Count d'Egmont and Simon Renard to the Emperor, on Philip's arrival in England, 8 March 1554. CSP Spain, Vol. 12, 144.
Huggarde, who wrote a series of anti-Reformation works defending Catholic orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{33} The dedication of many of his works to Mary, as well as his position as a maker of intimate garments for her majesty strongly suggests her support of his political activities. In 1551, Mary’s chief household officers, including Sir Edward Waldegrave, who would become the master of Mary’s Great Wardrobe, had been confined to the tower for refusing to end the saying of mass in her household.\textsuperscript{34} Her chief household officers, Waldegrave included, would have been those “partners in fortune” who helped with her secret communications with Pope Julius, even before her accession in 1553.\textsuperscript{35} Evidence suggests that the Imperial ambassadors were not informed of Mary’s overtures to Rome until September of that year, and her Privy Council were left in the dark until later still.\textsuperscript{36} Rather than staff her Privy Council with her intimates Mary used her Privy Chamber and her household intimates for the same purpose, creating a court centered around a more domestic model.

**Gendered Fashions in the Old Sartorial Regime**

When considering how Mary chose to differentiate or combine her masculine and feminine “bodies,” it helps to understand the sixteenth-century opinion of what constituted feminine and masculine dress. Unlike today, when men’s fashion tends to

\begin{footnotes}
\item[35] Ibid., 201 – 204.
\item[36] Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
focus on restraint and moderation and female fashion trends towards the excessive and bright, English dress pre-1666 – what David Kuchta refers to as “the old sartorial regime” – was far less gendered in terms of sumptuousness, expenditure and display. Both male and female fashions were designed with conspicuous consumption as a goal, and the monarch and court set the tone and the style of fashionable dress. “Rich, not gaudy” apparel defined masculinity, while gaudiness was considered more of a feminine prerogative. 

Sixteenth-century commentators conceived of the influence of apparel on the body as fundamentally spiritual in nature. What a person wore both displayed and in some ways determined the nature of his or her inner character. Clergy spoke out often against the indignities and spiritual damage caused and rendered by inappropriate dress. One surviving text, an officially sanctioned sermon entitled An Homily Against Excess of Apparel, was published in 1563. While it is found in an Elizabethan book of homilies, it cannot be assumed that such attitudes sprang into being, Athena-like, at the moment of Elizabeth’s coronation; it can be safely assumed that similar attitudes were at least partially in play during Mary’s reign. In the homily, rich clothing and “excessive” apparel are associated with myriad sins. Chief among them are incitement of lust; ambition, pride and vanity; care for worldly things over heavenly rewards; greed and avarice, and finally transgression of one’s proper place in the great chain of being. As the writer of the

37 Kuchta, Three-Piece Suit, 7.
38 Ibid., 26-27.
homily notes: “God hath appointed every man his degree and office within the limits thereof it behoveth him to keep himself.”

Fifteenth-century fashion, while beginning to differentiate the cut of collars and sleeves, overwhelmingly emphasized the same sections of the body on both men and women. Gowns for both fell below the knee, outer robes were arranged in rich pleats and often caught in with wide belts, and headdresses were elaborate. The later fifteenth-century short gowns, which evolved into the jerkins and bases of the first half of the sixteenth century, exposed fashionable men’s legs for the first time in centuries. By the middle of the sixteenth century, clothing styles had definitively split by gender in a way that would endure for the next four hundred years. Men’s fashions assumed a new aggressive form, emphasizing strong, broad shoulders, narrow hips, and strong, exposed legs. Women’s fashions, on the other hand, disguised the legs completely under voluminous skirts, emphasizing instead a slim, angular torso. The bodice opened at the collarbone, displaying an expanse of skin between neck and bosom that acted as a visual widener which, combined with the snug-fit bodices, turned the upper half of the body into an inverse triangle that balanced out the breadth of the bottom.

This changing emphasis on body parts was commented upon by contemporaries; Henry VIII was extremely proud of his fit shape, and his legs in particular. The Venetian
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ambassador to Henry’s court included a description of the English king that makes this point clearly:

His Majesty came into our arbor, and addressing me in French, said: 'Talk with me awhile! The King of France, is he as tall as I am?' I told him there was but little difference. He continued, 'Is he as stout?' I said he was not; and he then inquired, 'What sort of legs has he?' I replied 'Spare.' Whereupon he opened the front of his doublet, and placing his hand on his thigh, said 'Look here! and I have also a good calf to my leg.'

Feminine dress at the time obscured the legs entirely, making the woman seem all but to float above a ground that could not contain her. Mary’s French gowns, the necklines closed in with partlets, followed suit, maintaining that slim-shouldered style. The Spanish style gowns, which came into Mary’s wardrobe around 1556 and appear in her portraiture around 1557, added on shoulder rolls and a reduced waist-to-hip ratio compared to that displayed in Mary’s younger years. This shift in fashion turned the feminine double triangle – a cornerstone of female fashion both before 1555 and again after 1560 – into a straighter, broader-shouldered, more masculine look. Textiles were not specifically gendered in Mary’s time as they were elsewhere. In Imperial Rome, for example, silk was considered an effeminate textile, and was worn only by women. In early modern England, both men and women wore silk, velvet, damask and wool in equal amounts. The modes of decoration on the textiles were identical, as were the basic construction methods of some garments. What set women’s clothing apart from men’s was shape. At this point boning had not come into use in pairs of bodies, so the female torso was

---

supported and constrained by layers of tightly woven fabric, but not reshaped as dramatically as would be seen in twenty years’ time. This reshaping emphasized an idealized natural strength, and the angular lines of the upper body. Everything below the waist – and sleeves below the elbows – was large, everything above slim and neat. Partlets altered that tidy look, closing off the neckline and transforming the open-necklined bodices into something more modest and severe.

**Regendering the Coronation**

Mary’s coronation, the most significant public ceremony of her life to that point, was the stage upon which she played out her intentions and, through visual cues, announced the strategy that she intended to employ through the first years of her reign. As discussed in the previous chapter, Mary designed aspects of her coronation to act as visual reminders of her lineage and her lawful descent from previous Tudor kings. The second aspect of the coronation which she reworked was that pertaining to the gendered responsibilities and rituals originally belonging to the king and consort, respectively.

Unlike Edward before her, a minor whose ceremony was determined by his counsellors, Mary took direct control over the facets of her coronation which seemed most important to her. She rejected both a proposed oath and a request from parliament to delay the timing of the ceremony, establishing her desires and her authority as paramount. The regulations for the coronation set out in the *Little Devise* mandated specific regalia as part
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of the ritual investiture of the monarch. These differed along gendered lines, the garments required for male monarchs significantly different than those defined for the queens consort. Mary had her coronation robes designed to emphasize her legitimate descent from Henry VII and Henry VIII; the intricacies of the ceremony and the regalia, however, allowed her to add a secondary conversation that supported and reaffirmed the first. Mary included aspects in her coronation service which had been previously reserved for male monarchs. The regalia she included for those rites combined aspects of both king and queen, while retaining the ritual symbolism associated with the process and garments used by and for previous kings.

The instructions in the Liber Regalis, the document which dictated the order of the coronation service for Kings and Queen of England between 1380 and 1485, mandated that:

The queen shall be vested in a tunic and state robe with a long and flowing fringe. The tunic and robe shall be of one colour, that is, purple, and of one texture without any other embroidery on it. The queen must be bareheaded and her hair must be decently let down on to her shoulders. And she shall wear a circlet of gold adorned with jewels to keep her hair the more conveniently in order on her head.

Henry VII and then Henry VIII after him modified those rules to differentiate the queen’s robes further from those worn by the king. The Little Devise stipulates that the king’s

---

44 Hayward, KH8, 42 – 43
45 Legg, English Coronation Records, 122. Liber Regalis translation. Legg describes the instructions in the two versions of the Little Devise as substantially the same, and offers only one version in translation.
robes should be “a doublet of Grene,\(^{46}\) or white clothe of gold [satyn] a long gowne of purple veluet furred w[ith] Ermyns [poudred], w[ith] a rich Sarple and gartes.”\(^{47}\) By comparison, the queen following him is to wear “white damaske clothe of gold furred w[ith] Myniuer pur garnisshed w[ith] Amblettes of golde, Aboue that a Mantell [furred with menyver pure garnished] w[ith] trayne of the same white damaske clothe of golde, furred w[ith] Ermyns.”\(^{48}\)

While no equivalent order of service for Mary’s coronation survives, it is possible to piece together the events of the two-day celebration from official records, eyewitness accounts and chronicles. Mary processed into London wearing “a mantle and kirtle of cloth of gold, furred with miniver and powdered ermines, on her head a circlet of gold set with stones and pearls,”\(^{49}\) a description which corresponds exactly with purchase records appearing in the Lord Chamberlain’s papers:

Ffirst for hir majesties moste Royall parsone a Robe of white clothe of Golde Tisshewe conteynyng one mantle & one kirtle furred with powdered Ermyns with one mantell lace with buttons and Tassels of white silke and gold with hokes & anelettes of silks and gilte for the saide kirtle the which mantle, kirtle and surcote the Quenes Ma[jes]tie did were ridinge in her horselitte from the Tower of Lon[don] to West[minster] upon the Eve of the coronation.\(^{50}\)

Mary processed to her coronation dressed as a queen consort, her hair down and around her shoulders as can be seen in the Michaelmas roll (Figure 3, Appendix D), her physical being presented as the populace would expect to see a royal woman in a coronation

\(^{46}\) Henry VII’s personal colour, along with white.
\(^{47}\) Little Devise, in Legg, *English Coronation Records*, 222.
\(^{48}\) Ibid., 223 – 224.
\(^{49}\) CSP Domestic, 9.
\(^{50}\) Carter, *Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe*, 25.
procession. Machyn’s diary notes that Mary arrived in blue robes, which Holinshed later
describes as purple, but it is far more likely that the eyewitness account and the later
chronicle refer to the robes Mary wore on the following day, when she exited the
cathedral. The Lord Chamberlain’s papers include further description of a set of red robes
which match images and descriptions of the Parliament robes which Mary wore on 5
October 1553, when she rode from White Hall to Westminster:

A Robe of crimsin velvett conteynyng a mantle with a traine, a surcoate, with a
kirtle furred with wombes of menevere pure, a Riban of venice gold, a mantle
lace of silke and gold with buttons and Tassels (and) the same for the kirtle wth
annelettes of silver and gilte for to lace with, and Robes aglettes of silv’ and
gilt.

Some accounts of the coronation, in contrast with Machyn and Wriothesley, describe
Mary’s arrival at the Abbey “in a long scarlet robe, according to the ancient custom.”
The Lord Chamberlain’s description matches the requirements for both the king’s and
queen’s robes as laid out in the Little Devise:

The Queene also then immediately arayed in a smock of Raynes, A Sircote
rayall of crymsen velvet opened before vnder her wast fastened w[ith] a Lace of
the holie unction lyned the shulders and furred the bodie w[ith] Mynever pur
garnisshed w[ith] Amblettes of Siluer and gilte. Aboue that a Mantell of
crymsen veluet w[ith] a Trayne furred w[ith] Ermyns bearing on her bare hedd a
riche Circle of golde, her heare faire lying about her shoulders.
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51 Holinshed, Chronicles of England, Volume 6, 1090. “She sate in a gowne of purple
veluet, furred with pow|dered ermins, hauing on hir head a kall of cloth of tinsell, béeset
with pearle and stone, and aboue the same vpon hir head a round circlet of gold, béeset so
richlie with preitious stones, that the value thereof was inestimable.”
52 Machin, Diary of Henry Machyn, 46; Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England, 103.
53 Carter, Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe, 26.
54 MacCulloch, Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae, 276.
55 Legg, English Coronation Records, 226.
This protocol was followed by all three previous Tudor monarchs. Edward VI’s red robes were explicitly noted as those “which were called his Parliament Robes,”\(^{56}\) which confirms the nature of these robes for Mary as well.

Further accounts from Mary’s Chamberlain indicate that, among the materials purchased in preparation for her coronation, was a “Tabarde of white sarcenet after the shape of a dalmatike to be putt upon the Quenes gowne,”\(^{57}\) an item ordered for male monarchs, but never for queen consorts.\(^{58}\) This garment was used during the investiture ceremony, a private portion of the coronation held within the Abbey. After sitting overnight on vigil, the king was stripped of his upper clothes, a dalmatic placed over his head, and he was anointed with the holy chrism to designate him as a king: “the king shall be stripped as aforesaid of his royal ornaments as far as his silken tunic and shirt, royal shoes and sandals: and the king shall be revested with other vestments by the said Great Chamberlaine.”\(^{59}\) Following this service, the king was redressed in new robes, his old robes left in the possession of monks of the chapel,\(^{60}\) and he was led out to greet his populace newly invested with all the powers of a monarch.
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56 Hayward *KH8* 45; Leland, *Collectanea*, IV. 322-23.
58 Campbell, “*Materials for a history of the reign of Henry VII*,” 27, Item 6: “for making of ii dalmatikkes, one of crymsyn saten, the other of white sarsinet” Henry VIII: quoted in Hayward, *KH8*, 44. “a Tabard of white Tartaryn after the shape of a dalmatyk to be putt uppon the kinges Coote when he is anoyned.”
59 Legg, *English Coronation Records*, 127.
60 Ibid.
Queens, on the other hand, were enjoined in the *Little Devise* to have robes “so made that the consecrator can open it easily before the holy anointing of her breast, and that the noble lady who is always to attend on the queen can easily close it after the anointing.”

Mary wore a white dalmatic and was anointed as a king with the chrism on hands, heart and head, rather than as a queen consort, who would have been marked on head and breast alone. The inclusion of an order for “a paire of lynnen gloves or knytte gloves” together with the linen coif to protect the oil on Mary’s head attests this change in protocol. Planché describes the redressing as witnessed by de Noailles, the French ambassador: “at a certain part of the ceremony the Queen retired to a private chamber, and having taken off her mantle, returned in a corset of purple velvet, and, after being anointed, was clad in a robe of white taffeta and a mantle of purple velvet furred with ermine, and without a band.”

Mary’s decision to undergo the ceremonial undressing and redressing demonstrated a new kind of royal status, created in the moment of her anointing. Records corroborate de Noailles’ description, the Lord Chamberlain’s records describing “a robe of purple velvett conteyning kirtle, surcote over, & a mantle with a Traine ffurred w[ith] powdered Ermyns, a mantle Lace of Silke and gold w[ith] buttons and tassels of the same, & Riban
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61 Ibid., 123.
64 James Robinson Planché. *A Cyclopedia of Costume* Volume 1. London Chatto and Windus, 1876. 420. Note that ‘corset’ is an anachronistic eighteenth and nineteenth-century term for constrictive undergarments, and in this case likely refers to a structured kirtle or pair of bodies.
of venice gold w[ith] annelettes of silver and gilte for the same kirtle,” a description reminiscent of the king’s robes described in the *Little Devis* and those ordered by Henry VII for his own coronation. Judith Richards claims that “[Mary’s] procession through the City the day before her coronation was... an oddly missed propaganda opportunity and made little effort to define the nature and claims of the new regime.” This statement misses entirely the loud statements made by Mary’s attire, the changes she wrought to it, and her presentation before her public before and after the ceremony. She rode in to the service as a queen and emerged as a king, her own uniquely regendered brand of power strikingly announced to all and sundry.

Additional details from Mary’s procession complemented these changes. On her ride from the Tower to Westminster on September 30th, Mary was preceded by the usual members of the privy council and the court, including the earl of Arundel carrying her great bearing sword. This was common practice for a king’s coronation, but not for a queen consort, who was supposed to be preceded in only by the king, his retinue, and “two nobles, the first of whom shall carry the queen’s sceptre, and the second the queen’s crown.” This practice of associating the queen with masculine symbols of power had originally been used by Mary’s maternal grandmother, Isabella of Castile, who was preceded in her own coronation procession by a rider holding aloft an unsheathed sword. Isabella was the first to use this symbolism in Spanish memory, as Ferdinand’s

67 Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 136; also see contemporary accounts.
68 Legg, *English Coronation Records*, 129.
secretary recorded: “Everyone knows that these are conceded to kings... but never was known a queen who had usurped this masculine attribute.”

Mary’s repeat of her grandmother’s visual choices was not a singular event; the records from her wardrobe of robes show semi-annual payments to her cutler, John Eyeland, “for sharpening of the grete bearing sworde and the little bearing sworde / for making of a crymsen vellat scabbarde and for making of a case of leather lyned with cottan all of our grete garderobe.” The regular maintenance of this ceremonial set suggests reasonably frequent use, which required that the instruments be maintained in a state of ceremonial readiness.

**Marriage, and Dressing the Body Politic**

Mary’s next major ceremonial public appearance for which clothing records exist was her wedding to Philip of Spain, on 25 July 1554. The days before the actual service included a handful of public and semi-private moments of display which served to introduce the Spanish prince to his new bride and her people, and the clothing choices made on both sides clearly indicated the impressions which each member of the royal pair wished to convey. Philip arrived in England on 22 July 1554, and on 23 July was conveyed to Winchester where he met the queen in a semi-private first encounter. Mary greeted him “surrounded by three or four old councillors and her ladies in waiting,” a
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71 E 101/427/18 f. 1; LC 5/31 ff. 94-99. Item 43.
72 Unfortunately, no eyewitness accounts of Mary’s speech regarding the Wyatt rebellion mention her clothing.
small and intimate group.\textsuperscript{73} His arrival in Winchester was dramatically staged, as a
ccontemporary describes, with “nobles riding, one with an other before him, in good order
through the Citie, every one placed according to his vocacion and office, he riding on a
faire white horse in a riche coate embrodred with gold, his doubl[ [...] ]t, hosen, and hat suite
like, with a white fetherin his hat, very faire.”\textsuperscript{74} Philip’s arrival left no doubt about his
status, the expensive display and heavy decoration which indicated his rank typical of
Spanish fashion.

When receiving her fiancé that evening, Mary dressed in the style which has become
iconically associated with her reign. Despite the bulk of her wardrobe purchases in 1554
being gowns made up in purple, crimson or murrey, Mary chose to receive her new
husband-to-be in a dramatic black gown, a fashionable colour that was a sign of status,
wealth, and not coincidentally, a marker of authority and power. Her gown was “tight-
bodied,” a phrase indicating a feminine French gown rather than a more masculine loose
gown. Muñoz’s description of it as “una saya de terciopelo negro alta,” (“a high-necked
gown of black velvet”) indicates that she wore a matching partlet to cover her shoulders
and collarbone.\textsuperscript{75} Eyewitnesses noted that her gown was extremely ornate and “after the

\textsuperscript{73} CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 9.
\textsuperscript{74} Elder, John. \textit{Copy of a letter sent into Scotlande}. Imprinted at London in Fletestrete at
the signe of the Sunne ouer agaynst the Conduit, by John Waylande, cum priuilegio per
\textsuperscript{75} “The Queen was wearing a high-necked tight-bodied gown of black velvet, after the
fashion of that country, without any ornamental applied bands. Her forepart was of purled
silver, and her hood of black velvet with expensive gold earpieces, beautifully set with
jewels. Her wide girdle was of marvellous stones, as was her necklace.” (Muñoz 70,
quoted and translated in Carter, \textit{Mary Tudor's Wardrobe of Robes}, 28 , 63.) Also “The
fashion of that country [England], without any ornamental applied bands,”76 and “her headdress was after the English fashion.”77 “Applied bands” refers to a style of appliquéd decoration which was firmly associated with Spanish fashion, and which later appeared on a handful of Mary’s other gowns. The intricate forepart and the weight of jewels worn on her girdle, ears and hood served to demonstrate her wealth, the striking black velvet of her gown serving as a backdrop to highlight the expensive ornamentation. This was not a gown for an ingénue or a young princess, especially compared to Mary’s open-necked, red and gold wardrobe from previous decades.

Partlets were being worn by younger as well as older women of this time, but purchase records from contemporaries suggest that they were of the kind that Mary herself wore as princess – linen, often embroidered, lightweight and visually distinct from the bodies of the gowns themselves.78 For this reception, despite owning partlets which would have created that distinctive contrast and highlighted the higher bosom generated by stiffened upper bodies, Mary chose a matching partlet which turned the more seductive and youthful French gown into something more mature and, in some senses, masculine. The snug, closed gown with its rich assortment of decorations advertised that Mary was a mature queen, and while the encounter between Mary and Philip was described as

Queen... was dressed in black velvet covered with stones and buttons and adorned with brocade in front. Her headdress was after the English fashion.” CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 9.

76 Muñoz 70, quoted and translated in Carter, Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe, 28, 63.
77 CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 9.
78 See Mid. 406: linen purchased for partlets for Margaret Willoughby; See also a purple and tawney tissue partlet owned by Mary in April 1554, E101/427/11, f. 34.
“pleasant conversation,” there can be little doubt as to the physical impression with which she left observers.

The official reception for Philip the following day began privately, with the delivery of a gift to Philip from the Queen. The utility of garment exchanges and gifts for diplomatic purposes was well-established by this point, and the choices of garment which she sent him — “two suits, one of rich brocade adorned with gold thread, pearls and diamond buttons, the other of crimson brocade” — were designed along the same lines as garments which Mary’s Lord Chamberlain had ordered for her to be worn during her coronation. The combinations of purple, red and gold were intended to evoke notions of royal power. Philip “put on a coat of purple brocade with silver fringes and a frieze cloak with similar trimmings, white breeches and doublet,” in order to meet the queen publicly before the court, and she received him in a purple gown to match. Philip demonstrated his acceptance of the queen’s gift by wearing the suit which she had made for him, and notably, in this case, she appears to have presented herself in a gown with no partlet — neither eyewitness describes her gown as high-necked, as she had been described wearing the previous evening.

The Spanish ambassador Muñoz describes her outfit for this meeting in some detail, noting that her gown was “vestida de terciopelo morado, y la saya aforrada en brocado, y
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una delantera de oro escarchado con muy ricas piedras preciosas y perlas orientales y aljófar con el chapirón, cintura, collar, de la mesma pedreria.”

A forepart (delantera) is mentioned but no partlet, and the term “alta” is not used. Taken together, this all suggests that for the public reception before her court, Mary was wearing a French gown in purple velvet, and this time her shoulders and collarbone were left exposed. The description of this gown correlates exactly with one of the items in Mary’s inventory from April 1554, an entry which includes an associated “partelett of our store,” likely intended to be worn with the gown in question. Leaving off the partlet suggests that Mary’s intent was to emphasize a softer, open look, appearing as a model of feminine youth and grace, with the potential to bear children. Her wealth was still evident from the decorations employed on the gown, as was her royal status in the colour, but the differences suggest that her choice may have been calculated to give an entirely different impression on the viewer than that which she had employed the evening before.

The wedding the next day saw the return of the black gown, probably a similar gown to that depicted in the couple’s wedding portrait (Figure 7, Appendix D). Muñoz described Mary’s wedding gown as “a garment of black velvet embroidered with gold, with many
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83 “a tight-bodied [purple] coloured velvet gown, lined with brocade, and her forepart was of purled gold with precious stones, pearls from the east and other tiny pearls; her hood, girdle and necklace of the same stones.” Muñoz 72, quoted and translated in Carter, Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe, 28, 63-64.
84 E101/427/11 f. 34, Item 34: “a frenche Gowne of purple vellat turned up with the same. And a partelett of our store. The Gowne lyned with purple taphata… the fore boddyes of purple Sattin” The ‘forepart’ mentioned above may have been Item 27, “a French kirtle thotsid of cloth of tissue and thinside of cloth of golde edged with a raized lase of gold.”
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beautiful stones,"86 and Raviglio Rosso, a visitor from the court of Charles V, expanded that description, writing: “The Queen was dressed in the French style in a garment of rich brocaded velvet with a long train, covered in huge pearls and the most spectacular diamonds. The turned-back lining of the sleeves was of cloth-of-gold adorned with more pearls and diamonds.”87 Wriothesley, interestingly, described the robes as “gownes of cloth of golde sett with riche stones,” a garment found in neither Mary’s wardrobe records nor in other accounts of the day.88

The portrait depicts Mary and Philip in matching black outfits accented with cloth of gold. The gown she wears in the portrait differs from eyewitness accounts only in that the portrait gown’s sleeves are lined in silver fur, while the description is that of cloth of gold. It may well be that the summer-weight sleeves were later lined with fur for the winter months, as the wardrobe inventories from winters show a much higher use of fur than those cataloguing clothing ordered for summer wear. Mary’s gown is high-necked once more and lined with embroidered linen, the silhouette of the dramatic gown neatly echoing the shape and lines of Philip’s black velvet doublet. Mary’s gold forepart echoes and is echoed by Philip’s cloth of gold breeches and matching hose, even their skin and hair colours appear all but identical.

