

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Anna of Denmark and the Arts in Jacobean England

Jemma Aeronny Jane Field

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Art History

The University of Auckland

2015

Anna of Denmark and the Arts in
Jacobean England

Jemma Aeronny Jane Field

Volume One

Text

Abstract

This dissertation examines Anna of Denmark's (1574-1619) importance as a cultural agent and political figure at the Jacobean court (1603-1619). Using previously untapped archival material, it builds on existing scholarship to provide a more comprehensive and systematic analysis of the nature and significance of Anna's intellectual and cultural pursuits.

Encompassing the visual arts, material culture, patronage, collecting, and architecture, this study offers a multi-disciplinary approach that accords Anna greater relevance to Jacobean politics than is generally ceded. To achieve this, this thesis analyses Anna's visual persona in miniature and in large, her purchase and use of clothing and jewellery, her architectural choices and garden projects, and the layout and decoration of her three main residences: Somerset (Denmark) House, Greenwich Palace, and Oatlands Palace. In so doing, it moves beyond narrow models that have traditionally focussed on the person who paid for items, circumventing the male privilege of financial control and distribution in the period. This thesis demonstrates how Anna marshalled the portrait arts, material goods, interior furnishings, buildings, and garden structures to illustrate elements of her familial, cultural, and socio-political identity, which often diverged from that of her husband, King James VI and I (1566-1625).

This study examines how Anna negotiated a position of cultural and factional difference from James. In contrast to the work of Clare McManus, Karen Hearn, and Barbara Lewalski, however, this study does not concede that Anna was ever "estranged" from her husband. Rather, it