The wedding was a grandiose affair and one sure to draw a vast audience. While Richards points out that royal weddings were usually smaller events, superseded by the queen

86 Muñoz 73, quoted and translated in Carter, Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe, 29, 64.
87 Rosso 66, quoted and translated in Carter, Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe, 29, 64.
88 Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England, 120.
consort’s coronation, this one was certainly the reverse. Philip was never crowned, and the pageantry reserved for the wedding itself removed the focus from Philip as a king to emphasize Mary’s change of status from unmarried to married queen. Mary softened any perceptible blow with her feminine apparel on the previous day, and then chose this stage upon which to reassert her own powers in an unmistakeable form.

That assertion of power continued after the wedding, and Mary took the Whitehall chambers usually reserved for the king, relegating Philip and his household to the queen’s side: “[a]nd so the Quenes magestie enteringe that part of the courte comenly called the kinges side, and the kynges highnes entryng the other parte called the Quenes, there they rested and remayned for certayne dayes.” She processed in on his right side when they travelled, in a reversal of the usual sex assignments. That positioning was no accident, and contravened every contemporary understanding of the rightful order of things. This concept of man on the right and woman on the left was so ingrained into people’s mentality that it was seen as a state of nature: a midwifery text from 1540 notes that “always the man child lyeth in the right side [of the womb], the woman in the left side.”

Mary’s marriage contract with Philip kept decision making power in her hands; he was not to supersede her authority. In practice, however, she styled him her king and he
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appeared on coins and in official imagery at her royal side. The statute passed upon the marriage confirmed that understanding, declaring

that youre majestye as our onely Quene, shal and may, solye and as a sole quene use, have, and enjoye the Crowne and Sovraynte, of, and over your Realmes, Dominions, and Subjectes... after the solemnisation of the sayde maryage, and at all tymes durynge the same... as your grace hath had, used, exercised and enjoyed... before the solemnization of the sayde mariage.  

Despite the written contract to the contrary, the dual portrait of Mary and Philip places him in the dominant position, on the viewer’s left. Mary and Philip’s positions were reversed for a stained glass window that the pair donated to Sint-Janskerk, Gouda, in 1557, with Mary taking the dominant position on Philip’s right hand (Figure 8, Appendix D). A series of medals and coins minted in 1554 bear Philip’s head on the left hand side, placing him in the superior position (see Figure 9, Appendix D). The inconsistency in the placement of the king and queen in these images is suggestive, as Judith Richards has discussed, perhaps indicating a certain amount of official as well as unofficial confusion as to the sanctioned status of the king-consort.

One item intriguing by its absence in the records is mention of linen shirts, a traditionally important type of gift from wife to husband. No orders for linen intended for Philip’s shirts appear in Mary’s wardrobe warrants, while orders of fabric for gifts for others in her household do. As far as can be confirmed, Mary’s gifts to Philip consisted solely of outer garments, jewels and formal paraphernalia. All of these items were intended for public display and fell into the category of dress-diplomacy, from one monarch to

another. Linen garments such as shirts and partlets, worn next to the skin, were a signal of intimacy and access; the other major uses for linen, for bedsheets (household linens) and aprons, were intimately tied in to the female realms of domesticity. As the textile worn closest to the body, gifts of linen clothing suggested a level of connection beyond the merely diplomatic, into the familial or sexual. For new year’s 1543/1544, Mary received gifts of linen smocks and partlets from ladies of the court, the gifts from men tending to be sleeves, gloves and other less intimate layers of clothing. There is one reference to a ‘gold-wrought’ partlet given to her by "the Italian the Dauncer," a position assumed to be a male, though one outside the usual court structure. The gift roll for new year’s 1556/1557 displays the same pattern of behaviour: the male courtiers give gifts of money most frequently, followed by handkerchiefs, and one example of a partlet from the earl of Huntingdon, and “By Sir Leonard Chamberlen foure wastcoate foure peire of sleves and foure peire of hoosen of Garmesey making." Some of the female courtiers closest to her, including Lady Jane Seymour, a gentlewoman of Mary’s chamber who appears frequently in the Queen’s wardrobe records, gave her smocks, partlets and ruffs. The rest gave less intimate gifts of money, gloves and handkerchiefs. Gifts between women of personally-sewn clothing items carried a much greater intimacy than gifts of cash or land or other goods. Unlike her father, who gave to and received gifts from at least his first three wives at various new years’, no gifts of any kind between Philip and Mary appear on the 1556/57 gift roll.

95 MPP, ff. 111b – 113.
96 ADD. MS. 62525.
97 Ibid.
99 Hayward, “Gift Giving,” 133.
As Natasha Korda argues, linen appears as a symbol of misplaced intimacy in contemporary literature, typified by the use of the linen handkerchief as proof of adultery in *Othello*, and linen sheets as a hiding place for a lover in *Merry Wives of Windsor*.100

Shirts came as gifts from multiple sources: Isabel of Castile ordered shirts for her son and may well have spun the linen threads and embroidered the completed shirts herself.101 Princess Elizabeth, some years later, made and sent a gift of “A shyrte of cam’yke of her own makynge” to her two-year-old brother Edward, demonstrating both her skill with a needle at a young age, as well as her public and private allegiance with the young crown prince.102 The provision of such garments was especially important, however, as a marital duty for a wife. Catherine of Aragon continued to make her husband’s shirts even after the divorce had been put into motion, a clear statement that, at least as of December 1530, she still considered herself to be his wife. The ensuing temper tantrum on the part of Anne Boleyn demonstrated the level of importance the women placed upon the symbolic nature of such a personal gift. In June 1530, Chapuys described an ugly scene at the palace which he saw as a good sign for Catherine:

> Quite lately [Henry] sent [Catherine] some cloth begging her to have it made into shirts for him. The Lady [Anne], hearing of this, sent for the person who had taken the cloth—one of the principal gentlemen of the bedchamber—and although the King himself confessed that the cloth had been taken to the Queen by his order, she abused the bearer in the King's very presence, threatening that

she would have him punished severely.  

By sending the fabric to Catherine for his shirts, Henry was still acknowledging her as his wife, rather than as his brother’s widow. Anne’s fury was based on the understanding that her position as possible future queen was, at that moment, precarious. Chapuys’ commentary on the incident, that it marked a possibility of Catherine restoring herself to the King’s favour, corroborates that interpretation. Intriguingly enough, once Anne was herself queen, she sent Henry’s shirts out to a contracted shirt maker.  

Why, then, would Mary not give her husband shirts, as seemed to be the expectation in both English and Spanish circles? Perhaps it was because their relationship more closely mirrored that of a diplomatic exchange between putative equals than the incorporate marriages assumed when a foreign-born princess married into a royal family.

**Politics of Representation: Portraiture and Public Events**

Mary’s clothing choices for regular wear changed over the course of the years, as suggested by the descriptions of garments in her wardrobe warrants. Eyewitness accounts offer a chance to see Mary through others’ eyes, while her portraits, particularly those believed to have been personally commissioned, give a permanent visual record of the ways in which she chose to represent herself physically. In all of these accounts and images, after 1554, Mary is depicted and described as wearing warm, dark colours, and often muted versions of those colours. Her court was not shaded with the brilliantly

---

104 Hayward, KH8, 111.
primary palette of her father’s; rather, she chose subdued tones that spoke a very different message than her earlier garb.

On 17 February 1544, Henry VIII and Katherine Parr played host to the Duke of Najera. The Duke’s secretary described the Princess Mary’s clothing during that visit as “a petticoat of cloth of gold, and gown of violet coloured three-piled velvet with a headdress of many rich stones.”\(^{105}\) This demonstration of Mary’s restoration to royal favour included her appearance in the colours and textiles reserved for the king’s family, which was a major indication of her potential value as a bride – information for the Duke to carry back to the continent. Ten years later, on 28 July 1554, now-Queen Mary received the Duchess of Alva wearing “black damask with a stomacher of black velvet embroidered with gold.”\(^{106}\) This description corresponds with a gown listed in Mary’s wardrobe warrant from October of that year, “a frenche Gowne of blake Damaske of our store with thre weltes of blake vellat lined with buckeram underneath and blake Taphata above.”\(^{107}\) Black is the one consistent colour in Mary’s warrants from her years as princess and lady through to her final year as queen. Her use of it early on in her reign appears to have been specifically for the purpose of drawing attention to herself as a mark of authority.

The bulk of her portraits, on the other hand, eschew the severity of her black gowns and depict the queen in gowns of warmer and less severe tones. All but two of eight coloured


\(^{106}\) CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 12.

\(^{107}\) E101/427/11 f 38., Item 21. One other black damask gown is recorded for 1554, but it is listed as being a loose gown, which were not worn with stomachers.
images – both portrait and stained glass – show Mary wearing gowns in shades of brown and red. All but one of those created during her reign as queen show her in high-necked gowns, the open collars and intricate embroidery depicted in the wrought partlet linings drawing attention to the jewels with which she adorned herself and demonstrated her wealth. The final portrait, dated to 1557 and attributed to Hans Eworth, is an anomaly. The only commissioned portrait of Mary painted after her devastating failed pregnancy and Philip’s abandonment, it shows the queen as dramatically aged compared to previous images. This portrait is suggestive of the exhaustion and illness that would eventually take the queen’s life. She is dressed in a ropa in the Spanish style, a loose gown made of black velvet and decorated with fur lining and piping that is studded with expensive jewels (Figure 10, Appendix D). A variation of this portrait, artist unknown, has removed the fur trim, replacing it with decorations of pairs of gold aglettes, also a look very closely associated with the Spanish court.108 In the first iteration Mary appears to be wearing the pearl given to her as an engagement present from Philip, but without the iconic brooch which appears in every other image of the queen between 1553 and 1558. In the second version of the portrait, the entire jewel is missing: both brooch and pendant are uniquely absent. It is easy to speculate about the reasons for the jewel’s absence – perhaps commentary on her husband’s distance, or an attempt to strike a balance between the Spanish influences on her apparel by removing the Spanish jewel when wearing a Spanish gown – but as with many speculations, ultimately impossible to prove.

The Spanish-style loose gown gave the wearer a far more masculine silhouette than the snug-bodied French gowns which dominated Mary’s public wardrobe prior to 1557. While accounts of Mary’s possessions show that, up until 1558, she generally ordered somewhere around the same number of loose gowns as French gowns in any specific year (see Table 5, below), she invariably chose to wear the tight-bodied French gowns – with or without partlets – during public appearances and in her official portraits. In 1557, Mary chose to be painted in a Spanish gown, of which one appears in her warrants, “a Spanishe gowne of blacke vellvett bordered with buckram, the upper sleves lyned with frieze, and a stay of white fustian and bagges of blacke satten.”\textsuperscript{109} Subsequent to that, the only gowns listed in her wardrobe accounts for 1558 are loose gowns and night gowns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Loose</th>
<th>Night</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1554</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1554</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1557</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1557</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1558</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1558</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{109} LC 5/31 ff. 54 – 62. Item 21.
The French gowns gave the body an extremely stylized feminine silhouette, emphasizing the hips and constraining the torso. Breasts were reduced and the shoulder width narrowed to the eye, the better to draw the eye downwards towards the split skirts and stylistic emphasis on female fertility. The loose gowns and Spanish ropas, however, reduced the waist-to-hip differential so iconic of womens’ garments of the sixteenth century. The farthingale was still worn beneath it, but the open fronts and lack of stiffening in the bodices enabled the fabric to flow from bust to hip in an unbroken line, generating a silhouette far more akin to the masculine gown of the early sixteenth century than any female form. The puffed shoulders and sleeves drew attention back up towards the shoulders and broadened the chest, a sign of masculine power.

Despite her place as regnant Queen, Mary’s duty as royal wife was still to produce living heirs – in this case, for herself rather than in the name of her husband. It was well understood by 1557, especially considering the double blow of Mary’s ill health and her age, that children would not be forthcoming. At this stage, she ceased to operate under the dual bodily identities of masculinized monarch and royal mother, a sociological fiction which she could no longer legitimately employ. Rather, she embraced the masculinised, Spanish visual styles of her last two years on the throne. This more militant, masculine conceit echoed at her funeral where, as she and Isabella had taken up the bearing swords before them at their coronations, Mary was surrounded by the full set of four monarchical heraldic emblems: gauntlets, spurs, a horse and battleaxe. Mary I was the only reigning queen to receive such treatment; at Elizabeth’s funeral only the

symbols of horse and battleaxe were displayed, and none of the four military emblems was used for Mary II.\textsuperscript{111}

Astute and observant, Mary learned the art of visual display from her father and grandfather before her, and the subtler techniques required of female authority figures from her grandmother and great-grandmother. Combining those lessons, she designed her visual self-representation to accommodate both the masculine requirements of power and the feminine regulatory codes which were intended to keep authority vested in the hands of male figures. In generating a new kind of fiction based on the concept of the divided body politic and body natural, Mary set precedents for female rulers, some of which were followed by Elizabeth “according to the ancient precedents” – those being no more than six years old, and established by her own half-sister.\textsuperscript{112} Mary’s self-portrayal through her clothing changed as the years went on and her circumstances changed, displaying her ability to manoeuvre and manipulate her sartorial display – and perceptions of her inner self – in reaction to events around her. No political naïf, Mary may well have made choices that seem in retrospect to have been less than optimal, but she made them with her eyes open, and in full awareness of the messages she was sending.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{112} Richards, \textit{Mary Tudor}, 136.
One major issue with which Mary I grappled, both before and after her accession to the English throne, was that of her legitimacy and her place as the rightful heir. As discussed in chapter two, she laid out a response which included the use of clothing carefully chosen to emphasize the links between herself and her predecessors. Her gender created a second set of difficulties as she established her rule that had not been problems for the kings who had preceded her. She faced these challenges, as explored in chapter three, with a series of attempts both to blend the symbolic and masculine body of a king with her own female body natural, and to emphasize her maternal and domestic side as mother and wife to England. This latter attempt was less successful than the former, and it shared some characteristics with Mary’s strategy towards the third and final matter discussed in this thesis: her struggle to forge a unified English and Spanish visual identity.

Beyond issues of lineage and gender which she would have faced regardless of her choice of husband, Mary’s marriage to Philip of Spain created a new problem for her reign. Conflicts both internal to the marriage and at the governmental and policy level generated tensions within England to which Mary was sensitive. One strategy which she deployed to attempt to ameliorate those tensions was to emphasize visually the bond between the nations embodied in her union with Philip, first attempting to enfold Philip within the sartorial traditions of England, and then by taking upon herself the dress styles typical of
Spain. While there has been some debate as to what, precisely, constituted an English “national style,” there was enough consistency in what the ladies and gentlemen of the court were wearing to make at least a few assertions about the prevailing fashions of the 1550s. Spanish style was more distinct in nature, and it is possible to define now, as it was then, a particular set of characteristics intrinsic to mid sixteenth-century Spanish fashion which did not exist in the same way in other national dress. We can read Mary’s abandonment of English style in favour of Spanish fashion in 1557 and 1558 as suggestive of a shift in her attitude towards Philip and the Spanish alliance as well as her foreign policy as a whole.

National identity, that concept of a unique and bounded ‘us’ which by its nature demanded a ‘them’ against which to react, began to take shape at some point during the early modern era, emerging in full form by the eighteenth century. Different scholars have dated that emerging sense of national self to various times within this same era, the most convincing suggesting that it began to emerge in the early to mid-sixteenth century. Some historians have located the emergence of a national consciousness in England specifically in the Reformation, identifying Henry VIII’s ideological language

---

1 While some contemporaries described particular styles of dress as overtly English – see Giacomo Soranzo, *CSP Venice*, Vol. 5, 934 (18 August 1554) – others decried a lack of an obviously English mode, and rejected incorporation of continental styles into English wardrobes. See Andrew Boorde, for example, in *The First Book of the Introduction of Knowledge*, 1562, where he depicted Englishmen as perpetually naked and stymied by dress options from abroad.

surrounding the break with Rome as a watershed moment. Richard Helgerson describes that movement towards a concept of national English identity as occurring later in the sixteenth century, noting that “things English came to matter with a special intensity” in the 1550s and 1560s. Hayward identifies that same regional awareness present in contemporary view of costume; documents, letters and images from the time drew upon recognized regional differences, using them for easy visual identification as well as political commentary. Contemporaries noticed a connection between national cultures and behavioural mores. The notion of area-specific cultural identification appeared in documents such as costume books, which first emerged in the early 1500s and flowered in popularity in the later decades of that century. Alongside those formal encyclopaedias of national dress styles, sixteenth-century travellers collected images of clothing in personal albums, known as album amicora. Young gentlemen travelling the continent marked the countries they had visited with coats of arms of individuals met along the way, as well as vibrant images of the archetypical clothing of the citizens.

4 Helgerson, Forms of nationhood, 3.
5 Hayward, KH8, 11.
Clothing was a means by which not only individual identity but group identity might be established. Guild and household liveries marked their wearers as members of exclusive groups, sumptuary legislation affirmed the role of clothing as a marker for status, and regional variations in style and silhouette served as visual markers of national origins and allegiance. Ulinka Rublack argues that female dress played a particular role above and beyond those identity markers, standing in politically as a visual representation of national virtues and morality, as well as a venue for conveying stereotypes and rumoured vices.\textsuperscript{8} Orderly and appropriate dress implied a socially controlled state of being, both a person and a nation constrained within the rules of good behaviour and dignity.

Disorderly dress and foreign fashion, on the contrary, indicated a person existing outside the community, either through deliberate choice or by some form of barbarism, including mental illness.\textsuperscript{9} Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers such as Stephen Gosson associated French clothing with promiscuity and disease: “When whoores in stewes had gotten poxe, This French devise [the drum farthingale], keep coats from smocks.”\textsuperscript{10}

Movement through the public sphere offered plenty of opportunity for people to display allegiance through dress, on both personal and national levels. Wearing a gift from a monarch, or the badge of one’s household, was a means of making an immediate announcement about one’s loyalties. Monarchs or courtiers dressing in the style of another court or realm spoke volumes about their intentions. Bishop John Aylmer

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 136.
recounted an anecdote which illustrates the close connection that contemporaries saw between gifts of clothing and support for the giver:

A great man’s daughter, receavinge from Ladye Marye before she was Quene, goodly apparel of tynsyll, cloth of golde, and velvet, layd on with parchment lace of gold: when she saw it, sayde, what shal I doo with it? Marry saide a gentlewoman weare it. Nay, quothe she, that were a shame to followe my lady Mary against Gods woorde and leave my Lady Elyzabeth, which foloweth Gods woorde.\textsuperscript{11}

Clothing was not just a pretty gift, in other words; wearing the garments given to her by one noble lady would be understood to be a declaration of support for her, and a rejection of a second, previously held affinity.

Catherine of Aragon, as Maria Hayward describes, understood this notion well and made use of Spanish costume to great effect on multiple occasions. These targeted appearances included wearing a Spanish-style headdress at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520, and a Spanish gown in 1522 when hosting her nephew Charles V.\textsuperscript{12} Her use of Spanish dress on those occasions was telling, precisely because of its incongruity compared to the local passion for French-style clothing which was prevalent at the time. French costume, typified by snug, conical bodices, low, square necklines, a bright colour scheme and broad, turned-back sleeves lined with contrasting fabric, had been popularized by the court of Burgundy and was ubiquitous in England and indeed across Europe in the first half of the sixteenth century. The Iberian peninsula remained a stylistic exception, though French dress was worn by women on some occasions of international importance.

Margarita of Austria was described as wearing a gown of French design at her 1497

\textsuperscript{11} Aylmer, \textit{An harborowe for faithfull and trewe subiectes}, 1559.
\textsuperscript{12} Hayward \textit{KH8}, 177; Hayward, “Dressed to Impress,” 15 – 16.
betrothal to Prince Juan of Spain, and Germaine de Foix, queen-consort of Aragon (1488 – 1538), wore a similar gown while en route to Naples in 1506.\(^\text{13}\)

**Fashions of Spain, England and France**

Mary’s reign marked a transitional period for fashion in England that was echoed by similar shifts on the continent. Spanish dress became extremely popular across Europe during the latter half of the sixteenth century, thanks to the widespread influence of the Hapsburg family and its marriages. Only a few studies of Spanish costume of the sixteenth century are accessible in English, and Ruth Anderson’s 1979 survey is one of the most comprehensive. Drawing on her analysis, and that of Maria Hayward, as well as surviving artefacts and images, it is possible to pull together an outline of the basic forms of early modern Spanish style.

The same basic shift from columnar medieval gowns to the broad silhouette of the early modern era can be seen in Spanish clothing as elsewhere in Europe during the early sixteenth century. The stiffened skirt called a "verdugada" (farthingale) emerged first in Spain in the late fifteenth century before spreading northward, and while men’s doublets in the early sixteenth century lacked the skirts (called *bases*) which typified Tudor men’s wear, they adopted the broad shoulders and voluminous layers of fabric which served to bulk out and accentuate the breadth of the human form.

\(^{13}\) Anderson, *Spanish Costume*, 13, 18.
Elite Spanish dress was ornate, described as “jewel-laden” and “so heavily encrusted with gems and pearls...that little [fabric] could be seen.”\textsuperscript{14} Textiles were more likely to be woven in intricate brocade patterns, in contrast to the English preference for plain fabrics that were later embroidered, cut and voided (“wrought”), or left to serve as a backdrop for elaborate pieces of jewellery. Spanish garments had extensive surface decoration, with extravagant embroidery and appliqué work.\textsuperscript{15} One particularly popular form of appliqué was the use of guards or bands, strips of contrasting fabric applied around hems and sleeves of cloaks, gowns, jerkins, and other outer garments.\textsuperscript{16} These bands were often of velvet or satin, and presented a texture as well as colour contrast to the base garment. They were applied atop the finished edge of the garment with two rows of stitching, and could therefore easily be moved from gown to gown.\textsuperscript{17} Mary’s wardrobe warrants show an order for “a Loose gowne of Russett Satten garded with two Spanyshe gardes of blacke vlvett” in September 1557, applying the distinctive style of decoration to a garment that had been a long-time standard within the English wardrobe.\textsuperscript{18}

Spanish dress was known for its dark colours and modest cut. Red and black were most commonly worn, especially for formal occasions, and there was some use of mulberry, crimson, green and yellow.\textsuperscript{19} Tawney appeared later on, in the mid-sixteenth century, in sparing amounts.\textsuperscript{20} Red and yellow were the colours of the royal household, as well as

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{14}] Ibid., 28, discussing Charles V’s imperial coronation in Rome, 1530.
\item[\textsuperscript{15}] Ibid., 51.
\item[\textsuperscript{16}] Ibid., 49.
\item[\textsuperscript{17}] Arnold, \textit{QEU}, 185.
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] LC 5/31 ff. 75-79, Item 17.
\item[\textsuperscript{19}] Anderson, \textit{Spanish Costume}, 200.
\item[\textsuperscript{20}] Ibid., 201.
\end{itemize}
Philip’s personal livery. Charles V took red, yellow, silver and gold as his personal colours, which added some brightness to the palette at formal events.\textsuperscript{21} Wedding colours tended towards the sombre: Charles V wore “a black velvet jerkin with gold trimmings” to marry Isabel of Portugal in 1526,\textsuperscript{22} while in contrast, for his imperial coronation in Rome, he dressed in “white and gold, richly furred with sable.”\textsuperscript{23} That outfit is shown in a portrait from 1532, displaying the snug upperstocks (knee-length shorts), puffed uppersleeves and snug, puffed foresleeves that typify mid-century Spanish style (see Figure 11, Appendix D). Men's clothing showed very elaborate puffing and slashing from the 1530s onward, while women's decoration included more towards pinking, scalloped edges, and appliqué bands for decoration.\textsuperscript{24} Textiles tended towards velvet, wool and satin, with decorations in brocades, silk embroidery, and gold pastilles stitched on. Clothing was often decorated with fur, for both men and women, of which the most prevalent was ermine. Martin, sable and rabbit followed in popularity, as well as lynx, which may be the fur identified in English accounts as luzarnes or lucernes.\textsuperscript{25}

Spanish women’s gowns showed the same lower necklines as most other European women's gowns in the early sixteenth century, and could be cut either square or round. The major difference was that where other national dress often exposed the collarbone,  

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 27.  
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 22 & 27.  
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 28.  
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 29-30, 147 – 148.  
sometimes open as far down as the upper curve of the breasts, Spanish gowns were invariably worn with a ‘filler,’ either a full chemise worn beneath the gown, a partlet, or a corpetes which covered the bare skin with fabric.\textsuperscript{26} Partlets were being worn in other countries, usually by married women, but tended to be made of linen, sometimes so fine as to be practically transparent.\textsuperscript{27} Spanish partlets, on the other hand, were predominantly made from thicker fabrics, especially velvets and satins. Isabel of Castile’s inventories show mostly satin partlets, while Juana la Loca’s were listed as being made of holland, taffeta, silk, velvet, cloth of gold, and “ceti” or netting.\textsuperscript{28} Those made from netting were then lined with heavier fabrics, such as taffeta or cloth of gold, which added to the luxurious look as well as making the article of clothing entirely opaque.\textsuperscript{29} The partlet began to fade out of use in the mid-century in Spain, replaced by gowns with high necklines cut as an integral part of the bodice. This ‘saya alta’ (“high gown”) style appears in descriptions of Mary’s appearances in England in 1553 and 1554, though her warrants suggest that this is a mistaken identification of gowns with matching – rather than contrasting – partlets.\textsuperscript{30} Partlets often had intricately embroidered linings, and Mary received a number of wrought partlets as gifts, together with similarly decorated sleeves, in the late 1530s and early 1540s.\textsuperscript{31} Those which she ordered for herself in 1554 and 1557 were exclusively made of fustian and lined with paste buckram, a substance which lent considerable stiffness to the partlet, indicating its use in the standing collars prevalent in the portraits and miniatures of the time.

\textsuperscript{26} Anderson, \textit{Spanish Costume}, 181.
\textsuperscript{27} Mid 496, Item 14: linen for Margaret Willoughby for partlets.
\textsuperscript{28} Anderson, \textit{Spanish Costume}, 181.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 182.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 203, 205.
\textsuperscript{31} MPP, Folio 82b (four examples).
Spanish women’s gowns were long enough to cover the feet completely, which led to consternation on the parts of Philip’s Spanish retinue when they arrived in England. English round gowns (i.e., without trains) generally ended an inch or two above the floor, as described in a letter from one of Philip’s attendants: “they wear black stockings and show their legs up to the knee when walking. As their skirts are not long they are passably immodest when walking, and even when seated.”

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, when Catherine of Aragon moved to England, standard Spanish female gowns were full and pleated, reminding English observers of male overgowns:

> her gown very large, bothe the slevys and also the body with many plightes, moch litche unto menys clothyng; and aftir the same fourme the remenant of the ladies of Hispayne were arayed; and beneth her wastes certayn rownde hopys beryng owte ther gownes from ther bodies aftir their countray maner.

Those “rownde hopys” were the farthingales, already popular in Spain, and which would become standard wear in England by the 1540s.

By mid-century, the Spanish gown had shifted into a dress style called a saya, a gown with a fitted bodice and a sewn-on skirt attached at the natural waistline. These snug-fitting gowns were reminiscent of men's gowns from the late fifteenth century, which included skirts sewn on at the waistline rather than being cut in contiguous vertical pieces (see Figure 12, Appendix D). Sayas were worn with stomachers, neckbands, separate sleeves, and foreparts, as well as something called a ruedo (“a foot”). This was a hem

---

section, possibly guarded with a wide band of contrasting fabric. Underneath the saya, women wore a *cota*, which was an underdress of some form. Few descriptions and no depictions exist, and while some are described as including a bodice and sleeves, others appear to be only a skirt. This is likely analogous to the northern kirtle, which itself eventually transitioned into the paired upper bodies and petticoat. The *saya corta* (“short gown”) had no direct contemporary analogue in northern dress, but may be seen reflected in the jackets which became popular at the end of the sixteenth century in England. The *saya corta* was looser than the saya, and when worn over a skirt or *saya alta* gave the impression of a peplumed waistcoat. The *ropa* was a full-length overcoat or overgown which reached the floor, and opened down centre front (see Figure 13, Appendix D). This may have begun as an outdoor garment or mantle of some form, similar in many ways to the English loose or “turkey” gowns.

The fashion for women’s clothing in England in the sixteenth century comprised a series of layers, culminating in an outer gown. The smock, a garment made of linen, was worn closest to the skin. It was usually embroidered around the neck and cuffs, with long sleeves that came down to the wrist. Over this a lady wore her farthingale, a hooped skirt which held out the fabric of the upper layers, a petticoat, a kirtle, and a pair of matching sleeves (see Figure 14, Appendix D). Over top of all of this came the gown, in one of a variety of styles. The Venetian ambassador Giacomo Soranzo remarked upon the most prevalent fashions of the time in 1554:

---

34 Anderson, *Spanish Costume*, 201.
[Mary’s] garments are of two sorts; the one, a gown, such as men wear, but fitting very close, with an under-petticoat which has a very long train and this is her ordinary costume, being also that of the gentlewomen of England. The other garment is a gown and boddice, with wide hanging sleeves (con le maniche larghe rovesciate) in the French fashion, which she wears on State occasions, and she also wears much embroidery, and gowns and mantles of cloth of gold, and cloth of silver of great value, and changes every day. She also makes great use of jewels, wearing them both on her chaperon, and round her neck, and as trimming for her gowns, in which jewels she delights greatly.\(^{37}\)

These comments describe quite accurately both a loose gown worn over a trained French kirtle, in the former, and a French gown over a round kirtle (i.e, trainless) in the latter.

The loose gown was inspired by eastern coats and caftans, as was the Turkey gown which appeared in the late 1540s and the Spanish ropa.

Gowns were the primary article in Mary’s wardrobe, and seven styles appear in her records, three of them comprising the bulk of her wardrobe. French gowns, loose gowns and nightgowns are the most common, with a handful of instances of Spanish gowns or gowns of other forms with Spanish style detailing.\(^ {38}\) Of the fifty-four gowns purchased by Mary between April 1554 and October 1558, twenty-seven are loose gowns, generally made of damask, velvet or satin, heavy fabrics with a rich hand and luxurious drape (see Table 5, page 97). The proportion of loose gowns rises as Mary ages, as all forms of tight-bodied gowns vanish entirely from the 1558 warrants. One major benefit of loose gowns over the French gowns is that they could be worn with less restrictive undergarments, and so perhaps provided a greater level of comfort as Mary’s health

\(^{37}\) CSP Venice, Vol. 5. 533.

\(^{38}\) A night gown in this era meant a loose, lined overgown, usually fur-lined, worn by both men and women; it did not refer to sleepwear, for which there was no special clothing. See Hayward, KH8, 434.
worsened. The English loose gown was based on masculine fashion, cut with straight lines from neck to hem, included full hanging or puffed sleeves, and was often worn open. The body of the loose gown was fuller than the tight-bodied French gowns, opened down the centre front, and was worn over top of French kirtles, which included a train. Excellent examples of the garment can be seen on one of the daughters of Thomas More in Holbein’s study of the More family, and a similar garment with a different sleeve style on Christina of Denmark, in Holbein’s painting from 1538 (See Figures 15 and 16, Appendix D).

The second most common garment after the gowns was the kirtle, an underlayer usually visible at the hem, neckline and sometimes through the open-fronted skirts of the gowns. Kirtles were almost invariably made as a set with matching sleeves, which were attached to the body of the kirtle with ribbon points, a method which allowed them to be detachable for cleaning. Two main styles of kirtle are evident in the warrants: the majority the French kirtle, a snug-bodied underdress with matching sleeves, and a train of varying lengths. The round kirtle, based on yardage required, was more than likely trainless, the hem being the same length all around the body of the gown. Foreparts were made separately from the kirtles, though the disparity in numbers – five foreparts between 1554 and 1558 – suggests that they were not required to be part of a matching set: either kirtles could be worn without foreparts on top, or one forepart could be used with various kirtles, depending on the effect desired.

---

39 Arnold, QEU, 139.
40 Ibid., 114.
Beneath the kirtle, a series of structural layers gave shape to gowns. Petticoats, separate skirts suspended from stiffened minimalist bodices called upper bodies, were worn both for warmth and for added fullness beneath a gown. Petticoats were not meant to be seen, at this stage in fashion, and Mary’s – indeed, all of her recorded undergarments – were made of scarlet or crimson satin. Four of the eleven petticoats known to have been owned by the queen between 1554 and 1558 were made from scarlet, lined with taffeta and in one case, linen. One luxurious example was trimmed with red velvet. Red was believed to be a colour which promoted health in the wearer, and red petticoats, waistcoats, poultices and bed-hangings, among other things, were used to ward off illness.41 Beneath the petticoat Mary wore a farthingale, sometimes of taffeta and sometimes satin.42

A great deal of embroidery appears in the descriptions of English clothing, generally applied to the fabric of the garment prior to the cutting stage during construction. The embroidered bands and guards found on some of Mary’s gowns, together with the intricately embroidered sleeves which she received as gifts, suggest a dramatic decorative element that is not always fully apparent in the limited descriptions available in the warrants. The laces which were applied on top as decoration were not the lace made from white linen or silk openwork, as seventeenth-century lace would become, but rather strips woven from threads of gold, silver and coloured silk, including russet and purple.43 Cord and braid could also be called lace, and would look quite different than the white frills expected by the modern eye. The inventory of 1599 cited by Janet Arnold adds fuller

41 Mikhalia & Malcolm-Davies, Tudor Tailor, 40 – 41.
42 Alcega, Tailor's Pattern Book 1589, 7; Arnold, QEU, 196.
43 E101/427/11 f. 34 Item 102, for example: “riche lase of purple silk and gold.”
descriptions of some of the garments, including many with extensive metal thread embroidery as well as jewelled and embroidered decorations. Mary’s earlier gowns are more heavily decorated than her later ones, suggesting a retreat to a simplicity in style and in quantity of garments ordered.

French styles were extremely influential in defining English court dress, especially during the reign of Henry VIII. French dress appears in descriptions of English ladies throughout the first half of the sixteenth century, worn by the elite even at the utmost of state occasions. Raviglio Rosso described Mary’s wedding gown as being “in the French style in a garment of rich brocaded velvet with a long train, covered in huge pearls and the most spectacular diamonds. The turned-back lining of the sleeves was of cloth-of-gold adorned with more pearls and diamonds.” As Sorenzo noted in 1554, Mary made consistent use of French styles on public occasions: “a gown and bodice with wide hanging sleeves in the French fashion, which she wears on State occasions.” French gowns, of which Mary purchased at least twenty during her reign as queen, were tight-bodied gowns made generally of velvet, taffeta or satin, as well as tissue – a heavy form of cloth of gold or silver. French gowns were often described as having “pull outs” of sarcenet in the sleeves, while loose gowns were more likely to have the upper sleeves and foresleeves designated separately, and with separate textiles for the linings. Carter suggests that French kirtles were designed to be worn beneath loose gowns, but the

---

45 Hayward, *KH8*, 11.
47 CSP Venice, 532.
number of pairs of sleeves made for the French kirtles and separately for the loose gowns
suggests that the two garments were not a matched set – the foresleeves of a loose gown
would necessarily cover the fancy worked sleeves associated with the French kirtles,
making one or the other pair redundant.

The bulk of Mary’s French gowns were purchased in 1554 and 1557, with none listed in
the warrants for 1558. Alison Carter suggests that this might have been due to Mary’s
aging body and her levels of comfort, though it is likely, given the importance placed on
dress and dress styles, that there is more to it than that.49 The warrant for April 1557
included one Spanish gown: “a Spanishe gowne of blacke vellvett bordered with
buckram, the upper sleves lyned with frieze, and a stay of white fustian and bagges of
blacke satten.”50 The gown matches the ropa worn by Mary in the Eworth portrait of
1557, a garment nearly identical in detail to the masculine saya worn by Philip in a
similar portrait dating back to 1553 (see Figures 17 & 18, Appendix D).51 Gowns with
Spanish detailing, specifically the welts used to decorate hems and sleeves, appear on the
September 1557 and October 1558 warrants as well, as “a Loose gowne of Russett Satten
garded with two Spanyshe gardes of Blacke veluett,”52 “a nyghte gowne of black
Damaske with Spannyshe weltes,” and “a Lowse gowne of Russett Taffeta garded with
three Spanyshe weltes.”53 Another gown appears on the October 1558 warrant as “a
Louse gowne of Blacke Taffeta welsed with Blacke Velvet and Purled Lace,” which

49 Ibid.
51 Ibid., 38 – 39.
52 LC 5/31 ff. 75-79, Item 17.
while not specifically listed as Spanish, fit the general description. That same year, Mary provided Spanish welted gowns for both Katherine Grey and Jane Seymour as gifts.

While Catherine of Aragon brought Spanish fashion to England with her in 1501, and the farthingale had become an integral part of English style by the 1540s, the fashions of the Iberian peninsula did not take hold in England immediately. Maria Hayward notes that an ambassador present in 1515 described Catherine of Aragon as “richly dressed in the Spanish fashion,” apparently a reasonably common choice for Henry VIII’s first queen in her early years, who preferred, even after fourteen years of life in England, to converse in Spanish. By the time of her marriage to Henry VIII, Catherine was ordering gowns primarily in non-Spanish styles, however, a concession to her new homeland and station. Even as her wardrobe filled with gowns in the English and French styles, Catherine was known to choose Spanish clothing for particular events and specifically political purposes, donning a Spanish-style headdress and a St. George medallion (patron saint of Aragon as well as symbol of the English knights of the garter) for an appearances at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. Catherine also gave Henry VIII clothing in the

54 Ibid., Item 10.
55 Ibid., Items 25 – 27.
57 Maria Hayward, “Spanish Princess or Queen of England? The Image, Identity and Influence of Catherine of Aragon at the Courts of Henry VII and Henry VIII” Unpublished conference paper. (My thanks to Dr. Hayward for sharing a copy of her paper prior to publication.) 5.
59 Ibid., 15.
Spanish style, including some shirts and cloaks of Spanish work. A few items made in the Spanish style appear in Henry VIII’s own purchase records, but they did not make up a large percentage of his wardrobe.\(^{60}\)

Tracing the evolution of Mary’s wardrobe as she moved from princess to queen is illuminating. Her use of clothing appears to mirror that of her mother in that she chose and wore specific nationally-identified garments and styles to specific purpose at key moments. An anonymous portrait of a girl identified as Mary Tudor, currently in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris, purports to show the princess in Spanish fashion, her gown decorated with aglets, slashed and puffed shoulders through which her chemise can be seen, her hair dressed down around her ears in the Spanish fashion, and with a distinctive side-cap, caul and opaque partlet (see Figure 18, Appendix D). The portrait of a young pre-teen or teen, if it is the princess as suggested, would most likely have been painted between 1522 and 1526, while she was engaged to Charles V. The facial features, age and general appearance of the girl in the Spanish portrait correlate very closely to an portrait by Lucas Horenbout known to be that of the young princess (see Figure 1), which shows her in a French gown and was also painted during that four-year span. This Spanish image stands in dramatic contrast to both the Horenbout and Master John portraits, which depict Mary as the idealized English lady. No clothing records appear to have survived from the 1530s, but by the 1540s, of the few items with a style recorded, the bulk are already French and loose gowns, with an anomalous Dutch gown making an

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 20 – 21.
appearance in 1547.\textsuperscript{61} Mary received a gift of a dozen pairs of Spanish gloves from "A duchess in Spayne" in 1544, but while the records include references to “pullers out for an Italian gown” in 1542,\textsuperscript{62} there are no other Spanish references in that decade.\textsuperscript{63} Some portraits of English ladies from the 1540s show garments with a high collar similar to those found on Spanish gowns, but these are more properly identified with the loose gowns common to English inventories.

By 1554 Mary’s warrants show no such Spanish influence remaining. Wardrobe accounts from the first year of her reign include orders for Spanish lace, a kind of openwork decorative trim, but no garments fitting the descriptions of Spanish garments. Given the influence of her mother on English court fashion, including the popularity of cloaks and eventually of farthingales, the lack of Spanish fashions in the 1554 wardrobe records is intriguing. Mary’s embrace of English style in 1553 and 1554 suggests a deliberate if temporary rejection of Spanish clothing while she worked to establish her legitimacy before a primarily English audience.

Comments made by detractors, including John Knox, illustrate the importance of this emphasis on Englishness, as the new queen’s parentage and semi-foreign ancestry provided them with material to use against her in their polemic. In 1554’s \textit{Faithful Admonition to the Professors of God’s Truth in England}, a reaction to the Spanish match, Knox wrote that “Who seeth not nowe, that she [Mary] in all her doynges declareth moste

\begin{footnotes}
\item[61] E101/424 7, f. 5, Item 7.
\item[62] MPP, Fol 82.
\item[63] MPP, Fol. 124 b.
\end{footnotes}
manyfestylye, that vnder an Englyshe name she beareth a Spaniardes herte.”

Even the symbolism during the pageants upon Mary and Philip’s official royal entry into London two weeks after their marriage made much of the fact that both Philip and Mary were descended from Edward III. That descent made Philip a legitimate royal son of England, a point better suited to the sensibilities of the moment than making an equivalent connection to Mary’s status as the daughter of a Spanish infanta.

Whatever level of popularity Spanish fashions enjoyed during Henry VIII’s reign, all but the farthingale had vanished by the time of Mary’s accession. Philip’s Spanish entourage was dismayed by the sartorial style on display when they arrived, one anonymous letter-writer commenting acerbically:

The women here do not wear the hoods and veils so common in Spain, but walk about town uncovered and even travel in the same way, though some of them, when abroad in London, cover their faces with veils like those worn at home by nuns who wish not to be seen. All the women wear short skirts, and most of them very tight fitting black stockings and slashed shoes like the men’s; indeed they dress in a manner which I am unable to approve of, and I do not think any Spaniard would differ from me.

Mary herself was dressing in English style at this point, as shown by the wardrobe accounts as well as observations from contemporaries. Ruy Gomez de Silva, Philip’s

---

64 John Knox, *A faythfull admonition made by Iohn Knox, vnto the professours of Gods truthe in England whereby thou mayest learne howe God wyll haue his Churche exercised with troubles, and how he defendeth it in the same*. Imprynted at Kalykow [i.e. Emden : By Egidius van der Erve], the 20. daye of Julij. 1554. 56.


66 A letter from a gentleman in Philip’s retinue, 2 October, 1554. CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 61. (Most likely the same sender as 17 August, same year.)
close friend and advisor, noted in a letter to Charles V’s secretary a few days after the
entourage arrived in England: “The Princess of Portugal sent the Queen a fine present of
dresses and coifs, and the Queen has not yet finished looking at them and rejoicing over
them. I believe that if she dressed in our fashions she would not look so old and
flabby.”67

Entwhistle suggests that Mary and Philip’s marriage subsequently encouraged all
England to join in the continental embrace of Hapsburg style, linking that new, more
formal and elaborate fashion sense to the Counter-Reformation. Her argument that the
marriage ensured Spanish fashion’s “widespread adoption,” however, is put into doubt by
a letter from Annibale Litolfi in 1557 which describes English style in that year as much
the same as when the Spanish first arrived:

The costume of the female nobility is almost in the French fashion, but the others differ most especially in dressing their heads, which they cover, even below the ears, with linen cloth, over which they wear a coif or cap of white woollen cloth, either round or triangular, or else they wear a large hat of shaggy velvet.68

Nothing described in that letter is analogous to Spanish garments, despite, intriguingly, a
series of portraits of noble women wearing Spanish ropas and similar English loose
gowns (see, for example, Figure 19, Appendix D). Mary’s digressions back into Spanish
style in early 1557 – and possibly late 1556, as the warrant covers the months from
October to the following April – were nonetheless unusual, by English standards, despite
Hapsburg influence on the continent. Alison Carter’s suggestion that the marriage was

67 Ruy Gomez de Silva to Francisco de Eraso, 29 July 1554. CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 6.
68 Annibale Litolfi to Guglielmo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, 20 June 1557. CSP Venice,
Vol. 6, Part 3, Item 171. 1670.
influential in Mary’s particular case is certainly plausible, and it is to an exploration of the motivations behind those discrepancies that this study turns.\textsuperscript{69}

\textbf{Mary and Philip, England and Spain}

Legal issues would have accompanied Mary’s marriage irrespective of the nationality of her bridegroom. Her position as a regnant queen was unprecedented in English history. Her coronation ceremony made it clear that she intended to attempt to straddle that line between king and queen, between ruler and ruled, and yet the matter of her legal status after marriage still remained unclear. Under the laws and customs of the land, particularly that of coverture, a woman suffered civil death upon marriage, her property and legal identity largely subsumed into that of her husband. Marriage for a queen regnant created conflict between her individual right to rule, and her legally required submission to her husband.\textsuperscript{70} More than that, a husband’s honour depended on his ability to effect that domination and his wife’s submission.\textsuperscript{71} The key question was the definition of the monarchy itself: was it an estate, which could be passed along to her spouse, or a title, which was non-transitive? Mary and Philip’s marriage contract was drawn up in such a way as to ensure a clean division between her roles as wife and as monarch. The solution rested on the notion of the queen’s two bodies – the body politic and the body natural – which gave her leeway to extend her public role as monarch when

\textsuperscript{69} Carter, \textit{Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe}, 9.
\textsuperscript{70} Mendelson and Crawford, \textit{Women in Early Modern England}, 350.
necessary, to avoid conflict with her private role as Philip’s bride.\textsuperscript{72} In some respects marrying a foreign prince was likely Mary’s best option, the negotiations giving her an opportunity to set out her own requirements in an acceptable way. Marrying a Spanish prince, moreover, gave her access to precedent which he would have been able to accept: Mary and Philip’s contract was based on that struck between Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon in 1469, which also drew firm lines between the responsibilities of the respective reigning monarchs.\textsuperscript{73}

The result of the negotiations was that Philip was asked to make a great many more concessions than Mary (including giving up Doña Ana, his mistress of ten years, not a formal part of the contract but implied nevertheless).\textsuperscript{74} The English council’s attempt to redefine the nature of monarchy in response to the gender ‘problem’ left Philip – and Spain – in an awkward position. Philip held an extremely anomalous position, reinforced by English actions intended to elevate Mary and minimize English concerns about foreign invasion. Reports from members of the Spanish retinue displayed dissatisfaction with the way in which this new status of prince consort was implemented. Issues arose immediately with the way in which the households were to be constructed, especially over the question of whether Spanish or English lords should be permitted to serve the new king. Within four days of the wedding, Simon Renard was already writing home to inform the Emperor that “[t]he Spanish lords are losing their temper and talking of

\textsuperscript{72} Mendelson and Crawford, \textit{Women in Early Modern England}, 353.
\textsuperscript{73} Jansen, \textit{The Monstrous Regiment of Women}, 13.
\textsuperscript{74} Edward Grierson, \textit{King of Two Worlds: Philip II of Spain}. London: Collins, 1974. 43.
returning to Spain.”75 A large part of that discomfort was the lack of deference that, the Spanish retinue felt, was being given to Philip by the English. Rather than being greeted as their king as expected, he had been placed on Mary’s right hand at their wedding, given the queen’s quarters at court, served off of silver plate while the queen ate from gold,76 and while his name was placed on all proclamations, he was barred by the marriage treaty from making decisions with regards to English affairs:

\[Y\]et he should permit and suffer [Mary] to haue the whole disposition of all benefices, offices, lands, reuennes, and fruits of the said realmes and dominions, and that the same should be bestowed vpon such as were hir naturall borne subiects, and that all matters of the said realmes and dominions should be treated and handled in the same toongs, wherein of old they haue béene woont to be treated.77

While Philip’s letters and those of his advisors displayed their discomfort with these arrangements, his outward behaviour was beyond reproach; contemporary reports describe Philip as acting carefully and diplomatically in the carrying out of his duty.78 By all indications he was not in love with Mary, while she appeared to be infatuated with him. Philip returned to the continent in August 1555, following the failure of Mary’s first suspected pregnancy. He assumed the title of King of Spain following his father’s abdication in October 1555, and by spring of 1556 Mary was writing to him and to Charles V, begging for her husband’s return.79

75 CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 3. Item 5.
76 Grierson, King of Two Worlds, 44 – 45.
78 Grierson, King of Two Worlds, 45 – 46.
79 Ibid., 55.
All these factors together made a new legal situation even more difficult to negotiate, and Mary’s compensatory tactics changed over the course of the next four years. At the beginning of the marriage it appears that Mary set out to reinforce her English identity, building on her previous use of symbols and semiotics related to the previous Tudor courts. She emphasized and reiterated her right to the English throne by embracing the Henrician roots of her heritage and not overtly discussing or reminding others of her Spanish mother.\footnote{Russell, “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins,” 267.} When in the midst of marriage negotiations with Charles V and Philip, Mary played on general belief in female ‘weakness’ to raise doubts about political security if she caved in to demands from the pope and the Hapsburgs. In so doing, she was able to win more concessions than might have been otherwise possible.\footnote{Ibid., 272.} In England, Mary appointed a handful of her father’s surviving advisors to her council, and then set Parliament up to take the blame for certain decisions that she may have preferred to avoid.\footnote{Mason and Paget, Gardiner, Heath and Thirlby. Russell, “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins,” 269.} She used the displeasure of “the realm” as a convenient excuse when avoiding Philip’s repeated requests for a coronation despite the new coin which appeared to give him that desired status, showed a floating crown surmounting both Mary and Philip’s heads, his bust in the dominant place on the same coin, and his name appearing before Mary’s on official documents.\footnote{Richards, “Sole Quene,” 920, also see Loades.} The no-coronation decision fit with an act of parliament made in 1554, which stated that “the Regall power of thyse realme is in the Quenes Majestie as fully and absolutely as ever it was in anye of her mooste nobl progenytors
kynges of this Realme." That act ratified her status as a political male, a king in her own right who could then, despite Mary’s staged protests to the contrary, decide on her own – as Henry VII had delayed the coronation of Elizabeth of York – whether or not to crown her consort, and when.

Magdalena Sanchez suggests that Mary’s apparent deference to the council, and to Charles in earlier letters, was neither weak nor neurotic, but deliberate and calculated for specific effect. Mary’s surviving correspondence bears that out. Her letters vary considerably in tone depending on the audience, those of January 1554 to the earl of Sussex and the general nobility written in a commanding and authoritative voice. That tone is vastly different from her earlier correspondence with Cromwell in 1538, and then later with Philip and Charles V in 1554 and thereafter. Here, Mary’s language is submissive and conciliatory, containing multiple references to “my simple wit” and “the frailty of my youth” as means of blunting any force behind her petitions and requests. Intriguingly, this is not the tone she took in her surviving letters to Edward VI during his years on the throne; her letters to him, while respectful, show none of the deference present in her communications with her father, his representative, her husband or father in law. Like Margaret Beaufort, Mary appeared to be working with the belief that an appeal to feminine weakness would make her decisions and petitions more acceptable,

---

softening orders that might otherwise have been taken poorly.\textsuperscript{86} This deflection on Mary’s part, while it ensured her ability to accomplish matters behind the scenes, did not generate the hoped-for reaction from some quarters.\textsuperscript{87} Rather than seeming to be the dutiful wife, Mary appeared to a few vocal critics to be acting as a traitor, giving over leadership of England to Spain. Had she tried the same tactics with an English husband, reactions might well have been very different.

The presence of a Catholic and Spanish prince in England had been the trigger for conflict even before his arrival. Philip’s presence in England was a new opportunity to correct that first impression, and enabled Mary to attempt to incorporate him into her English milieu in a concrete way. There are indications that she tried to effect this transformation of the Prince of Spain and King of Naples into a King of England, through standard mechanisms of enfolding and incorporation. Like the Marquis dressing Patient Griselda, Mary attempted, through gifts of clothing and jewellery, to act as the male spouse and dress her ‘bride’ to incorporate him into her household and family.\textsuperscript{88} By providing her husband with clothing to wear, she demonstrated an intent to control and connect with his physical form. An annotated inventory of the gifts given to Philip by Mary, written shortly after her death, includes eleven individual medallions bearing the likeness of St. George, the patron saint of both England and Aragon. Philip’s notes on the inventory indicate that “[o]f these, some were given to me by the Queen, and I bought

\textsuperscript{86} Magdalena S. Sánchez. The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun: Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. 132-133.

\textsuperscript{87} Green, Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies, Vol. 3, 285-287.

\textsuperscript{88} The Clerk’s Tale, Chaucer. See Jones and Stallybrass, Materials of Memory, 220-228.
others,” suggesting an acceptance of Mary’s intent in her original gifts: not only would he wear the symbol that they shared, he purchased more of the same of his own volition.\(^\text{89}\)

As with Catherine of Aragon wearing a jewel of St. George to the Field of the Cloth of Gold, these jewels marked the union of Spain and England in a very visible way.

Also on that list were clothes made in the English fashion, including “[a] velvet cap, also given to his Majesty by the Queen, with its stones and pearls and a bonnet with a little chain and a medal with diamonds and rubies, and white plumes.” Philip annotates that entry with the following: “This was sent to me by the Queen in the house where I spent the night before entering London, and I wore it on my head on that occasion.”\(^\text{90}\) Also on that list, aside from the various robes of stage for Parliament and the Order of the Golden Fleece, was a pair of notes describing robes sent to Philip for his use on their wedding day (italics indicate annotations made in Philip’s hand):

A French robe of cloth of gold adorned with crimson velvet and thistles of curled gold, lined in crimson satin, with twelve buttons made of four pearls each on each sleeve, making twenty-four in all. \textit{I wore this at my wedding, and the Queen sent it to me for that purpose.}

Another French robe of cloth of gold, with the roses of England and pomegranates embroidered on it, adorned with drawn gold beads and seed pearls. The sleeves carry eighteen buttons, nine on each, made of table diamonds. The lining is of purple satin. \textit{This was given to me by the Queen for me to wear on our wedding day in the afternoon, but I do not think I wore it because it seemed to me ornate.}\(^\text{91}\)

\(^{89}\) Late November, 1558. CSP Spain vol. 13. 441 – 442. The purchases lead to a question regarding which of the St. Georges – those given to Philip or those he purchased himself – he wore, and on which occasions, but that will have to be left for a later time.

\(^{90}\) Late November, 1558. CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 442.

\(^{91}\) Ibid.
On Philip’s first and most important public appearance in England – more important in hindsight due to the lack of coronation ceremony for him – he was to appear in clothing chosen by his bride, made in a style commonly worn in England, already having been decorated with garter and St. George by the earl of Arundel. The symbolism of this cannot be understated, especially when combined with the emphasis on his distant English heritage in the processional pageants displayed before the new couple of that day. Philip was taking on the role of the dressed and subsumed, visibly joining the affinity of his English wife. An image of the royal pair on the Easter roll for 1556 emphasized this blend, as it depicted the king and queen, Mary on the dominant right, both in a blend of

These correspond with two items from Mary’s wardrobe warrant from October, 1554: E101/427/11, f 38, Items 64 and 65. The descriptions in the warrants are extremely similar to the descriptions from Philip’s list, including a few specifications on materials: "a Gowne for his Maiestie of purple tissue lined with purple Satten and with a (border of) purple Satten enbrauderid with purle and damaske golde of our store"; and "another Gowne for his saide Maiestie of crymsen tissue raized w[ith] vellat and passamaine lace of golde (about it) of our store, lined with crymsen Satten."

Intriguingly, a description of Philip and Mary on their way to bed on their wedding night includes the following: “The King had on the cloak sent to him by the Queen, who was dressed in a robe ; both wore great quantities of jewellery.” Though no other description is included, making it impossible to know whether this meant the red robe he wore to the ceremony, or the supposedly rejected ornate purple robe. (CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 11, author unknown: “A letter relating Philip's voyage to England and marriage”)

92 “A rich garter, with two large faceted diamonds, a large pearl, five flat diamonds set in a rose pattern, twelve flat rubies round the garter, set two by two, and twenty-four pearls set two by two. The Earl of Arundel attached this to my leg on board ship at Southampton. A chain of fifty-eight links, each link carrying diamonds or rubies, two stones on each, together with a St. George in armour made of diamonds, and the dragon formed by a pearl. The Earl of Arundel hung this round my neck on the same occasion.” Late November, 1558. CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 441.
English and Spanish clothing. It appeared, near the end of their reign, as though that tactic had brought about some of Mary’s desired effect. Despite his frequent and lengthy absences, Philip seemed to be generally accepted in a way that his personal retinue had not. Giovanni Michiel, the Venetian ambassador to England, sent a lengthy report to the Venetian senate on 13 May 1557. In it, he described the English reactions to Philip as follows:

he is not only popular And universally beloved, but even longed for, most especially if the Spaniards who surround him could be got rid of, as they are feared, and consequently hated, from the dread the English have of their altering the King’s nature and custom, and turning him aside from his present mode of proceeding.

Mary’s acts of incorporation and Philip’s care not to usurp her authority had served to differentiate him from the rest of his countrymen, bringing him closer into the fold of England. That campaign of incorporation had begun in full force with Mary and Philip’s wedding, on 25 July 1554.

The wedding was a spectacular event, and as he was never given a coronation, the most important ceremony in which Philip would ever participate in England. Raviglio Rosso described Mary as having dressed for the wedding “in the French style in a garment of rich brocaded velvet with a long train, covered in huge pearls and the most spectacular diamonds. The turned-back lining of the sleeves was of cloth-of-gold adorned with more pearls and diamonds.” Muñoz confirmed the description in his own reports, noting that “[t]he queen wore a garment of black velvet embroidered with gold, with many beautiful

93 Sharpe, Selling the Tudor Monarchy, 275.
94 CSP Venice, Vol. 3. 1066.
95 Rosso 66, quoted and translated in Carter, Mary Tudor’s Wardrobe, 29, 64.
stones.” These outfits are echoed in a portrait of the royal pair painted – not from life – in 1558, in which bride and groom mirror each other in pose and costume, the gold standing out against the black velvet in ample demonstration of luxury, unity and equal power (Figure 7, Appendix D).

As with linen shirts, as discussed previously in chapter three, there is no evidence of Mary ordering or fashioning any inner garments for her husband. Dress diplomacy, the act of exchanging garments and lengths of textiles as part of building a diplomatic relationship, was well known and commonly practised in the early modern era, as seen with the gifts of clothing to Mary from the Princess of Portugal, Henry VIII’s gifts of matching clothing to his French counterpart Francis I in 1520, and a similar exchange with Charles V in 1522. In all these cases, the garments given between monarchs were outer garments, meant to be publicly visible and as such, convey a particular message about the giver, receiver, and the relationship between them. Henry VIII’s arrangements to appear at treaty events in clothing that matched those of his fellow monarchs were designed to create an even playing field, and visibly identify the men as a distinct class of person, distinct from everyone else surrounding them.

Dress diplomacy at the royal level was most commonly practised between monarchs of the same gender, as with Henry VIII, Francis II and Charles V. The elite across Europe and into the east used outer clothing and jewellery as political tools, both internally and
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Clothing gifts between married couples, even royal ones, generally took on a different overtone. The socially acceptable procedure was for husbands to purchase items of clothing for their wives, and by so doing, have a hand in creating the latter’s sartorial – and therefore public – identities. Henry VIII’s official new year’s gifts to his wives had been formal, including display items such as “a faier standing cupp of golde garnished with Diamountes and perles,” or an elaborate table-fountain. His privy purse records, on the other hand, recorded long lists of materials and garments ordered both for his queens and for his children. This responsibility for outfitting his household and family was appropriate for both father and king.

By contrast, Mary played the role of the dominant spouse, providing Philip with robes to be worn at their wedding, as well as jewels and accessories meant for display. Her mother had given gifts of clothing to Henry VIII, as noted in the gift rolls, showing that queens consort giving garments to kings regnant was not unusual, though a non-reciprocal arrangement was considered more problematic. That Catherine gave gifts of clothing to Henry would have been entirely unremarkable, as he of necessity provided the funds for her household and ordered clothing for her as any good husband ought. For a wife to dress her husband was far more problematic; the concept was used to make Mrs. Ott an object of scorn in Ben Jonson’s *Epicoene* in 1609. The notion of a woman “allowing” her husband access to material goods, including a long list of garments, was introduced in order to denigrate the character of the husband and wife together as rude mechanicals,
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worthy only of the “greasy buff-doublet” in which the husband was clothed before becoming the recipient of his wife’s uncouth generosity.\textsuperscript{101}

Philip does not appear to have given many gifts to his wife, except a ruby which Mary had set into a ring. His best-known gift was an engagement gift of an extremely large pearl, now known as “La Peregrina,” which she wore constantly. That pearl and the brooch to which it was attached became an icon with which Mary has been permanently associated.\textsuperscript{102} Philip’s father gave Mary far more jewelery than ever came from her husband, as mentioned in her will:

\begin{quote}
...a table dyamond which the [e]mperours Majesty, his and my most honourable Father, sent unto me by the Cont degment, at the insurance of my sayde lorde and busbande, and also one other table dyamonde whiche his Majesty sent unto me by the marques de les Nanes, and the Coler of golde set with nyne dyamonds, the whiche his Majestye gave me the Epiphanie after our Maryage, also the rubie now sett in a Golde ryng which his Highnesse sent me by the Cont of Feria.\textsuperscript{103}
\end{quote}

Lacking evidence from gift rolls between 1544 and 1555, as well as any extant privy purse records, it appears that Philip’s primary gifts to Mary were of jewels, and not of clothing. The Spanish-style clothing she owned as queen, unlike that owned by Henry VIII before her, was entirely of her own purchase.


\textsuperscript{102} So much so that older drawings were redone, adding in the jewel for identification purposes, even when the original had been created too early for the jewel to be in her possession – see the sketch and painted versions of ‘King Henry and his children’, Figure 20, Appendix D.

Rather than subsuming Philip into England and under England’s protection, Mary found herself in a position where she was both king and queen, but her husband was not fully either. Philip’s discontent with the position in which he had been placed seemed to express itself through his lengthy absences from England, as well as the mistresses he kept on the continent. Mary’s reaction appears to have been to emphasize the official connections between the two realms and then, in the absence of Philip in the flesh, to take portions of that Spanish identity upon herself. At approximately the same point as Philip absented himself from England for the first long stretch of time, Mary’s political tactics began to change.

Mary Sans Philip, Spain in England

1555 was a transitional year for Mary, though not for reasons that many had anticipated. The unfortunate revelation of a nonexistent pregnancy and the problem of Mary’s life-long ill-health were factors on everyone’s mind. Elizabeth Russell suggests that Mary’s reign became a “lame duck regime” at this point, Mary no longer able to command respect in the same way she previously had. This argument leaves a great number of factors up to the vagaries of fate, and Russell identifies some of the same political delaying tactics used by both Mary and Elizabeth as weak or indecisive when

105 Russell, “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins.” Mary’s watershed moment is the end of the pregnancy in 1555 and Philip’s subsequent abandonment.
107 Russell, “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins.” 264.
used by Mary, but praiseworthy when applied to her successor. While there was a change in Mary’s policy and interactions in 1555, there was more taking place than a reaction to fertility problems. Philip’s absence created a void in the construction of the English/Spanish alliance that needed to be rectified in order to keep Mary’s plans for her kingdom on track, and to keep alive any last lingering hopes for a Catholic heir.

Around the time of her marriage, as Sharpe notes in his discussion of her portraiture, Mary flirted with portrayal of herself as a typical Hapsburg bride. The Anthonis Mor portrait (Figure 21, Appendix D) was a stylistic departure from other Tudor portraits, and is much closer in style to portraits of other Hapsburg brides. Mary’s seated posture showed a break from the full-front standing poses she otherwise favoured. Mary is seated and her features are realistically done and picked out with very dramatic use of lighting and shade (chiaroscuro), unlike the iconographic images of her father and sister. Mor arrived with Philip in the summer of 1554, and may well have painted Mary in a style with which her husband was familiar as a gift to him.

While she began her reign visually presenting herself as a proper English queen, the introduction of the Spanish alliance required a reconfiguration of that self-presentation in order to better incorporate Philip into the kingdom. Philip’s departure on 29 August 1555 necessitated changing strategy, from casting Philip as an involved and integrated English monarch, to representing both nations within herself. This change, combined with a series of forthright requests and pleas to Philip and Charles V for her husband’s safe return
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from the continent, demonstrate her concern over the state of the kingdom – and the alliance – in Philip’s absence. Even as Mary’s policies towards rebels and heretics became harsher, her letters to Charles indicate the anxiety she seemed to feel surrounding Philip’s return. In May, 1556, two months after the Dudley conspiracy against her throne, she wrote:

> I cannot but deeply feel the solitude in which the King's absence leaves me. As your Majesty well knows, he is the chief joy and comfort I have in this world. Therefore I can only desire that he may return here as soon as the state of affairs permits, and your Majesty will do me the greatest favour by contributing to this.\textsuperscript{110}

Partially intended to work on the men’s egos and partially an honest plea for her supposed partner to return, Mary’s letters return to this theme multiple times:

> Now that June is over and July drawing to an end it would be pleasanter for me to be able to thank your Majesty for sending me back the King, my lord and good husband... However, as your Majesty has been pleased to break your promise in this connection, a promise you made to me regarding the return of the King, my husband, I must perforce be satisfied, although to my unspeakable regret.\textsuperscript{111}

This letter was described in the Spanish calendar of state papers as having been “written in a trembling hand,”\textsuperscript{112} a dramatic note that emphasizes the emotion of the writer. A prayer book of Mary’s, described as “blurred and tear-stained” and with its spine broken in at a spot where it automatically opens to a page with facing prayers – one for the unity

\textsuperscript{110} Mary to the Emperor, May, 1556. CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 267. Item 269.
\textsuperscript{111} Mary to the Emperor, 15 July 1556. CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 271, Item 273.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid.
of the Catholic church and the facing page a prayer for safe delivery of a child – is similarly suggestive of Mary’s state of mind.\textsuperscript{113}

By September of that same year, the tone of Mary’s letters changed to one of resignation:

My desire is that his Highness should be in the place where he may best serve God, and his conscience and mine be at rest. Therefore I leave the choice of this place to your Majesty and his Highness, confessing that you two know better than I how to choose it.\textsuperscript{114}

The years 1555 and 1556 also saw a run of carefully orchestrated and visually powerful propaganda aimed against Mary and the Catholic Counter-Reformation, challenging Mary’s right to rule, her re-legitimization and the validity of her parents’ marriage.\textsuperscript{115} The leaders of the Stafford rebellion in April 1557 drew upon English fears of Spanish invasion to try to raise support to remove Mary from the throne, though the number of rebels was small, and the rebellion failed, as had Wyatt’s before.\textsuperscript{116} Sharpe attributes this failure to the universally acknowledged truth that Mary would have no heirs of her body, and so the succession could be waited out.\textsuperscript{117}

Each of these factors on its own would be ample justification for a change in tactic; together they created a difficult few years for Mary, to which she seems to have responded with a change in her personal representation as well as something of a reversal

\textsuperscript{113} Jean Mary Stone. \textit{The History of Mary I., Queen of England: As Found in the Public Records ...} Sands & co. 1901. 351.
\textsuperscript{114} Mary to the Emperor, CSP Spain Vol. 13. 276. Item 279.
\textsuperscript{115} Sharpe, \textit{Selling the Tudor Monarchy}, 309 – 310.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 314.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.
of her original gentle and maternal demeanour. There are no extant visual records of Mary in 1556 and no wardrobe warrants surviving from that year, but by 1557 Spanish styles had begun to reappear in her possessions and her chosen colour palette had settled on the darkest colours – black and russet – eschewing the brights of the early Tudor courts entirely. Some of her court followed suit, and by 1556 and continuing into the 1560s the short-sleeved Spanish ropas replaced full-sleeved loose gowns in many portraits of the older female elite. Materials ordered by Mary’s wardrobe included “Spanish silke” for surface embroidery, as well as ounces of Spanish lace. Gowns described as Spanish or with Spanish-style decoration and trim were listed in the warrant for April 1557, both for Mary and for two of her ladies. Two gowns are listed specifically labelled as Spanish or with Spanish trimming, one “a Spanishe gowne of blacke vellvett bordered with buckram,” and the other “a Loose gowne of Russett Satten garded with two Spanyshe gardes of blacke vlvett.”

One of the most intriguing pieces of evidence of the shift in Mary’s public presentation comes in the form of a portrait by Hans Eworth, dated to 1557 and discussed briefly above. Two versions of this portrait exist, and in both the original and the copy, Mary is depicted wearing a Spanish ropa, the puffed upper sleeves, non-fitted waistline, tight foresleeves and trim all overtly of Spanish design (see Figure 10, Appendix D). The original Eworth portrait shows the gown trimmed with fur and round buttons, the copy
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trimmed with gold braid and aglets.\textsuperscript{121} The gown matches one ordered in April 1557, during Philip’s last sojourn in England: “a Spanishe gowne of blacke vellvett bordered with buckram, the upper sleves lyned with frieze, and a stay of white fustian and bagges of blacke satten.”\textsuperscript{122} This gown is an almost identical copy of the sayo – man’s gown – worn by Philip in a portrait by Titian, which Charles Hope identifies as the famous portrait sent to Mary in 1553 as part of the marriage negotiations.\textsuperscript{123} While the portrait does not appear in Mary’s post-mortem inventory, it does match that described in Eraso’s letter to Philip from 21 November 1553: “vestido con un sayo aforrado con lobos blancos,” originally and incorrectly translated as “the one in the blue coat with the white

\textsuperscript{121} Roy Strong. "Hans Eworth Reconsidered." \textit{The Burlington Magazine}. 108, no. 758: 222. 1966. 226. Intriguingly, the glove that Mary holds in her right hand in the original portrait has also been removed in the copy, and replaced with a folded letter.

\textsuperscript{122} LC 5/31 ff. 54 – 62, Item 21. The furred garment is the original of the two, as the warrant records payment for the application of sable and squirrel furs to the gown in question: “And also for furrynge of a Spanyshe Gowne of black velvett with twente and three Sable skynnes of our store receved of the said Arthur Sturton and for foure tymber of Calabor to the same gowne.” LC 5/31 ff. 54 – 62, Item 39.

\textsuperscript{123} Charles Hope. “Titian, Philip II and Mary Tudor,” in \textit{England and the Continental Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J.B. Trapp}. Eds. Trapp, J. B., Edward Chaney, and Peter Mack. Woodbridge, Suffolk [England]: Boydell Press, 1990. 59. This portrait became the focus for Mary’s feelings about her husband, as central as it was for her original feelings of love. When it became clear to Mary in early 1556 that Philip did not intend to return soon, according to contemporary testimony, she had his portrait removed from the Privy Chamber:

26 March 1556: “Confession of Thomas White, detailing the progress of the conspiracy. The Queen, on hearing that the King would not return to England for a long time, was in a rage, and caused his picture to be carried out of the Privy Chamber.” CSP Domestic, Vol. 7. 77. Item 37.

31 March 1556: “Item 66. Examination of John Throgmerton. Deposes that there was no oath of secrecy taken by himself or others. He never said the Queen took down King Philip's picture, and kicked it out of the Privy Chamber.” CSP Domestic Vol. 7. 78. Item 66.
wolf skin,” and for which the description continues: “which is very good and like you, has been sent in secret to the Queen in England.” The word ‘blue’ from the calendar is incorrect, and no colour description appears in the original Spanish description.

Mary’s choices for the Spanish gown made for her portrait, and timed around Philip’s last return to England, cannot have been coincidental. Everything about her gown was designed to match the details of Philip’s iconic portrait, just as the gown she wore in the Master John portrait of herself from thirteen years previously was designed to mirror the tastes of her father. This time, rather than marking herself as a Tudor daughter or a Hapsburg bride, Mary’s clothing indicated that she was now to be considered a Spanish queen in her own right, a mirror of Philip on his return that would, perhaps, convince him of their affinity and her people of their union.

Mary’s use of iconic Englishness as a tool for political legitimacy had become less useful at this stage in her reign, and drawing upon the strength and moral basis for England’s union with Spain became the next useful solution. Her re-adoption of the Spanish aesthetic originally introduced by her mother upon Catherine’s entrance to England drove home the visual connection between England and the continent, between the house of Tudor and Hapsburg power, and between Mary and her right hand – her king, at the point of the creation of this portrait back in England for his final visit before Mary’s death in 1558. War with France, declared in the spring of 1557, interrupted trade between the two nations and may have had some impact on the number of courtiers discarding the

124 Francisco de Eraso, 1 November 1553. CSP Spain, Vol. 11. 384; Hope, “Titian, Philip II and Mary Tudor,” 54.
fashions of their once-again-enemy. Certainly, Mary’s wardrobe began to shift towards Spanish styles before the outbreak of war with France in 1557, though her assumption of the style may have been partially intended to reinforce to France – not only to England and to Spain – the depths of her connection with her mother and husband’s homeland. After all, England had been at war with France before, the latest example less than a decade prior, between 1543 and 1546; a period when French gowns and French sleeves were at the height of fashion in the Tudor court.

Mary’s use of Spanish dress was distinctive, as noted above, for it had not taken hold in the popular aesthetic as it had elsewhere in Europe. Men adopted some of the fashions a little earlier, but women took it on more slowly. By April of 1557, Spanish styles of decoration were entering use in a much more prevalent way. Loose gowns rose in popularity through the 1550s, and a number of portraits dated between 1556 – 1560s showed women of the court dressed in variations of the loose gown and Spanish gown. By 1559, portraits of Queen Elizabeth show her in a very distinctively Spanish style. This was the pinnacle moment of the look before Elizabeth asserted her own style and decisions, and sent English fashion back towards the low-necked gowns and inverted triangle silhouettes of earlier Tudor female dress.

At the beginning of her reign, Mary used her wardrobe to create an image of herself as a proper English queen. Her marriage to Philip of Spain changed the power dynamics in the kingdom and the court in new and unexplored ways, to which Mary responded by
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extending her sartorial identity to include her husband as well. Acting as the dominant spouse within the marriage, Mary gave Philip articles of clothing that were publicly visible, rather than the personal gifts of shirts which were expected in both Spanish and English marriages. When Philip’s absences became more common than his presence in England, as his attention was drawn elsewhere, and as Mary found herself a sole ruler again over an increasingly precarious domestic peace, she was forced to revisit her strategy once more. Adopting Spanish dress for public events, especially the last portrait of herself to be painted from life, Mary attempted to become both king and queen of England and Spain, incorporating her husband’s national identity and the strength of Hapsburg Spain into her own political self.
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Political activity can take many forms, and while historians often focus on the written remnants of an era, speeches, letters and statutes do not and cannot make up the entirety of the conversation. How a speech was delivered, to whom and in what context, are all factors that remain as important as the words that were recorded for posterity. In a visually-oriented society, accustomed to interpreting the coded meanings within religious iconography and allegorical pageantry, a person’s visual presentation carried as much – or more – weight with an audience as their paper titles or authority. When concerned about the rising permeability of socioeconomic strata in the late middle ages and early modern era, authorities enacted sumptuary laws, which sought to prevent those below various stations from dressing as – and therefore being perceived as – men and women above their station. When a couple married, a groom could give his bride clothing and accessories that enfolded her into his own self, like Patient Griselda, whose old identity was contained and kept dormant within her old clothes.¹ And like Desdemona’s wandering handkerchief, garments became symbols of deep and abiding intimacy and loyalty.²

Mary I came to the throne in the middle of the Tudor century, a time when the self-presentation of the monarch mattered more than ever before. As Kevin Sharpe has argued, Henry VII, a putative usurper of the Yorkist throne, came out of the far reaches

¹ Jones and Stallybrass, *Materials of Memory*, 220.
² Korda, “Coverture and its Discontents”
of Wales and installed himself as a king for a new era in England. He made clever use of propaganda techniques, including pageantry and heraldic symbolism, in order to solidify his claim in the eyes and minds of the English people. His son, Henry VIII, perpetuated that same practice, using many of the same techniques of carefully crafted representation, as well as symbolic use of colour, shape and symbol, to smooth his path towards Reformation. He too understood the importance of clothing in constructing an image or persona, and where his father had drawn upon tropes associated with Edward the Confessor, Henry VIII embraced the rich textiles and lush, vibrant colours that announced and enhanced his majesterial presence at top volume. Mary learned those lessons well and changed her own wardrobe to convey messages relevant to events and circumstances.

Mary’s reputation for political inability grew unchecked throughout the last few centuries. Written originally by her critics, this unflattering version of her reign prompted derision and assumptions of ineffectuality from historians and the populace alike. “Bloody Mary’s” undeserved reputation has been revisited in recent years by several biographers and scholars of the period, with an eye towards redressing some of the religiously-tinted wrongs of yesteryear. Once material culture is returned to the discussion, as has been begun by authors including Jeri McIntosh, Roze Hentschell and Kevin Sharpe, a new realm of discussion is opened up. Rather than relying only on what high politics and contemporary textual exchanges can tell us, analysis of the material culture and visual experiences of an era fills in many of the gaps in current understanding. This work has been an attempt to add some analysis of Mary’s wardrobe
to the growing pool of work on Tudor material culture and its intersection with both domestic and foreign affairs. Through the transcription and analysis of the previously unpublished documents from Mary’s reign – discussed in some detail in previous chapters, and included in Appendix C – together with materials available but not previously considered in this fashion, it is possible to draw an outline of a queen who, rather than abandoning the rule of her country to her councillors, used every means at her disposal to attempt to steer the ship of state with a steady hand. Understanding the importance of physical presentation from her father’s example, and drawing on the tactics and lived experiences of her mother and grandmothers, Mary crafted a visual persona for herself which embodied the messages she was also sending in her words and actions.

Three major areas of contention emerge when examining Mary’s pursuit of political legitimacy. While the tensions between Catholics and Protestants coloured everything in the mid-sixteenth century, these three other conflicts were more discrete in their boundaries and unlike the tensions of the Reformation were in their specifics unique to Mary’s reign. First, Mary coped with issues surrounding the legitimacy of her claim to the throne through the use of garments that visually identified her with her father and grandfather, emphasizing her membership in the Tudor family line. She made conscious use of livery colours for her yeomen during her arrival in London in 1553, dressing them in Henry VII and Henry VIII’s household colours, as well as her own, as a symbol of dynastic continuity. Her choices of dress during her coronation echoed those of Henry VII, whose affiliation with the Catholic church was as dedicated as her own. Secondly, forced to negotiate a new position as the first regnant queen of England, she used a
carefully constructed blend of feminine and masculine dress in order to portray herself as both king and queen in one body natural. Her coronation was a prime example of that maneuvering, as Mary rejected suggestions made by her council in order to design the ceremony to her own specifications. Accepting the pattern of anointing usually reserved for male monarchs and participating in the ritual reclothing that went along with the service turned Mary into a new kind of monarch, and set a series of precedents that Elizabeth I would later follow. Thirdly, when she failed in her attempts to incorporate her Spanish husband more fully into her kingdom, Mary reversed her tactics and began to include a strong Spanish element into her own sartorial presentation, becoming a physical sign of Spain in England as Philip had never been.

The pivotal events in Mary’s career, namely her arrival in London after the deposition of Jane Grey, her coronation, and her wedding to Philip of Spain, were the main stages upon which she played out her new scripts. The coronation in particular, an event which already had a predefined order of events and one which Mary personally took in hand to alter to her own liking, offers the clearest example of the queen’s intent to send a clear and somewhat radical message. The performative nature of dress in these circumstances, part of the pageantry and public display in a way that private audiences did not embody, ensured the widest possible dissemination of her message. With those incidents documented and explained, it becomes clearer how Mary used those same tactics in other ways, including her choice of dress for her official portraits, her gift-giving, and in her daily life.
This re-examination of a well-known and until recently much-maligned monarch is important beyond what it says about the specifics of Mary’s dress sense. Taking previous interpretations for granted can only lead to more variations of the same; instead, we must return to the primary sources and examine the surviving materials rather than the interpretations tinged by centuries of religious and political conflict. The picture we have of a reign cannot be complete until we understand how contemporaries viewed the monarch; not only their written opinions, but how they saw the monarch move, speak, and dress. One constant across human culture is the idea of a language and messages encoded within clothing. It is the vocabulary which changes, and which must be examined anew with each time period and culture. In decoding those messages, oblique to the modern eye but obvious to those for whom the messages were intended, we can uncover another vital piece of the puzzle.

Mary will most likely never be remembered with the same kind of reverence and awe as attached to her father and sister’s images, but the tactics she used were the same. Aware of the need to find new vocabulary with which to describe her unprecedented position, she carefully chose and manipulated her clothing, that most immediate of bodily signifiers, to present her ideas to the world. Groundbreaking in her time, Mary manipulated her physical self to become the things she most needed to be, and in doing so, set the stage for her sister, and all reigning queens after her, to follow.
APPENDIX A: TIMELINE

18 February, 1516  Mary Tudor born to Henry VIII of England and Catherine of Aragon.

5 October 1518  Mary betrothed to the Dauphin of France.

16 June 1522  Mary betrothed to Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire.

August 1525  Mary sent to her new household in the Welsh Marches (suggestions of training for future as royal heir).

1528  Mary recalled from her household at Ludlow (Wales); Henry’s Great Matter underway.

25 January, 1533  Marriage of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. Henry VIII excommunicated by Pope Clement VII.

May 1533  Marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon annulled.

1 June, 1553  Coronation of Anne Boleyn.

7 September, 1533  Birth of Elizabeth Tudor, to Henry VIII of England and Anne Boleyn.

September 1533  Mary declared illegitimate, now to be styled Lady Mary.

December 1533  Disbanding of Mary’s household; Mary sent to serve in Elizabeth’s household.

1534  Act of Supremacy, naming the English Monarch the head of the Church of England.

January 1534  “In January, Mary is ill again, without sufficient clothing, and she sent to her father for some, instructing her messenger to accept no
writing in which she was not entitled princess.”

23 March, 1534  Act of Succession, formally removing Mary from consideration as heir to the throne.

Spring 1534  “Mary was now deprived of her jewellery.”

7 January, 1536  Catherine of Aragon dies.

19 May, 1536  Anne Boleyn executed.

30th May, 1536  Marriage of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour.

15 June, 1536  Mary signs a document admitting that her parents’ marriage was invalid, and acknowledging Henry VIII as head of the church.

6 July, 1536  Secret night-time meeting between Mary and Henry VIII, restoring her to his affections.

23 July, 1536  Death of Henry Fitzroy, illegitimate son to Henry VIII.

12 October 1537  Birth of Edward Tudor to Henry VIII and Jane Seymour.

24 October, 1537  Death of Jane Seymour from childbirth complications.

December, 1539  Mary proposed in marriage to Duke Philip of Bavaria.

6 January, 1540  Marriage of Henry VIII and Anne of Cleves.

6 July 1540  Marriage to Anne of Cleves annulled.

28 July, 1540  Marriage of Henry VIII to Catherine Howard.

13 February, 1542  Execution of Catherine Howard.

12 July, 1543  Marriage of Henry VIII to Catherine Parr.

1543  Third Act of Succession: Restores Mary and Elizabeth to the line

---

3 Chamberlin, Private Character of Henry VIII, 217.
4 Ibid., 218.
5 Ibid., 221 – 222.
6 Richards, Mary Tudor, 63 – 64 (Wriothesley).
of succession, behind Edward VI.


28 January, 1547 Death of Henry VIII.

20 February, 1547 Coronation of Edward VI.

6 July, 1553 Death of Edward VI.


19 July 1553 Privy Council declares Mary to be Queen of England.

3 August, 1553 Mary rides into London and takes official possession of her kingdom.

1 October, 1553 Coronation of Mary I.

5 October, 1553 Mary’s first Parliament.

28 October, 1553 Formal proposal of marriage to Philip of Spain.\(^7\)

Late January 1554 Wyatt’s Rebellion.

1 February, 1554 Mary’s speech to the Guildhall assembly in response to Wyatt’s rebellion and the Spanish marriage.\(^8\)

6 March, 1554 Formal betrothal to Philip of Spain, Count of Egmont standing proxy for Philip.

23 July, 1554 First (informal) meeting of Mary I and Philip of Spain.\(^9\)

24 July, 1554 First (official state) meeting of Mary I and Philip of Spain.\(^10\)

25 July, 1554 Marriage of Mary I and Philip of Spain.\(^11\)

\(^7\) CSP Spain, Vol. 11. 251–252.


\(^10\) CSP Spain, Vol. 13. 9.

\(^11\) Wriothesley, 120.
September 1554 – Mary has false pregnancy, ends in neither child nor stillbirth.

July 1555

30 November, 1554 England’s reconciliation with Rome.\(^{12}\)

20 January 1555 Heresy laws passed in England.\(^{13}\)

4 February, 1555 First of the Marian burnings of Protestant martyrs (John Rogers). Approximately 300 were burned during the next four years.\(^{14}\)

27 August, 1555 Mary, Cardinal Pole and Philip II process publicly through London.\(^{15}\)

29 August, 1555 Philip leaves England for the continent.

25 October 1555 Abdication of Charles V, Philip and Mary become king and queen of Spain. The royal pair are now styled *Philip and Mary by the Grace of God King and Queen of England, Spain, France, Jerusalem, both the Sicilies and Ireland, Defenders of the Faith, Archdukes of Austria, Dukes of Milan, Burgundy and Brabant; Counts of Habsburg, Flanders and Tyrol*.\(^{16}\)

March 1556 The Dudley conspiracy threatens Mary’s throne.

20 March, 1557 Philip back in England.

March 1557 England declares war on France.

25 – 28 April, 1557 Stafford Rebellion.

6 July 1557 Philip leaves England for the final time.

\(^{12}\) Russell, “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins,” 267.

\(^{13}\) Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 196.

\(^{14}\) Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 113.


\(^{16}\) Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 160.
January 1558  Mary sends word to Philip that she once more believes herself to be pregnant.\textsuperscript{17}

13 January 1558  Calais, the last English stronghold on the continent, falls to the French.

17 November, 1558  Death of Mary I (ovarian cancer suspected).

\textsuperscript{17} CSP Venice, Vol. 6, Part 3. 1432.
APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY

Bagges: Integrated pockets, almost invariably made of black satin, possibly aligned with vents in the outer layers of the clothing in order to make their contents accessible. By Elizabeth’s time these contraptions are referred to as “pocketts” and are made of fabric chosen to match the gowns themselves.

Bases: A pleated skirt sewn on to a jerkin or doublet at the waist seam. Made of the same fabric as the jerkin or doublet to which they were attached, they usually fell to just above the knee.

Buckeram: A tightly woven plain fabric made from any one of hemp, linen or cotton fibres.

Paste Buckeram: Buckram stiffened with paste, and used as an insert to reinforce collars and sleeves. A purely structural fabric, not one meant to show on the exterior of a garment.

Calaber: Squirrel fur.

Canvas: A name used for cloth made from hemp. A coarse textile used for aprons, shirts for labourers, and heavy-use household linen.

Carnation: A peach shade tending towards red, between pink and deep murreye.

Cases: Cotton bags meant for protection and storage of garments in the wardrobe.

Coney: Rabbit fur.

---

19 Ibid.
20 Lithnicum, *Costume in the Drama*, 104.
21 Ibid., 97.
22 Ibid., 39, 37
**Cotton:** A fabric treatment which lifted the nap of fibres to create a soft texture. Not yet referring to the plant fibre.

**Crimson:** A vivid, deep red, more on the yellow/warm side of the tonal range than the blue/purple. Often appears in the context of undergarments.

**Dalmatic:** A tunic with short, wide sleeves. Originally part of everyday dress in the Roman and Byzantine empires, the dalmatic became associated with ritual dress through use in Catholic vestments.

**Damask:** A double-sided patterned weaving technique, used with silk or wool fibres.

**Doublet:** A fitted jacket, often padded, with matching sleeves. Worn over a linen shirt, and sometimes under a robe or gown.

**Dutch gown:** Cut with a softer line and less structured bodice, appeared in orders for Jane, one of Mary’s court fools. These gowns were generally brighter in colour than French or Italian gowns, made up of yellow, red and green cloth. The gifts of Dutch gowns may have been intended to visually differentiate the court fool from the courtiers and her royal mistress, as well as present a visual punchline based on the English habit of using the Dutch as the common butt of jokes.\(^\text{24}\) Lithnicum associates the Dutch gown with the round, trainless gown, a point made less convincing by the distinct separation in style between Mary’s rounde kirtles of extremely expensive tissue and white satin, and the far less luxurious Dutch gownes made for Jane the foole of multi-coloured velvet, mockado and cloth.\(^\text{25}\)

---


\(^{25}\) Lithnicum, *Costume in the Drama*, 183; LC 5/31 ff. 75-79, Item 22; E 101/427/18 f. 1; LC 5/31 ff. 94-99, Item 21.
**Ermine:** The winter coat of a stoat; a white pelt with a black tail. Used as trim on garments for royalty, and on robes of state.

**Farthingale:** A hooped skirt often made of crimson fabric, sometimes of taffeta and sometimes satin. A series of bands made from kersey were sewn around the body of the skirt, making pockets intended for the insertion of stiffened rope or fabric which would give structure to the garment.

**Forepart:** Decorative triangular pieces of cloth pinned on the the front of a kirtle. Made from decorative fabric, and intended to fill in the open triangle on the skirt front of a front-opening gown.

**Foresleeves:** Sleeves which attached to the gown at the shoulder but were covered by a separate upper sleeve, so that only the portion below the elbow was ultimately visible.

**Frieze:** A medium-weight wool used to line sleeves and petticoats. The extra weight given by the heavy lining would give a rich drape to otherwise lightweight taffeta sleeves, and add an extra layer of warmth to the body.

**Fustian:** A cotton-based fabric or a flax/wool blend, may have included wool fibres. Slightly napped, in many cases could substitute for velvet. Used as a lining fabric by the wealthy, mostly for bodices and sleeves, as well as staying bands in pleated gowns.

**Gardes/Guards:** Bands of fabric applied to the edges of a garment, especially hemlines, which served as protection against scuffing, dirt and general wear.

**Holland cloth:** Very fine linen used primarily for shirts, smocks, kerchiefs and other soft body linens.

---

27 Arnold, *QEU*, 143.
28 Lithnicum, *Costume in the Drama*, 106.
**Jerkin:** A sleeveless jacket sometimes worn overtop of a doublet.

**Kirtle:** A woman’s undergown, often sleeveless, worn above the smock and farthingale and beneath the gown. Sometimes visible through the open-front skirts of French and loose gowns, when not covered by a forepart.

**Lace/Lase:** The term ‘lase’ shows up in multiple contexts; the most popular forms appearing in the warrants are ‘Spanyshe lase,’ ‘purled lase,’ ‘bussell work lase’ and ‘parchment work lase.’

**Bussell work lace:** May be a corrupted reference to Brussels work lace, which was a form of lace produced from the fifteenth century onwards. There is some confusion, however, over whether the reference to parchment lace is a reference to the same form.³⁰

**Hollowe Lace:** A cord woven with a hollow centre.³¹

**Parchment work lace:** Open-work needle lace, built up with a series of threads over a patterns drawn onto a sheet of parchment.³²

**Purled lace:** A kind of braid, a narrow strip of trim created with a row of small loops or twists along the edge.³³ Laces in the warrants are described as ‘purled’

---

²⁹ Ibid., 98.
³⁰ Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest Now First Published from Official Records & Other Documents, Private As Well As Public.* London: Published for Henry Colburn by his successors, Hurst and Blackett, 1854. 154 – 155
³² Lithnicum, *Costume in the Drama,* 134.
³³ Arnold, *QEÜ,* 370.
or ‘purled on both sides,’ which suggests one or two of the long edges so
decorated.

**Spanyshe lase:** A very fine threadwork lace, built on a braided or stitching
foundation. A variation of parchment work lace, with a four-sided mesh.  

**Loose Gown:** a style of loose-bodied gown evolved from the Spanish ropa and worn for
informal occasions. These were generally made of damaske, velvet or satin, heavy
fabrics with a rich hand and luxurious drape. Worn over top of french kirtles, which
included a train.

**Luzarnes:** Fur used for lining and trim on garments, most likely lynx. Occasionally
identified as russian lynx or wolf. Usually restricted in the Acts of Apparel to earls and
higher in precedence.

**Miniver:** A lesser quality of white ermine, lacking the black tails.

**Mockado:** A form of false velvet, generally woven from linen with a wool pile that was
cut and brushed to give a soft textured nap. This second, less expensive form of false
velvet served as a cheaper replacement for fustian, itself a replacement for silk velvet.

Used for clothing for members of Mary’s household.

**Murreye:** A shade of purplish-red that resembled a mulberry, from which the colour took
its name.

**Pair of Bodies:** An early proto-corset, with internal stiffening designed to shape the
wearer’s upper torso. These evolved from the earlier un-boned upper bodies, which could
be attached to a petticoat skirt or worn alone as a separate undergarment.

---

**Partlet:** A small dickie which sat in the neckline of a gown and covered the breastbone and shoulders. Worn with French and Italian gowns, and vanished from the inventories at about the same time.

**Raized Satin:** A means of cutting satin to create a decorative pattern of frayed threads. The satin was scored with a sharp tool, then the surface warp threads were scored and carefully cut in a series of short strokes. The cut threads were then brushed up to form a textured pattern.\(^{37}\)

“**Red**”: A red shade not dyed with the kermes grains. Appears in a few places, mostly on guards and other less obtrusive places on garments otherwise dyed in grain.

**Ropa:** A Spanish overgown, typified by short sleeves and an unfitted bodice. It had no defined waist, and could be worn open or closed.

**Russet:** “A dusky, reddish-brown, or ashey-grey.”\(^{38}\)

**Sarcenet:** A light silk; appears both as linings and as “pull outs” for upper sleeves on some gowns, a style in which lining fabric was pulled through a series of slits in the garment.

**Scarlet:** An expensive worsted wool cloth. Scarlet was a more durable fabric than satin or taffeta, and was used for garments which could be expected to see a lot of wear.

“**Scarlet in grain**”: A fabric made of wool dyed red with kermes, an association which eventually led to the term coming into use for the colour, as opposed to the fabric itself.\(^{39}\)

**Stays:** Strips of fabric, usually white fustian, that were stitched to the inside of pleats or rows of gathers to trap the fullness in place.\(^{40}\)

---

\(^{37}\) Arnold, *QEU*, 186.


Swete powder: Used to keep clothing smelling clean, as well as potentially to keep away moths.\textsuperscript{41}

Taffeta: A lighter, crisper form of silk than satin, was used on some occasions for outer garments including kirtles and gowns. More often seen as a lining for gowns made of velvet or damaske.

Tawney: A light colour best described as “a yellowish tan.”\textsuperscript{42} Lithnicum cites it as ‘much used for liveries’ in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Turkey Gown/Turkish Gown: A straight-seamed long coat with narrow sleeves, or a gown in the Turkish style.

Upper Bodies: The precursor to the boned pairs of bodies which would come into use at the end of the century. Stiffened with interlinings of canvas and paste buckeram and either sewn on to the petticoat or farthingale or tied on with ribbon points.\textsuperscript{43}

Vents: Slits in a garment, faced with fustian, through which underlayers could be accessed.\textsuperscript{44}

Violet: A blue-based shade of purple.

‘Wrought’ textiles have part of their surface cut or burned away to form intricate patterns. They often appeared in descriptions of sleeves, as a pair from 1554, “wrought with satten grounde of our store”\textsuperscript{45} and smocks, as well as velvets used for loose and french gowns.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 188.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} Lithnicum, \textit{Costume in the Drama}, 46.
\textsuperscript{43} Mikhaila & Malcom-Davies, \textit{Tudor Tailor}, 22 – 23.
\textsuperscript{44} Arnold, \textit{QEU}, 188.
\textsuperscript{45} E101/427/11 ff 38, Item 35.
\textsuperscript{46} E101/427/11 ff 34, Items 14 and 70; E 101/427/18 f. 1; LC 5/31 ff. 94-99, Item 26.
APPENDIX C: TRANSCRIPTIONS OF WARDROBE RECORDS

(Primary Source Documents – Warrants and Account Books)\(^{47}\)

Transcription conventions used:

\(\text{\textquotedblleft} xx\text{\textquotedblright}\) Italicized letters are those which have been reinserted to fill out contractions and scribal abbreviations, such as o\(\text{u}r\) and w\(^{\text{th}}\).

\(\{\ldots\}\) Illegible letters, on damaged sections of paper, under blots of ink, or otherwise disrupted. The letters have been included if they can be deduced, otherwise dots are used in place of the approximate number of letters.

\(\langle xx\rangle\) Corrected text within the manuscript, struck out either as a scribal error or a correction made at a later date.

\(\text{	extbackslash xxx/}\) Inserted text, either within a completed line, in a margin or at the top of the page.

\(\text{LC 5/31 ff. 54 – 62 : 30 March - 6 April 1557}\)

\textbf{Lord Chamberlaine’s copies of the warrants}

[f. 54]

\textbackslash A warrante for the Quenes majesties Apparell for one haulfe yere ended the xxxth of Marche in the fourthe yere of her majesties Reigne/

\(^{47}\) For the 1554 warrants, see Carter, Alison J. "Mary Tudor's Wardrobe." \textit{Costume} 18 (1984): 9-28
We woll and Comannde you that mediatly upon the sight hereof ye do contente and paye or cause to be contented and payde to all suche persone whose names hereafter ensue for all suche percel of Stuffe and workemanshipes by them done and delyvered to oure use as particularly hereafter ensuethe That is to say,

1. Ff firste to Edwarde Jones oure Tayler for makinge of a louse gowne of blacke Damaske garded with blacke veluett the garding stitched all over with blacke sylke, and whipped upon the edge with blacke twyste, withe bagges of blacke Satten, the upper sleves lyned with ffryse, the lynynges of the foore sleves and steys of white fustian all of our greate Garderobe

2. ITEM for making of a frenche kyrtell of blacke Satten lyned withe blacke Taffata, the pleytes lyned with kersey, and edged with blacke velvett of oure greate Garderobe

3. ITEM for makinge of a peire of frenche sleves of blacke Satten e'd/ged with blacke velvett lyned with fustian and Canvas of oure greate Garderobe

4. ITEM for makinge of a lowse gowne of russett Satten garded withe russett velluat, enbrauder with russett Silke with bagges of blacke Satten the uper sleves lyned with fryse, the foore sleves lyned with Sarstenett and the stayes of white fustian of oure greate Garderobe the enbrauderye of our Store

5. ITEM for makinge of a frenche kirtell of russett Satten lyned withe russett Taffata, the pleites lyned with kersey and edged with russet veluett, with a paire of sleves to the same kirtell edged with russet veluett and lyned with fustian & canvas of oure greate Garderobe
6. ITEM for makinge of a fore parte of a kirtell of blacke veluett lyned with blacke Taffata of our greate Guarderobe

7. ITEM for makinge of a frenche kertell of russett wroughte veluatt with Satten grownde lyned with russet Taffata the pleites lyned withe kersey and let downe with russet Satten, with a peire of frenche sleves to the same lyned with fustian and Canvas of our greate Guarderobe

8. ITEM for makinge of a kirtle/ blacke satten lyned with blacke Taffata the pletes lyned with kersey & edged with blacke veluett and a peire of frenche sleves

[f. 55]

Yet for the Guarderobe of the Robes/

edged with velvett lyned with fustian and canvas of our greate Guarderobe

a lose gowne of black Satten/{

9. ITEM for makinge of a lowse gowne of blacke veluett furred with lyzarnes the upper sleves lyned with freese, the fore sleves and steys of fustian with bagges of blacke Satten and bordered aboute with buckeram all of our greate Guarderobe

10. ITEM for makinge of a rounde kyrtell of blacke veluett lyned with blacke Taffata and let downe with blacke Satten, And the pleites lyned with kersey all of our greate Guarderobe

11. ITEM for makinge of a frenche gowne of Russett velluet lyned withe russett Taphata, the pleites lyned with Cotton the bodies peced with Satten and lyned with white fustian /
And for makinge of a partlett of russet veluett lyned with white fustian and past buckram for the coller all of our greate Guarderobe

12. ITEM for makinge of a frenche gowne of blacke Satten lyned with Taphata and buckram the pleits lyned with Cotton, the bodies & sleves lyned with ffustian and edged with blacke Veluett all of oure greate Guarderobe

13. ITEM for makinge of a Partlet of blacke veluett lyned with white fustian and past buckeram for the Coller all of our greate Guarderobe

14. ITEM for upper bodyinge of a frenche gowne of purple velluet of our store recovered from Arthur S\t/urton peced with purple Satten and lyned with white ffustian / And for makinge of a frenche kyrteell of purple wroughte velluett with Satten grownde of our Store recovered from the saide Sturton / let downe with purple Satten the pletes lyned with kersey, and for a paire of Frenche sleves lyned with fustian and Canvas of our greate Guarderobe

15. ITEM for upper bodyinge of another Gowne of purple veluett peced with purple Satten and lyned with white fustian / And for upperbodyinge of a frenche gowne of blacke veluett the bodies peced with blacke Satten and lyned with Whyte fustian of our greate Guarderobe

16. ITEM for making of a peticoate of Crymsin Satten lyned with red kersey, the bodies and placarde lyned with lynen clothe garded with Crymsen veluett stitched all over with Crimsen silke all of our greate Guarderobe

\a ffrenche kirtle of pple Satten/
17. ITEM for makinge of a frenche Kirtell of purple Satten rayzed, of our store receved of Thomas Hobbes yeoman of oure robes lyned with purple Taffata the pleites lyned

[f. 56]

\'yet for the warderobe of the robes/

with kersey and edged with purple velluett with a peire of frenche sleves of purple Satten edged with veluett lyned with fustian and Canvas all of our greate warderobe

18. ITEM for makinge of a nyght gowne of blacke velluett furred with Sables with bagges of blacke Satten and staye of fustian / And for making of a peire of sleves for the same gowne all of our greate Guarderobe

19. ITEM for making of a frenche kirtell of blacke Satten edged with blacke veluett lyned with Taffata, the pleites lyned with kersey with sleves of blacke satten edged with blacke veluett lyned withe white fustian and Canvas all of our greate Guarderobe

20. ITEM for makinge of a frenche gowne of blacke Satten lyned withe tawnye Taffata and buckeram, the pleites lyned with Cotton the bodies and sleves lyned with fustian and edged with blacke veluett all of our greate Guarderobe

21. ITEM for making of a Spanishe gowne of blacke velluett bordered with buckeram, the upper sleves lyned with fryse, and a stey of white fustian and bagges of blacke Satten all of our greate Guarderobe

22. ITEM for making of a frenche kyrtell of russet Satten rayzed lyned with russett Taffata the pleites lyned with kersey and edged with russett veluett and the sleves lyned
with white fustian and Canvas all of our greate Guarderobe

23. ITEM for making of a varthyngall of Crymsin Satten lyned with Crimsen Taffata, garded with Crimsen velvett the garde stitched with crimsen silke and the ropes covered over with rede kersey and bodies lyned withe lynn clothe all of our greate Guarderobe

24. ITEM for threescore and seventene yerdes of russett Satten to make seven Gownes for our maides (that is to saye) to everye of them eleven yardes / And for fforretene yerdes of blacke Velluett of of doble Jeane for gardinge of the same Gownes (that is to say to every Gowne two yerdes all of our greate wardrobe

25. ITEM for trannslatinge of a frenche Gowne for the ladye Jane Somer of blacke satten with wide sleves of blacke clothe of golde of our store with velluett fryse fustian and Sarstnett to perfourme the same and brydges Satten for the wide sleves of our greate Guarderobe

26. ITEM for making of a partlete for the saide Lady Jane of Blacke veluett lyned with fustian and past buckeram for the coller / for trannslatinge of a frenche kyrtell of Sylver

[f. 57]

\yet for the warderobe of the robes/

receved from the saide Thomas Hobbes, for makinge of a Case of yellowe Cotton for the gowne and another for the wide sleves / for trannslating of a frenche Gowne of Crimsen veluett, for veluett fryse Sarstnett and fustian to performe the same gowne / for making of a partelete of Crimsin veluett to the same gowne lyned with fustiai & past buckeram for
the coller for makinge of a Peticote of Scarlett garded with crimsen velvett the garde 
stitched all on with sylke the upper bodies of Crymsin taffata and lyned with linnen clothe 
/ for translatinge of a frenche gowne of blacke veluett the wide sleves turned up with 
Sylver of our store receved from the saide Smeton lyned with bridges Satten, for veluett 
Sarstinet fryse and ffustian to perfourme the said gowne / for makinge of a Partelete of 
blacke veluet lyned with fustian and past buckeram, ffor makinge of a douteche Gowne of 
blacke veluett layde one with boneworke lase of golde and Sylver the skerte lyned with 
buckeram and Cotton, the bodies and sleves lyned withe fustian and pulled oute with 
golde Sarstnett the upper sleves lyned with fryse of our greate Garderobe, ye lase of our 
store

27. ITEM for makinge of a Varthingall of Crymsin Taffata for her lyned with buckeram 
the ropes covered with kersey and bordered aboute with Crymsin veluett / for making of 
a douteche Gowne of russet Satten with two Spanyshe gardes of blacke veluett laide on 
with russett lase & twiste the skerte lyned with fustian and the sleves pulled oute with 
russett Sarstnett, and the upper sleves lyned with fryse and edged aboute with frengge / 
and for translatinge and newe makinge of a dowche gowne of blacke veluett of our 
store lyned with Cotton the plete and skerte lyned with buckeram the bodies and sleves 
lyned with fustian layde one withe brode lase of knyte worke and small lase of bushell 
worke and frengge aboute with blacke frengge the upper sleves lyned with fryse the lase 
receved of the Silkewoman and veluett to perfourme the same of our greate Guarderobe

28. ITEM for makinge of a douteche Gowne (for Jane our foole) of yelowe and rede Caphe 
lyned with fryse and buckeram, the
yet for the warderobe of the robes/

bodies and sleves lyned with fustian and frenged aboute, And for one Gowne of fryse for her all of our greate Guarderobe

29. ITEM delyvered to our use two yerdes of Taffata Sarstnett and quarter of a yarde of Scarlett fyftene yerdes of blacke veluett Twentie and seven yerdes of Blacke Satten for newyeres guifte by us geven to our gentellmen ushers and other officers of our householde on new yeres daye laste past / Sixe yerdes & a haulfe of Damaske geven to misteris Russell, thre yerdes of blacke Satten geven to Master Smythe gentleman usher being Janes valentyne Seven yerdes of Crymsin shenet? delyvered to Mistress Clarentines to our use all of our grete Garderobe

30. ITEM for three yerdes of blacke Satten geven to Sir Hughe Askewe by oure comanndmente / Three peces and a remnannte of hollande clothe conteynyng thurtine ells & a haulfe / thirtie one elles thre quarters and a haulfe Thirtie ells quarter & a halfe and Twentie ells and a haulfe delyvered to Mistress Babington to our use all of oure greate Garderobe

31. ITEM for thre elles of Lynen clothe for William Somer for makinge of two cases of yellowe Cotton and one of buckeram / a botell of ynke / one boulte of blacke threade and a quarterme of white / one dossen of thymbles, haulfe a pownde of seringe Candell / Two dossen of brushes, fyftye yerdes of Cotton / And for two bokes and one realme of paper for the saide Garderobe of Robes / and a cloute of nedelles all of our greate Garderobe
32. ITEM more for the said ladye Jeane Somer one yarde and a nayle of blacke velluett / one yerde of Crimsin Satten / one yerde of white Satten / tenne yards of blacke Damaske and two yerdes of blacke veluett to make a Gowne for Anne Chodnall her woman sixe yerdes of blacke Satten for her valentyne all of oure greate Guarderobe

33. ITEM delyvered by our comandmente to Thomas Rutlage yeoman of our persons kytchen thre yards of black Satten all of oure greate Guarderobe

34. ITEM for three yards of clothe to make a Coate for the saide Edwarde Jones and two yerdes of veluett to garde the same / And for lynynge making and Embrawdering of our letters all of oure greate Guarderobe

35. ITEM to Thomas Percye our SKYNNER

[f. 59]

\yet for the warderobe of the Robes/

\Thomas Percy\{/ for furring of a louse Gowne of blacke Damaske withe eighte blake Conye skynnes with white heares to the same Gowne / and fourscore and eleven blacke conye skynnes to the same Gowne of oure greate Guarderobe

36. ITEM for furring of a lowse Gowne of russet Satten with with sixe luzarne skynnes to the same Gowne / and for sixe furres of lybarthe powte more to the same Gowne all of our greate Guarderobe

37. ITEM for furringe of a lowse gownte of blake veluett with Luzarnes of our store / And
a furre and a haulfe of Luzarnes pawte to the same Gowne of our greate wardrope

38. ITEM for furringe of a lowse gowne of blacke veluett with three score Sable skynnes employed upon the same Gowne of our store receyved from the saide Arthur Sturton / And for foure tymber of Squerrelles of our greate Guarderobe

39. ITEM for furringe of a frenche Gowne of blacke Satten with luzarnes of our store and of the Chardge of the saide Thomas Hobbes / And for furringe of a frenche Gowne of blacke Satten furred with Sables of oure store and of the chardge of the saide Thomas Hobbes And also for furrynge of a Spanyshe Gowne of black velvett with twente and three Sable skynnes of our store receved of the saide Arthur Sturton and for foure tymber of Calaber to the same gowne of our greate Guarderobe

40. ITEM for furringe of a peire of buskynes of blacke veluett with sextene blacke Conye skynnes \all/ of our greate Guarderobe

41. ITEM deleyvered into our Guarderobe of Robes to our use foure powndes of swete powder of our greate Guarderobe

42. ITEM for furringe of a Gowne for William Somer our foole with graye Jenette powte and two panes of graye Coneys all of our greate Guarderobe

\Mary Wilkenson{/

43. ITEM to Marye Wilkinson our Silkewoman for fourscore yerdes of gartering Ribande / oone hundrethe three scoore and three yerdes of ribande for Girdelles / fwayne quarter and a haulfe of Spanyshe lace / Three dossen peres of Jennes ribande of diverse
colours / eight grosse of Ribande poynnes / fyve dossen of fyne myllen buttons of diverse
collours two ounces & a haufl quarter of granado Silke of sundrye collours

[f. 60]
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one quarter of a pownde of fyne whighe threde / And fyve dossen of fyne buttons with
broade knottes all of our greate Guarderobe

44. ITEM delyvered to the saide Jones and by him employed upon our apparell
aforewriten oone pownde quarter of granado Silke of sunderye Collours / two dossen and
a hauflfe of buttons with stalkes of sunderye collours / two oz. and a hauflfe and halfe a
quarter of Crymsen & russett twiste / oone pere of blacke Jene poynting Ribande / foure
yardes and a hauflfe of Tawney Jene poynting Ribande all of our grete Guarderobe

45. ITEM delyvered for the saide Lady Jeane and emplyed upon her apparell aforesaide
tenne ownces of Granado Silke of divers collours / hauflfe a dossen of buttones with
stalkes / eleven ownces of bushill worke lase purled on theone side bothe russett &
blacke / blacke knott lase XXXVJ yerdes weinge fourtene ownces thre quarters / fyve
peres of Jene poynting Ribandes of sunderye colors / oone ownce of fyne hallowe lase /
fyve ownces of Russett twiste bothe greate and smale / thirtene ownces of blacke Satten
fringe / and sextene ownces of russett Satten frenge all of oure greate Guarderobe

46. ITEM delyvered for the saide William Somer tenne dossen of silke buttons of diverse
collors / two ownces & a hauflfe of Silke / Tenne paire of Lynen hose / three paire of knite
hose / and twelve surtes and twelve handkercheves of hollande all of our greate
Guarderobe

47. ITEM more for Jeane our foole Seven ownces thre quarteres of frenge of diverse collours for fringing of a Cowne and cape of rede & yellow Damaske afore writen / for making of the same Cape / Sixe yerdes of blacke poyntinge rebande and sixe pere of blacke knite hose all of our greate Guarderobe

\Milce Huggard/

48. ITEM to Myles Huggarde our hoser for fourtene peires of hoose stitched with Spanyshe Silke all of oure greate Guarderobe

49. ITEM for foure peires of hoose for the saide Lady Jeane Semer all of our greate Guarderobe

50. ITEM for three yerdes of rede clothe to make him a Coate and two yerdes of veluett to garde the same for lyning makinge and
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\Henry Arnold/

embrawdering of our letters all of oure greate Guarderobe

51. ITEM to Henerye Arnolde our shoemaker for makinge of sextene peres of velvett shews lyned with Saten and Scarlet and stitched with silke / two peires of veluett Slippers lyned with Scarlet and for makinge of a peire of velluet buskyns all of our greate
Guarderobe

52. ITEM for foure peires of veluett shooes for the saide Ladye Jeane and a peire of veluett moyles [ed: mules] all of our greate Guarderobe

53. ITEM for sixe peires of shewes for the saide Jane our foole all of our greate Guarderobe

54. ITEM for three yerdes of rede clothe to make him a a Coate and two yerdes of veluett to garde the same for lynyng making and enbraudering of oure letters all of our greate Guarderobe

\John Keyin/

55. ITEM to John Keyne our lockesmythe for two keyes for the yinner dore in oure Robes at St. James for two lockes and a haspe for a cheste for a stocklocke in the same office / for mending of a loke and a newe keye in our Guarderobe at the Tower / and for a fyer shovell in the same office in the Tower all of our greate Guarderobe

56. ITEM for three yerdes of clothe to make him a Coate & two yeardes of velvett to garde the same for lynyng makinge and Enbraudering of our letters all of our greate Guarderobe

\John Iylannd/

57. ITEM to John Eyelande our Cutler for dressing of our bearing sworde, for dressing of the litell bearinge sworde and guilding the halfe pomell and Chape withe golde / for making of a handell of golde for the same sworde and the fringe of golde & silke / for
dressing of two rapiers and Daggers for a case of leather lyned with Cotton for the bearinge swords all of our greate wardrobe

58. ITEM for iiij yards of rede clothe to make him a Coate and two yerdes of veluett to garde the same for lynynge makynge & Enbrauderinge of our letters, all of our greate Guarderobe

59. ITEM to Richarde Tysdall Tayler for making of a Coate for William Somer our foole garded with veluett and lyned with cotton for makinge of a Gowne of clothe playne lyned with cotton for makinge of a Coate of clothe playne lyned with cotton / for a peticoate
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of cotton for him and for a doublet of bla\{.\}ke fustian lyned with cotton all of our greate Guarderobe

\Edmund Pigeon/

60. ITEM for making of a Gowne for Edmunde Pigeon clerke of our Guarderobe, of Chamblett garded with Puke veluett layed one withe lase and furred with boudge / and for making of a Jaquit for him of Pucke veluett garded with the same Puke veluett and layde on with lase the bodies lyned with fustian, the bases with Cottone & buttons & Silke / And for makinge of a Doublett for him of like Veluett lyned with ffustian and Canvas and buttons and Silke all of our greate Guarderobe
61. ITEM more to the saide John Eylande our Cutler for making of three Scabourdes of Purple veluett for the litell bearinge Sworde all of our greate Guarderobe / And these our letters signed withe our owne hande shalbe your sufficienete warrante & discharge thise behaulfe gouen under our Signet at our Pallaice at Westminster the sixthe of Aprill in the thirde & fourthe yeres of our Reigne

bottom right:

To oure Trustye and right welbeloved

Counsailoure Sir Edwarde Waldgrave

Knighte master of oure Greate Guarderobe

LC 5/31 ff. 75-79: September 30, 1557

Lord Chamberlaine’s copies of the warrants
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\ for the warderobe of the Roobes / for one half year ended at the ffeast of St. Mighell Anno quinto ½ /

We woll and commannde you that immediately uppon the sight hereof ye content and paie or cause to be contented and Paide to all suche persones whose names hereafter dothe ensue for all such parcelles of Stuff and workemaneshipes by them done and deliuered to our use as particulery ensueth That is to say
1. Firste to Edwarde Jones our Tailor for making of a frenche gowne and a partlett of Blacke figured Velluett of our store in our Roobes lyned with blacke Taffata the pleites lined with Cotton the forebodies peced with blacke Satten and lined with fustian & edged with Blacke veluett The partlett lined with fustian and paste buckeram of our greate wardrobe

2. ITEM for upperbodyes of a frenche gowne of white Tysshewe the fore bodies peced \{with\} white Satten and lined with fustian all of our greate wardrobe

3. ITEM for making of a rownde kirtell of Tysshewe and a peire of sleves to the same of our store in oure saide Roobes the hinder parte of white Satten lined with white Taffata the sleves lyned withe fustiane the pleites lined with kersey and a case of white Cotton of our greate warderobe

4. ITEM for makinge of a frenche kirtell and a peire of sleves of Clothe of golde of oure store receyvd frome Arthur Sturton let downe with Crymsen Satten and
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Lyned with Crimsin taffata Sarsenett the pleites lyned with kersey and eged with crimsen veluett the sleves lined with fustian and a Case of white Cotton of oure greate wardrobe

5. ITEM for makinge of a frenche kirtell and \(<a peire>\) of sleves of blacke Sylver receyved from the saide Sturton lett downe with blacke Satten and lyned with Crimsin Taffata Sarsenett the plites lyned with kersey and edged with blacke veluett The sleves
lyned with fustiane and a case of white Cotton of our greate wardrobe

6. ITEM for making of a frenche kirtell and a peire of sleves of Crimsin velluet with Satten grounde of our store in our saide Roobes lete downe with Crimsin Satten and Lyned with Crimsin Taffata and eged with red velluet the plites lyned with kersey the sleves lined with fustian of our greate guarderobe

7. ITEM for making of a frenche kirtell & a peire of sleves of white figured veluett of our store in our saide Roobes let downe with white Satten lyned with Crimsin Taffata the plite lyned with kersey the sleves lyned with fustian of our greate wardrobe

8. ITEM for makinge of a Stommichcher of Scarlet lined with Crimsin velluett all of our greate wardrobe

9. ITEM for making of a frenche kirtell and a pere of sleves of Purple clothe of Tysshewe of our store receyved of the saide Sturton let downe with purpell Satten and lyned with Crimsn Taffata the pleites lined with kersey the sleves lined with fustian and a case of white Cotton of our greate wardrobe

10. ITEM for makinge of a loose gowne of Blacke Taphata lyned with blacke Taffata garded with blacke velluett the garde enbraundered with purled lase of Silke the sleves pulled oute with Sarssenet the upper sleves lyned with frise an{d} the stayes of white fustian all of our greate warderobe excelp{e} the lace receyved of the Silkewoman

11. ITEM for making of a frenche gowne of purple Taffata of our store in our saide Roobes lined with purple Taffata the plites lined with Cotton the bodyes and sleves lyned with fustian the forequarter lined with buckeram and eged with purple veluett of our
greate warderobe

12. ITEM for upperbodinge of a frenche gowne of purple Satten lined with fustian all of oure greate wardrobe

13. ITEM for makinge of a loose gowne of Russett Satten lined withe Russett Taffata and garded with blacke veluett enbraudered with Sylver Lace the u{p}er sleves lyned with frise and the Coller lined with past buckeram the sleves pulled outhe with Sylver Sarstnet with a Case of white Cotton all of our greate wardrobe

14. ITEM for makinge of a loose gowne of Purple Taffata of our store in oure saide Roobes lined with purple Taffata garded with Velvett and one with golde lase the upper sleves lyned with frise a staye of fustian and {p}as{t}e buckeram for the coller the sleves pulled outhe with the golde sarstnett and a case of yellowe Cotton of our greate warderobe excepte the lase recevde of our Silkewoman

15. ITEM for makinge of a frenche kirtill of Crimsin veluett lett {d}owne with Crimsin Satten lyned with Crimsen Taffata &
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eged with Crimsen velvett the pleites lined with kersy and a peire of frenche sleves of Crimsin veluett for the same lined with fustian all of our greate Warderobe

16. ITEM for making of a loose gowne of Blacke Damaske of our store <. .... store> in our saide Roobes with foure welltes of veluett and purled lase betwene the weltes lined

176
with blacke Taffata the upper sleves lyned with frise and pulled oute with Taffata Sarstinet the Coller and stayes of white fustian and past buckeram of our greate warderobe

17. ITEM for makinge of a Loose gowne of Russett Satten garded with two Spanyshe gardes of Blacke veluett and layed one with Russett purled lase and lyned with Taffata the sleves lyned with frese and pulled out with Taffata Sarstinet the coller and stayes lined with fustian and paste Buckeram all of our greate wardrobe

18. ITEM for makinge of a foreparte of a kirtell of black veluett lined with Blacke taffata all of our greate wardrobe

19. ITEM for making of a night gowne of Blacke Damaske of our store in our saide Roobes eged with blacke veluett bordered about with buckeram with bagges of blacke Satten & stayes of white fustiane of our greate warderobe

20. ITEM delyvered into our saide Roobes to our use oone cloute of nedelles oone bottell of ynke halfe a pownde of white therde and boultes of blacke threade oone dussen of brusshes and oone brushe oone yarde of Clothe for necessaries sixe yardes of Taffata Sarsenet tawny and yellow for swete bagges all to Mistress Clarentius thre yardes of Crimsen Satten geven to Mistress Bodye Clercke of the grenclohes for a newe yeares guyfte two pece and a remnannte of hollande cont xxiiij elles iij quarters xxxij elles quarter xxxj elles & xxj elles and haulfe haulfe quarter delivered to our use to Mistress Babington oone yerde of yellowe Satten lefte oute of the laste warrannte and for lynynge of a kirtell of purple Taffata lefte oute of the last warrannte all of oure greate warderobe
21. ITEM for making of a peticoat for the ladye Jeane Somer of Crimsin Taffata garded with Crimsin veluett stiched with Crimsen Silke the bodyes lyned with lynnen clothe all of our greate warderobe

22. ITEM for making of a douche gowne for Jeane our foole of purple and yellowe Capha lyned with freese and buckeram the bodies and stays lyned with fustian for makinge of a kirtell for hir of yellowe and white Moccado lyned with Cotton and lynnen cloth And for makinge of a peticoate for hir of red clothe lyned with lynnen clothe and upper bodies of Moccado all of our greate warderobe

23. ITEM to Thomas Parry our Skinner for furring of a gowne of purple Satten enbrauedered with golde furred with Luzarnes for furringe of a peire of sleves of Russett Satten enbrauedered with Sylver lase furred with Luzarnes and for furringe of another peire of sleves enbrauedered with golde furred with Luzarnes all of our greate warderobe

[f. 78]
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24. ITEM for furringe of a gowne of blacke Damaske with foure white heared coney skynnes to the Cape and sleves and one hundreth blacke Conye skynnes more to the same gowne all of our greate wardrobe

25. ITEM for two Cappes of powdered Armions and for two poundes of swete powder all of our greate Warderobe

26. ITEM for furring of a peire of buskins of blacke velvet furred withe sixetene blacke
conye skins all of our greate warderobe

27. ITEM to MARY Wilkinsonoure Silkwomanfor threscore and twelve yerdes of
garthering Ribande thre dosson pece of Jeane poyntinge Ribande one pece of brode
blacke Jeane Ribande eleven ounce quarter d of granado Silkes of Colloures & blacke
Thre ounces d quarter of Spanyshe Lase and grosse of Blacke Buttons and one peire of
ballandes with a pile of weightes all of our greate warderobe

28. ITEM delivered to the saide Edwarde Jones and by him employed uppon our apparell
above saide twenty & two ounces quarter of granado Silke of collors and Blacke / two
dossen Buttons with stalkes nyntene ounces three quarters of bussshell worke lase purled
Sixe ounces and a haulf of Russett bussshell work{e} lase purled one bothe sides /
Twentie & two ounces iij quarters of Sylver lase frenged on bothe sides and also planne
empoyled [sic] upon a gowne of Russett Satten Thirtine and nyne ounces d quarter of
golde lase {ra}yzed emploied uppon a gowne of purple Taffata and dossen of buttones
with stawlkes of venice golde and Sylver oone pece of blacke jeane poynting Ribande
and foure yerdes of brode Tawny Jeane Ribande for the Maundie gowne all of our greate
warderobe

29. ITEM delyvered for the saide lady Jeane Somer foure pece of hollowe lase of
collours & foure pece of collourd Jene poynting Ribande and one pece of girdeling all of
our greate warderobe

30. ITEM delyvered for William Somer oure foole nyne dossen of buttons of diverse
collours fyve ounces quarter of silke fourtene peire of lynen hoose Sixe peire of
buckeram hoose and two peires of wollen hoose all of our greate warderobe
31. ITEM delyvered for Jeane *our* foole twelve ounces of frenge of collors to edge a
gowne and a Cap \for making of the same gowne/ and for four peres of knit hoose All of
*our* greate warderobe

32. ITEM more dylyvered to the saide Jones for the saide Ladie Somer tenne yardes of
Tawney and blacke jeane poynting Ribande and one ounce *quarter* of Crimsin Silke All
of our greate warderobe

33. ITEM to Myles Huggarde our hoser for fyvetene peires of hoose stiched withe
Spanyshe Silke all of our greate wardrobe

34. ITEM for fyve peres of hoose for the \*saide/ Ladye Jeane Somer all of *our* greate
warderobe

35. ITEM to Henry Arnolde our Shoomaker for makinge of fyvetene \*pere of/ veluett
<paire of> shoos lined *with* Satten and Scarlett in the sowles and stiched *with* Silke for
making of two peires of slippers lined *with* Scarlett and stiched *with* Silke and for making
of a peire of buskins of veluett all of *our* greate warderobe

36. ITEM for sixe peires of shoos for
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The saide Ladye Jeane stiched all of *our* greate warderobe

37. ITEM for twelve peire of letter shooes for the saide Jeane *our* foole all of our greate
warderobe
38. ITEM to Anthony Sylver our whelwrite for a newe close Carre complet with wheles strakes nayles colyges Locke and keyes with all manner of troneworke belonging to ye same Carre and for paynting of the same with our armes and letters all of our greate wardrobe

39. ITEM to Richarde Tysdale Taylor for making of a Coate of grene clothe planne for the saide William Somer our foole lined with blacke Cotton for making of a Coate of grene clothe garded with grene veluett and lined with Cotton for making of a gowne and a Jerkin of blewe Damaske guarded with Carnation veluett the jerken lined with cotton for two dublettes of Canvas lined with canvas and Lockeram And a dublett of Blacke fustian lined with Canvas & Cotton all of our greate wardrobe

40. ITEM to Johne Eyelande our Cutler for dressing our greate bearing sworde for dressing our Litell bearing Sworde for dressing of a guilt Rapier and dagger and for dressing of a white Rapier and dagger all of our greate wardrobe

41. To John Grome our Cofermaker for one bearehide to cover and closecarre with of letter and sereclothe to put in under the letter and lynynges of it with lynnen & garnysshed with Ribande & noules / for a clothe sacke of letter lined with Canvas with laces & braces to the same for one Male of leather lined with yellowe Cotton with laces & braces to the same for two greate colie baskettes lined with letter & two finale pottes of double letter all of our greate wardrobe And these our letters signed with our one hande shalbe youre sufficient and warrannte & dischardge in the behaulf yeomen under our Signett at our Manor of St. James the last of September the vth yeare of our reigne

*lower right:*
To our Trusty and right
welbeloved Connsailor Sir Edwarde
Waldegrave Knight Master of oure
Greate warderobe

LC 5/31 ff. 94-99: 27 March 1558
Lord Chamberlaine’s copies of the warrants
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A Warrannte for the Quenes Majesty’s apparell for halfe a yere ended at our lady day ro? with & c & also for dyvers other allowannces in ye same tyme/

We woll and Commannde you that immediately upon the sight hereof ye do content and paye or cause to be contented and payde to all suche persons whose names hereafter ensuethe for all suche parcelles of Stuff and workemanshipes by them don and delyvered to oure use as particularly hereafter ensuethe That is to saye

1. FIRST to Edwarde Jones our TAYLOR for lynyng of a french kyrtle of figured velluett withe blacke Taffata of our greate warderobe.

2. ITEM for making of a frenche kyrtle and a payre of sleves of blake Satten lined withe blacke Taffata and edged with blacke velluett the pleights lyned withe kersy the sleves withe fustian and Canvas all of our grete Garderobe.
3. ITEM for Edging of two kyrtles the one of Purple Tysshewe edged *with* Purple velluet, thother of White velluett edged withe blacke velluett lefte oute of the laste Warrannste of our greate warderobe.

4. ITEM for making of a lowse gowne of blacke velluett bordered withe Buckeram the upper sleves lyned withe fryse the foresleves and stey withe fustian and bagges of blacke Satten all of oure grete Gardebroe.

5. ITEM for sleuing of two gowns thone of Purple Satten enbrauedered withe withe [sic] golde Thother of Purple figured Veluet likewyse Enbrauedered withe golde of our greate wardrobe.

6. ITEM for
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makinge of a lowse gowne of blacke damaske of oure store in the warderobe of oure Roobes garded with blacke velluett layd one withe purled lase and styched withe silke the upper sleves lyned withe fryse the foresleves and stayes *with* white fustian withe bagges of blacke Satten and bordered withe buckeram of our grete warderobe.

7. ITEM for making of a frenche kyrtle and a paire of sleves of blake veluett lyned withe blacke Taffata the pleights lyned withe kersey and lett downe withe blacke Satten the sleves lyned with blacke fustian all of our greate warderobe.

8. ITEM ffor makinge of a lowse gown of Russett Velluett, the uppersleves lyned *with*
fryse the foresleves and stey with the white fustian with the bagges of blacke Satten and bordered with the Buckeram all of our greate Warderobe.

9. ITEM for making of a frenche kyrtle and a payre of sleves of Russet Satten lyned with russet Taffata and Edged with russett velluett, the pleights lyned withe kersy the sleves with fustian and Canvas all of our grete Garderobe

10. ITEM for making of two petycoats of crimsin Satten garded with Crimsin velluett styched and whypeped one the edge with twiste the skyrte lyned withe red kersey the bodyes and placarde with lynen all of our greate warderobe

11. ITEM for makinge of a Vardingall of Crimsin Satten lyned with crimsin Taffata and bordered with crimsin velluett the roopes covered with red kersy and the bodyes lined withe lynen all of our greate warderobe.

12. ITEM for makinge of a lowse gown of blacke Satten garded withe an Enbraudered garde of blacke velluett bordered with Buckeram the sleves and steye with fustian, the upersleves lyned with fryse and bagges of blacke Satten of our greate warderobe the saide garde of our store excepte one yarde of velluett to perfourme The same of our greate warderobe

13. ITEM for makyng of a lowse gowne of russett wrought velluett bordered withe Buckeram the upper sleves lyned with frise the foresleves and stey withe fustian and bagges of blacke Satten all of our greate warderobe

14. ITEM: Delyvered unto thoffice of the wardrobe of our roobes to our use three clowte of nedells one quarterne of white threde one dosen
\yet for the warderobe of the Roobes/

and a halfe of brushes one bolte of blacke threde sixe rubbinge brushes one bottle of ynke
one realme of Paper one quarterm of Seringe candelles and one yarde of clothe for
necessaryes all of our grete warderobe.

15. ITEM for thre quarteres of a yarde of grene Sarstnett to cover a picture one yarde of
Crimsin Satten and one yarde of white Satten delyvered to oure use all of our greate
warderobe

16. ITEM for halfe a yarde and half a quarter of Crimsin Satten to make a Corporno and
one quarter and a halfe of crimsin Taffata to lyne the same of oure greate warderobe.

17. ITEM for fivetene yerdes of blacke velluet and thirty yardes of blacke satten by us
gyven in neweyeres guyftes to our gentlemen ushers and other officers of oure Chambre
and householde on newyeres daye last past Thre yardes of blacke Satten gyven to
Mistress Barney beinge Jeane Foole her valentyne And thre yardes of blacke Satten
gyven to Thomas Rutlag yeoman Cooke for our monthe all of oure greate warderobe.

18. ITEM for making of a petycoate for the Lady Jane Semor of Scarlett garded with
crimsin velluett and upperbodyed with Crimsin Satten styched & lyned withe lyanen
clothe And for makyng of a Varthingall of red Mocado for her the nether skyrtes bordred
withe clothe & one yarde of Crimsin Satten and one yarde of White Satten and one yarde
halfe quarter of blacke velluett to mak her habylliamente all of our greate warderobe
19. ITEM: for fyve yardes of Taffata to make a gowne for her gentlewoman and two yerdes of Velluett to garde the same all of our greate warderobe

20. ITEM: for making of a dowche gowne for Jane our foole of blewe fustian of Naples the pleights lyned withe Cotton and Buckeram, the bodyes and sleves with fustian the uppersleves withe fryse and for makyng of a krtle for her of striped Mocado lined with Cotton the bodyes and placarde with lynen cloth And for makinge of an other dowche gowne for her of wrought fustian of Naples the pleights lyned withe Cotton and buckeram the bodyes and sleves with fustian the uppersleves with fryse and the collor with past buckeram and also for makyng of a krtle for her of striped Russello lyned withe Cotton the bodeys and placard with lynen clothe all of oure greate Garderobe

21. ITEM: for three yards of russet clothe to make a gowne for William Somer his sister of oure greate warderobe

22. ITEM: for thre yardes of red clothe to
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\ yet for the warderobe of the roobes/ make a Coate for the saide Edwarde Jones and two yerdes of veluett to garde the same for lynyng makynge and Enbroderinge of our letters all of our grete warderobe

23. ITEM to Thomas Perrye our SKYNNER for furring of a gowne of blacke veluett with one hunderethe of blacke coney skynnes and eighte blacke coney skynnes with white heares to the ventes and Caapes all of our grete warderobe.
24. ITEM for furring of a gowne of blacke damask with the one hundredth and five blacke coney skynnes and eighte blacke coney skynnes with white heares to the caaps ventes and sleves all of our greate warderobe.

25. ITEM: for furring of a gowne of Russet velluet with eightene Sable skynnes ofoure store receyved of a David Vincente & two Sable skynnes of our store received of Arthur Sturton / And more thre Tymbre of Callabor of our greate warderobe.

26. ITEM for makyng of a Typpett with foure sable skynnes of our store receved of the same Sturton

27. ITEM for furring of a Gowne of blacke Satten Enbrauered withe sixe Luzarne skynnes and fyve furres of lybordes powte of our greate warderobe.

28. ITEM for furring of a Gowne of blacke velluett withe sixe Luzarne skynnes and fyve furres of Liberde powte of our greate warderobe.

29. ITEM for thre powndes of swete powder of our greate warderobe.

30. ITEM to Mary Wilkinson our SILKEWOMAN for forescore and eighte yerdes of garthering Ribande and for one hunderethe fyftye & eighte yardes and a halfe of girdelinge And twenty & one peces of Jeane poynting Ribande and twelve yardes of brode crimsin Ribandes fyve ounce halfe one quarter of silke of sundery colours fyve dozen of buttons of sundery colours foure ounces of Spanyshe lase nyne grosse and a halfe of Ribande poyntes of diverse colours And one quarterme of a pounde of whyte threde all of our greate warderobe.
31. ITEM Delivered to the saide Edward Jones our Taylor and by him employed upon our apparell aforesaide Twenty and one ounces of granado Silke of sundery collours fourtene ounces and a halfe of blacke bussshell worke lace / two dosen of Buttons with stalks / Thre ounces of Crimsin Cheyme twiste and halfe one dosen of Buttons withooute stalkes all of oure greate warderobe.

32. ITEM: Delyvered to the saide Lady Jane Semor sixe peces of blacke Jeane
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\'yett for the warderobe of the roobes/

poyntinge Ribandes ffoure peces of hollowe lase one pece of girdling and thre ounces of of crimsin sylke in grayne

33. ITEM delyvered for the saide William Somer eighte dosen of rounde sylke poyntes thre ounces thre quarters of sylke twelve shirts of Hollande clothe twelve handekercheres of hollande, foure payres of wollen hooose, sixe payres of lynen hooose and two paires <of> of blacke buckeram hooose all of oure greate warderobe.

34. ITEM delyvered for the said Jane foole thyrtie one ounces thre quarters of frendge in collours and frendging of the saide two Gownes and Cappes of fustian of Naples and for makynge of the same Cappes and for thirtene payres of blacke knite hooose all of oure greate warderobe.

35. ITEM: to Myles Huggarde our HOSYER for fyvetene payres of hooose styched withe Spanyshe silke all of oure greate warderobe.
36. ITEM: for thre yardes of clothe to make the saide Myles a Coate & two yardes of velluet to garde the same for lynyng makynge and Enbrauderings of oure letters all of our greate Warderobe.

37. ITEM to Henrye Arnold our SHOMAKER for makinge of sixtene payre of shooes of velluett lyned with Satten and Skarlett in ye soles and for stichinge those shooes And for makynge of two payres of velluett slippers lyned with Skarlett all of oure greate Warderobe.

38. ITEM for makynge sixe payres of velluett shooes for the saide Lady Jane and for stichinge them and for a payre of velluett slippers for her and for stiching them all of our grete Garderobe.

39. ITEM for twelve paires of shooes for the saide Jane foole of oure grete warderobe.

40. ITEM for thre yardes of clothe to make a Coate for the said Henrye Arnoldde and two yardes of velluet to garde the same for lynyng, makyng and Enbrauderings of our letters all of our greate Warderobe.

41. ITEM to John Grome our COFERMAKER for two cloose stoles covered with velluett Crimsin and for one clothe sacke of hyde lether lyned with Canvas with braces & laces to the same for the sompter and male of lether lyned with yellowe Cotton withe braces and laces to the same two thousande hookes and one hundrethes Crochettes all of oure greate warderobe.

42. ITEM to John Keyne our BLAKESMYTHE for makynge of thre keyes for thoffices of oure Roobes and for a storkelocke and two keyes for the same and a fyer shovell all of
our greate warderobe.

43. ITEM for thre yarde of
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\yet for the warderobe of the Roobes/

Clothe to make hym a Coate and two yarde of Velluett to garde the same for lynynge makynge & Enbraudering \of our letters/ all of our greate Warderobe.

44. ITEM to John Eylande our CUTLAR for dressinge the greate bearinge Sworde and the litle bearing Sworde for makynge of a Crimsin velluett Scaborde and for makynge of a case of letcher lyned with Cotten all of our greate Warderobe.

45. ITEM for thre yarde of clothe to make him a coate and two yerdes of veluett to garde the same for lynynge makynge and Enbrauderinge of our letters all of our grete warderobe.

46. ITEM to Rycharde Tysdale TAYLOR for makynge of a Coate for the saide William Somer of clothe garded with russett velluet and lyned with Cotton And for makynge of a wynter Gowne for him of clothe the sleves lyned with Cotton and for makynge of a Coate of playne clothe for hym lyned with Cotton for making of two Petycoats of flanen and for makynge of two doublettes for him of fustian lyned with Cotton all of our greate Warderobe.

47. ITEM: for makyng of a Gowne for Edwarde Prydon clerke of our warderobe of roobes and beldles of Chamblett garded with Puke velluet layed on with lace and furred
with boodge for makinge of a Jacquet for him of Puke veluett garded with the same veluett and layd on with lace with buttons of Sylke the bodyes lyned with fustian and the bases with cotton And for makyng a doublett for him of the saide veluett lyned withe fustian and Canvas and buttons of Silke all of oure greate warderobe.

48. ITEM to the said Thomas Perrye for furringe of a Gowne of cloth for the said William Somer withe thre Tymber of Callabor and thyrtine and eighte whyte lambe Skynnes all of our greate warderobe.

49. ITEM to the saide Mary Wilkinson for four elles of hollande delyvered for the saide William Somer And more for sixe pece of blacke Jeane poyntinge Ribande two dosen of Buttons withe brode knottes and one ounce of Spanyshe lase all of our greate warderobe.

50. ITEM to the saide Myles Huggarde for makyng of foure paire of hoose of clothe for the sayde Ladye Jane Semor of our greate warderobe.

AND THEISE our letters Signed with our owne hande shalbe your sufficient warrannte & dischardge on the behalfe YOUEN under our Signett at our Mannor at Grenewiche the xxxth of of Marche the vth yere of our reigne

lower right hand corner:

To our trusty and righte welbeloved counsaillor

Sir Edwarde Waldegrave knight maister

of our greate warderobe
Lord Chamberlaine’s copies of the warrants
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A warrant for the wardrobe of the Roobes for one halfe year ended at March 1 Anno vj

We woll and Commannde you that immediately upon the sight hereof ye do content and paye or cause to be content and payde to all suche persones whose names hereafter ensue for all suche parcelles of Stuffe and workmankshipes by them done and delyvered to oure use as particulary hereafter ensuethe That is to say

1. FIRST to Edwarde Jones our Taylour for making of a ffrench kirtle of Russett veluett lett downe with Russett Satten and lyned/ with Russett Taffata the pleights lyned with kersey with a paiire of sleves of the same Satten lyned withe fustian all of oure great Wardrobe

2. ITEM for makinge of a frenche kirtle of blacke Satten Lyned with black Taphata the pleits Lyned with karyse and edged with Blacke velvet with a paiire of Sleves to the same Lyned with ffustian and Canvas all of oure greate warderobe

3. ITEM for makinge of a ngght gowne of Blacke veluett Lyned with Blacke Taffata and edged with Lace and ffrendge the upper sleves Lyned with Cotton the gowne Bordured with Buckeram the staie of white ffustian and the Coller Lyned with ffurred Veluett all of our greate warderobe
4. ITEM for making of a nyghte gowne of black Damaske with Spanyshe welts and Stytched Laied on with purled Lace the Sleves pulled oute with Sarstnett the Upper sleves Lyned with Cotton and a Staie of white fustian all of oure greate warderobe

5. ITEM for making a Lowse gowne of Russett Taffata garded with three Spanyshe weltes and purled Lace Lyned with Russett Taphata the garde Lyned with Buckeram the upper sleves Lyned with ffrise the Coller and Staie of white ffustian the Sleves pulled oute with Russett Taffata Sarcenett the Coller Lyned with paste Buckeram all of oure greate warderobe

6. ITEM for makinge of a ffrench kirtle of Russett Veluett Lett downe with Russett Satten Lyned with russett Taffata The pletes Lyned with Carseye with a paire of sleves of the same \lyned with fustian/ all of oure greate warderobe

7. ITEM for making of a Lowse gowne of Russett Satten garded with russett veluett the garde enbrauedered Lyned with Russett Taffata the upper sleves Lyned with ffrise and the coller and Staie of white ffustian the Sleves pulled oute with Russett Taffata Sarcenett and paste buckeram for the collar all of oure Greate wardrobe

8. ITEM for making of a Loose gowne of Black Wrought Veluett Lyned with blacke Taffata the Sleves pulled oute with Taffata Sarstinnett the collar and Stae of white ffustian the upper sleves Lyned with ffrise and paste buckram for the collar and border all of oure greate warderobe

9. ITEM for makinge of a ffrench kirtle of Blacke wrought veluett Lined with Blacke Taffata lett downe with Blacke Satten and the pletes Lyned with karseye with a paire of
sleves to the same Lyned with ffustian all of oure greate Wardrobe

10. ITEM for makinge of a Louse gowne of Blacke Taffata welted with
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Blacke Velvett and Purled Lace the gowne Lined with Black Taffata the Coller and Staie of white ffustian and past buckram and Bordered aboute with buckeram the sleves pulled oute with Taffata Saracenett the uppersleves Lyned with ffrise all of oure greate wardrobe.

11. ITEM for makinge a nyght gowne of Black Damaske edged with blacke veluett bordered with Buckeram with Bagges of Black Satten and Staie of white ffustian all of oure greate wardrobe

12. ITEM for makinge of a Stomacher of Skarlett Lyned with crimsin velvett, all of oure greate wardrobe

13. ITEM for makinge of a forepart of a kirtell of Blacke Vluett Lyned with Blacke Taffata all of oure greate wardrobe

14. ITEM for makinge of a Verthingale of crimsin satten Lyned with crimsin Taffata the ropes covered with red karsey and for two Bodies for the same verthen-gale thone of Crimsin Satten thother of Crimsin Taffata both Lyned with Canvas all of our greate wardrobe

15. ITEM for makinge of ij Cases of Buckeram for ij riche gownes all of our greate wardrobe

16. ITEM for xxx elles quarter of hollande cloth delivered to Mistress Babington to oure
use all of oure greate wardrobe

17. ITEM for twenti and foure yardees iiij quarters and half a quarter of Clothe of Silver playn xij yardees of purple veluett and xij yardees of Orinje veluett by us geven to the Ladie Anne Sommersett to hir mariage all of oure greate wardrobe

18. ITEM for xviij yardees of Blacke veluett and xviij yardees of Russett Veluett by us geven to Margarete Cooke to hir mariage all of oure greate wardrobe

19. ITEM for xviij yardees of Russett Veluett by us geven to Marnie Farnegan to hir mariage all of oure greate Wardrobe

20. ITEM for an halfe yarde and half a quarter of Crimsin veluett delivered to Mistress Russell for oure use all of oure greate wardrobe

21. ITEM for ij yardees of yelowe Taffata Sarcenett ij yardees of Tawney Taffata Sarcenett iiij yardees of yelowe Sarcenett and iiij yardees of Blewe Sarcenett delivered to Mistress Clarenecius to oure use all of oure greate wardrobe

22. ITEM for one half elle of grene sarcenett one half ell of yelowe Taffata Sarcenett ij yardees of Purple veluett and iiij quarters of a yarde of yelowe Sarcenett delivered to oure use all of our great wardrobe

23. ITEM delivered unto the wardrobe of oure Robes to oure use one quarter of a pounde of white thred ij delivered of Brusses and one brushe one yarde of Cloths for necessaries xij yardees of white Cotton to case riche sleves ij Bottelles of ynke one paper Booke one Realme of papere one paire of sleves and ij clowtes of nedles all of oure greate wardrobe
24. ITEM for makinge of a ffrench kirtl for the Ladie Katherine Graie of yolowe Satten raised Lyned with yolowe taffata Sarce nett and edged with yellow veluet Lett downe with yolowe Bridge Satten the pletes Lyned with yolowe Cotton with a paire of sleves
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of the same {all of} Lyned with ffustian all of oure grete wardrobe

25. ITEM for makinge of a Loose gowne for hir of Blaque taffata Garded with Spanyshe weltes and Stitched Laied aboute with purled Lace and ffrendge and Lyned with ffustian the fore sleves Lyned with Sarstnett the upper sleves Lined with ffrize the garde Lyned with Buckeram and the coller Lined with paste Buckeram all of our greate wardrobe

26. ITEM for makinge of a loose gowne of Black damaske for the Ladie Jane Seamor lyned with ffustian garded with iij weltes of Blacke Velvet and Stitched and whipped with purled Lace and edged on eather sid with purled Lace frendged aboute with a ffrendge the upper sleves Lyned with ffrize the foresleves Lyned with Sarstnett all of oure greate wardrobe

27. ITEM for makinge of a Loose gowne for hir of Russett tafata Lyned with ffustian welted with Blacke Velvuett edged with Purled Lace and ffrendge the uppersleves Lyned with frize the foresleves Lyned with Sarstnett and the garde Lyned with Buckeram all of oure greate wardrobe

28. ITEM for making of a Loose gowne for hir of Blacke figured veluett Lyned with ffustian edged with ffrendge the cape Lyned with ffurred Veluett the upper sleves Lyned with ffrize the fore sleves Lyned with Sarstnett all of oure greate wardrobe
29. ITEM for making of a ffrench kirtle for hir of Clothe of Silver Lyned with Sarstnett edged with white veluett Lett Downe with Bridge Satten And the plites Lyned with cotton for makinge of a kirtle of Blacke Veluett for hyr Lyned with Blacke Sarstnett Lett downe with Bridge satten and the Plites Lined with Blacke cotton And for makinge of a kirtle of yelowe velvet for hir Lyned with yelowe Sarstnett Lett Downe with yelowe Bridge Satten and the Plaites Lyned with Yelowe Cotton all of oure greate warderobe

30. ITEM: for making of a peticote for hir of Crimsen Taffata garded with crismin Veluett the garde stitched all on and edged with Crimsen Satten the Bodies Lyned with Lyning cloth for makinge of a verthingale for hir of crimsin Bridge Satten Bordured with Crimsin Veluett and one yarde one nale of Black velvet one yarde of Crimsin Satten and one yarde of white Satten to make a Billamente for hir all of our great wardrobe

31. ITEM for makinge of a Loose gown of Blacke Clothe ffor ffrance makwilliams garded with Blacke velvet and stitched with Silke Lyned with cotton and ffustian the uppersleves Lyned with ffryse the Bagges and Staiies of ffustian all of oure greate wardrobe

32. ITEM for makinge
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of a Dutche gowne for Jane oure ffoole of redde and yelowe silk Lyned with Cotton and ffustian and Buckeram to the nether skirtes and Paste Buckeram to the collar and ffrize for thupper sleves for makinge of a duytche gown for hir of grene damaske Garded with yelowe velvett the garde Stitched with grene Silke Lyned with Cotton and ffustian with
Buckeram to the nether skirtes and paste Buckeram for the coller and frize for the upper sleves and Pulled oute with grene Sarstnett all of oure greate wardrobe

33. ITEM for making of a loose gowne for hir of Crimsin ffustian of naples Lyned with Blacke Cotton the uppersleves Lyned with ffrrize foresleves Lyned with fustian with a Bagge and a Staie of ffustian Buckeram and for makinge of a peticote of red cloth the Bodies of red ffustian and Lyned with Lynen cloth all of oure greate wardrobe

34. ITEM To Thomas Percie oure SKYNNER for one capp of Powdered Ermyns and v poundes of Swett powdre all of oure greate wardrobe

35. ITEM: for ffurring of a gowne of black Damaske with viij white heared Coney Skynnes and one other Black Coney Skinnes all of oure greate wardrobe

36. ITEM for furringe of one paire of Buskinns of Blacke velvet xv Black Coney skynnes all of oure greate wardrobe

37. ITEM for furynge of a gowne of Black clothe for the foresaid mak{.. “} with vj Black Coney Skynnes with white heres all of our greate wardrobe

38. ITEM: for furring of a gowne of Redde fustian of Naples for Jane our foole with a newe coloured ffurre all of oure greate wardrobe

39. ITEM to Mary Wilkenson oure SILKEWOMAN for lxxv yardes of garteringe Ribande for xxxj peices of Poynting Ribande iiiij ounces and a half of Spanyshe Lace half a pounde of Silk and grosse of Buttons halfe a pounde and half an ounce of white threed and ij dl of Buttons with Brode Knottes all of oure greate wardrobe
40. ITEM delyvered to the saide Edwarde Jones and by him employed upon our apparell aforewritten twentie and Sixe ounces of Silke Twentie & iiiij ounces of purled lace nintene ounces of Satten frendege twentie yardes of Passamocyne lace fyve dosen and foure buttons with brode knottes two dosen & a halfe of buttons with Stalkes foure pece of poynting Ribandes & one ounce of Crimsin Silke for the stitchinge of a Varthingale all of oure greate wardrobe

41. ITEM: delyvered to the saide Jones and by him employed upon the Lady Katherines apparell aforesaide nyne ounces of purled lace fyvetene ounces of frendege vj ounces of Silke & ij pece of poynting riband all of our great wardrobe
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42. ITEM delyvered to the saide Jones as aforesaide for the Lady Jane Semor seventene ounces of Silke twentie & vj ounces of purled lace fourtie sixe ounces thre quarter of Satten frendge bothe russett & Blacke twelve pece of poynting Riband & sixe pece of hollowe lace all of oure greate wardrobe

43. ITEM delyvered to John Grene our Coffermaker and by him employed upon certen cases to oure use Sixe ounces of golde lace rysed & playne & thirtene yardes more of golde lace fourtene yardes of Spanyshe Riband thre dosen of Ribon poyntes two ounces of Silke & halfe a yarde of golde twist all of oure greate wardrobe

44. ITEM: delyvered for William Somer our foole seven ounces & a halfe of Silke one grosse of Buttons withe stalkes eight Tassells of grene & yellowe Silke two elles of holland clothe fore paires of lynen hose v paires of Buckeram hose half a dosen of
handkerchers & three dozen of rounde Buttons all of our greate Wardrobe

45. ITEM for the saide Jane our fool e thirtene ounces & a half of Silke frendge to frendge a gowne & two cappes for making of the saide two cappes for thre ounces of grene Silke for another gowne of grene Damaske one pece of Ribande & twelve paires of wollen hose all of our greate wardrobe

46. ITEM to Miles Huggarde our HOSER for making of fyvetene pairs of hoose stitched with the Sylke for clothe and makinge all of our greate wardrobe

47. ITEM for making of fyve paires of hose for the ladie Jane Semor for clothe & making all of our greate wardrobe

48. ITEM to Henry Arnolde our Shomaker for makinge of two paires of Veluett buskins for makinge of two paires of veluett Slippers & fyvetene pairs of veluett shoo lined with Satten and skarlett in the soles all of our greate wardrobe

49. ITEM for making of Sixe paires of veluett shooes for the saide Ladye Jane Semer all of our great Wardrobe

50. ITEM To John Grene our COFFERMAKER for making of three smale coffers covered & lyned withe Blacke veluett & edged withe Passamaynes of golde one coffer covered and lined withe Crimsin veluett & edged with passamayne of golde And one frame of Copper covered withe lynen clothe under & covered upon the same withe grene clothe of gold all of our greate warderobe

51. ITEM for our clothe sacke of sade coffer Lined with Canvas with laces and braces to
the same for the Sumpter & one Male of hide leather lyned with yellowe cotton withe laces & braces to the same for one beare hide of oxe leather to cover a Carte for thuse of oure saide Warderobe of Roobes ffor foure coffer cases lined with yellowe Cotton & two smale pottes of letter all of oure great wardrobe

52. ITEM to Richard Tysdale TAYLOUR for making of two grene coates for William Somer our foole thone garded withe veluett & thother playne bothe lyned with Cotton for making of two canvas doublette
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for him lyned with Lockeram and for making of a gowne of grene Damaske garded withe yellowe veluett & for makinge of a Jerken of the same Damaske likewise garded withe yellowe veluett and lyned with cotton all of oure greate wardrobe

53. ITEM to John Aylande our CUTLER for dressinge and making cleane of the greate bearinge Swordes for dressing and making cleane of the littell bearinge swords And for dressing of two rapiers & two daggers all of oure greate wardrobe

54. ITEM to Jon Keynes oure LOCKSMITHE for one pressing from three newe handles of Iron for a greate Capcase and for mendinge of the same Capcast for one locke for our office of Roobes at Richmounte for fyve handles for two chests in the same office for a hammer of Iron to the same office for one storke locke thoffice at St. James & one newe locke & two keyes for mendinge of the locke of the close carre And for the Ironworke of a chest with two lockes & one haspe for the same all of oure greate wardrobe
AND this oure letters signed with our owne hande shalbe your sufficient Warrannte &
dischardge in this behalf YEOVEY under our Signett at our Manour of Saynt James the
last of Octobre the Sixthe yere of our Reigne

To our trusty & right welbeloved Concellor

Sir Edward Waldegrave knight Master

of oure great Warderobe

E101/424 7: Accounts of Apparel for Mary, 1545 – 1547

[f. 1]

\ffor my lady Marys grace/

1. Ffyrst for the translatyng of a gowne of blacke velvett with pyppyes of damaske golde
   – for the Werkmanshynp of yt – xl s
2. Item for xvj oz wyrth of damaske golld spent about the sayde Gowne and pyppyes at
   vj the oz – iiij li xv s
3. Item for cutting apayre of slyves of blacke damaske and drawen owtt of blacke
   sarsenett pryse – v s
4. Item for cutting a payre of slevyes of blacke taffeta and drawen owtt of blacke
   sarsenett pryse – v s
5. Item for cuttynge a payre of slyves of blacke veluett – v s
6. Item for the Enbrotheryng of a gowne of blacke velvet of pastine of golld with a
braydde of fyne venyse golld for the werkemenshyp – xl s

7. Item for on pownde and a halfe of venyse golld spent upon a sayde gowne at lij s the pounde tot – iiij li xviij s

8. Item for xxxvj oz of pastmene spent upon the sayd gowne at viij s the oz tot – xiiiij li xv iiij s

9. Item for halfe a pownde of sylke spent upon the Sayde gowne at xiiij d the oz tot – ix s iiiij d

10. Item for the enbrotheryng of a gowne of pourpyll Satten Wrought with pastment of golde and sylver with a brayd of golldde and sylver for the weremanshyp of yt – xl s

11. Item for xxxvj oz of pastment of golldde spent upon the sayde gowne at viij b th oz tot – xiiiij li viij s

12. Item for one pownde and a halfe of fyne venys golldde spente upon yis sayde gowne at lij s the pownde tot – iiij li xviij s

13. It{em for} halfe pow{n}d of sylke spent upon the sayd {portion of line missing/bottom of page torn} tot – ix s iiiij d

bottom right scribbles, mostly illegible, seem to be calculations. some missing due to page tear
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\yet for my lady marys grace/

14. Item for the translatying of thre payre of sleves to make them frenche sleves the one payre of blacke lynsen another payre of pourpyll Satten another payre of cramsyn Satten new frendgye all aboutt With frenge of venyse golldde and Wreghep of venyse
gollde and pyrll of damaske golld for the wer-kemanshyp of a payre – xx s Tot – iij li

15. Item for the enbrotheryng of a gowne of blacke satten enbrotheryd with pastmene of gollde and sylver and with abrayde one entire syde of even pastmene off venyse gollde and sylver for the werkemynshype of yt – x l s

16. Item for one pownde and a halfe of fyne venyse gollde and sylver spent upon ye sayd gowne at lij s the pownde tot – iii li xviii s

17. Item for xxxvj oz of pastmene of gollde and sylver spent upon the sayde gowne at viij s the oz same – xviii li viii s

18. Item for hafe a pownd of fyne sylke spent upon ye sayd gowne at xiiiij d the ox tot – ix s iiii d

19. Itm for the translatyng of a payre of frenche slyvys to make them venysyane slyvys of blacke veluett gardye with pastmene of gollde and greate Wrought of venyse gollde ou{t} ev? sydt pryse – x s

20. Item for thre oz of venyse spent upon the sayd slyvyse at iiij s iiij d the oz tot – xiii s

21. Item for cuttyng of a pay{re} {remainder of line lost to a torn page} velvet and draw{.....} {remainder of line lost to a torn page}

[f. 2]

\yet for my lady marys grace/

22. Item for cuttyng a payre of slyvys of tawny veluett and drawen of tawny sarstnet pryse – v s

23. Item for cuttyng a payre of slyvyse of pourpyll velvet and drawen of golde sarsenet
pryse – v s

24. Item for cuttynge a payre of slyvyes of cramyn velvet and drawen of cramyn
sarsenett pryse – v s

25. Item for the drawyng of the lynynge of a partlet upon camb{ry}cke – iiij s iiiij d

26. Item for the enbrotherynge of a payre of slyvyse upon blacke velvet enbrotheryd with
pyrlle off damaske golldde and with venyse gol{l}de for the werkmenshyp of ytt – xxx s

27. Item for vj oz of pyrlle of damaske golldde spente upon the sayde gowne at vj s the oz
tot – xxxvj s

28. Item for one oz of fyne venyse golldde spent upon the Sayd gowne at iiiij s iiiij d the oz
tot – iiiij s iiiij d

29. Item for ij oz of sylke spent upon the sayd gowne at xiiij the oz tot – ij s iiiij d

Signed in Lady Mary’s handwriting: ///Marye /// {illegible date follows: ... ... ...} XJth
year

{crossed out notes below signature}

[f. 3]

My Lady Maryes graces the viijth day of December the xxxviiith {....} of King Henry the
viiiith

[7 December 1546]
1. Item for furring of a gowne of black velvett *with* powdred armyns – vj s viij d

2. Item to the same gowne iij tymbre of *calaber* at mynd gow{s} the tymber xxvj s viij d – iiij li

3. Item more to the same vj hondeeth powedryngs payes the hundreth ij s – xij s

4. Item for furryng of a gowne of blacke satten gardett *with* blacke velvett furred *with* blacke coneys – vj s viij d

5. Item to the same gowne vjxx xij blake cony skynes go{.} of the prycs the pees iij li xvij s

6. Item for furring of a gowne of blacke Satten *with* budge of golde *with* lusarnis and white lamb – lvj s viij d

7. Item to the same gowne iij lusarnes skynes prycs the pees iiij li Imm – xij li

8. Item more to the body and sleves of the same gowne xl white lamb skyns prycs the pees iiij d Imm – xx s

9. Item for furryng of a gowne of \blacke veluett *with* gamgullyam – x {\*missing – torn paper\*}

10. Item to the same xij gamgullyam skynes prycs the pees vj li Imm – iiij li

{page torn – words missing} to thatt xxvj li xix s

////Marye///

Folios 3d–4d are records of tinctures, cleaners, spices and other non-textile goods intended for use in Mary’s wardrobe.

[f. 5]
My lady Mares grace

\xxix Daye Julye an\textsuperscript{o} xxxviiiith hviiith/ [29 July 1546]

1. Item ff\textae r Makinge of ff\textae renche gownes of crimsin Clothe of tysshewe Lased with 
   <tysh> Sylver – x s

2. Item ff\textae r v yardes of ffrise – iij s iiij d

3. Item ff\textae r ij yardes of ffustiand – xvj d

4. Item ff\textae r Makinge a ff\textae renche gowne of clothe of Sylver frengde uppe \textit{with} the same – 
   x s

5. Item ff\textae r v yardes of ffryse – iij s iiij d

6. Item ff\textae r ij yardes of ffustiand – xvj d

7. Item ff\textae r Makinge doewche gownes of \textit{pur}pull Satten Embrodered \textit{with} parsshement 
   of golde – x s

8. Item ff\textae r v yardes of ffryse – iij s iiij d

9. Item ff\textae r ij yardes of ffustiand – xvj d

10. Item ff\textae r vj yardes of buckeram – iij vj d

11. Item ff\textae r ij ellze of Serssenyt – xj d

12. Item ff\textae r ij {..} of two ell’ of \textit{pur}pull golde \textit{sarsennyt} ff\textae r the pullinge owte of the 
   sleyves – vj s

13. Item ff\textae r Makinge a kyrtille of crymsyn Clothe of ttysshewe – v s

14. Item ff\textae r lynynclothe to the same – viij d

15. Item ff\textae r Makinge ij payre of slyves of the same – iij s v d \textit{(page torn – possibly 
   missing characters)}

16. Item ff\textae r ij yardes of ffustiand – xvi s
17. Item for Makinge of a kyrtill of crymsyn velvet strypped with golde – v s
18. Item ffôr lynynclothe to the Same – viij d
19. Item ffôr makinge ij payre of slyves of the same – ij s viij d
20. Item ffôr ij yardes of ffustiand – xvj s
21. {Item} ffôr a yarde of canvas to trym bothe – viij s

///Marye///

Note, bottom RC: iii iiij li iiij s vj d paid

[f. 5d.]

My Lady Mares grace

22. Item ffôr Makinge iiiij kyrtilles embrodered all over with golde – xv s
23. Item ffôr lynynclothe to them all – ij s
24. Item ffôr xij yards of Skarllyt kersseye at iiiij s the yard Eom’ – xvliij s
25. Item ffôr makinge iiij payres of sleyves of the same – iiij s
26. Item ffôr iiij yardes of ffustiand – iiij s
27. Item ffôr a yarde of canvas – viij d
28. Item ffôr a yarde of velvet for edgynge the kyrtilles and the Sleyves – xiiij s iiiij d
29. Item ffôr makinge of ij partelyttes Clothe of golde and clothe of Sylver – xvj d
30. Item ffôr a yarde of ffustiand – viij d
31. Item ffôr Translatinge of a turkeys gowne of blake velvet / Embrodered with parshement lace of golde – v s
32. Item ffôr a yarde and {.} of blake velvet o the same gowne – xxiiiij s
33. Item ffor makinge a turkeye gowne of blake Satten – x s
34. Item ffor iiiij Dozen of Satten wurtges – vj s
35. Item ffor Cuttinge and pyngkinge of the velvet – iii s iii d
36. Item ffor makinge a turkeys gowne of blake Taphata - x s
37. Item ffor a roolle offyne buckeram- iiij s iiij d
38. Item ffor ij yardes of ffustian – xvj d
39. Item ffor ij hownces of wegypte lace – vi s
40. Item ffor pynkyng of ij yar{des} of {original ripped here – corner missing}
41. Item ffor an ownce of {...}

[f. 6]

My lady Mares grace

42. Item ffor makinge a vardingalle of crimsen Satten - v s
43. Item ffor a yarde and {.} of brode clothe To the rowlles – V s
44. Item ffor ij yardes of whyte Satten ffor parformane a kyrtille of <wthe> of Sylver – xvj s
45. Item ffor makinge a plackarde of <wthe> of sylver – iiij d
46. Item ffor halfe a yarde of ffustiand – iiiij d
47. Item for xxx yardes of whyte cotten ffor to Laye with in yon gownes and yon kyrtilles
   at vij d thyarde – xvij s vj d

Item ffor my lades mornyngge Apparrell

48. Item ffor makinge A matill hoode and typpett – x s
49. Item for making a surcott – x s

50. Item for making a turkeye gowne of blake clothe – x s

51. Item for making of a kyrtille of blake clothe – iiij s

{crossed out notes at the bottom: Som tote of you owne bill v s / xvj li iiiij s viij d

///Marye///

[f. 6d]

Ffor my lady mares gentelwomens morninge Apparrell

52. Item <ff> for makinge ix Slope hoodes and typpettes at ij s apece – xvij s

53. Item for makinge ix turkeye gownes for the Same gentlewomen – xxiiij s

///Marye///

CM xlij s

Some tote of your owne bill and your gentlewomens bill – <xvij li vj s viij d>

{}

Total of {...} the bylle } xiiiij li xv s vj d <{...j} xv s vj d

Which somme of xiiiij li xv s vj d <Cxiij li xv s vj d> next before saide the kings Majesty pleasure by that devise of us the Lord Protectur and others of his highneses counsill is that your Master Peckham shall paye to thandes of Nrhbrand and Rochester to the use of our very good Lady the Lady Marye grace for Discharge of all the bills before mentioned
Xxx mno D{.} march A° E vj primo [30 March 1547]

R{e~} by me Rich Wilbram signit to the Lady Marys grace to thand of my said same
Ladye Maryes grace of Master Edward Peckham Kinges treasre of the mynte / for
dyscharche of all the bills beked? Sens? by vestince? of the Councelle wan as appeth the
same of on hundrethe thyrty thre pounde ffyften Shelinges syxe pence sterling } --
Cxxxiiij li xv s vj d Richard Wilbram
APPENDIX D: FIGURES

Figure 1  Mary I, c. 1521 – 1525, Lucas Horenbout. National Portrait Gallery.
Figure 2  Mary I, 1544, Master John. National Portrait Gallery.
Figure 3  Mary I, 1553, Michaelmas roll.
Figure 4  Elizabeth I, 1559. (copy c. 1600) Unknown Artist. National Portrait Gallery, London.
Figure 5  Henry VIII, c. 1545. Unknown artist, after Hans Holbein. Courtesy of National Museums Liverpool (the Walker Gallery).

Figure 6  King Edward VI, c. 1547. Unknown artist, after William Scrots. National Portrait Gallery, London.
Figure 7  King Philip II and Queen Mary I. Eworth. 1558. Bedford Collection, Woburn Abbey.
Figure 8  Stained glass window donated by Mary and Philip. Dirck Crabeth, 1557. Sint Janskerk, Gouda, The Netherlands
Figure 9    1554 Sixpence. Private Collection, see www.petitioncrown.com

Figure 10    Two versions of Eworth 1557 portrait


Mary I, 1557. Unknown Artist, copy of Eworth original.
Figure 11  Portrait of Emperor Charles V, 1532. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna
Figure 12 Portrait of Isabel of Valois, c. 1563 - 65. Sofonisba Anguissola. Museo del Prado, Madrid.

Note the shoulder rolls, high neckline, paired aglettes and jewelled bands that make this a distinctly Spanish saya alta.

Figure 13 Catalina of Austria, Wife of Juan III of Portugal. 1553. Antonio Mor. Museo del Prado, Madrid.

Wearing a typical Spanish ropa; note the bands of trim and heavy use of gold.
Figure 14  Catherine Parr, c. 1545. Master John. National Portrait Gallery, London.
Figure 15  Closeup from Study for the Family Portrait of Thomas More, c. 1527. Hans Holbein. Kupferstichkabinett, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, Basel.
Figure 16  Christina of Denmark, Duchess of Milan, 1538. Hans Holbein. National Gallery, London
Figure 17  Philip II, c. 1550. Titian.  

As compared to Mary I, 1557. Hans Eworth.  
Private Collection, New York.
Figure 18  Mary Tudor, Artist unknown. C. 1521 – 1526. Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris
Figure 19  Unknown Woman, 1557. Hans Eworth. Tate Gallery
Figure 20  The Children of Henry VIII, c.1650-1680. Copy of a lost original, c.1545-1550. © The Duke of Buccleuch, Boughton House.
Figure 21  Mary I, 1554, Anthonis Mor. Gardner Museum, Boston.
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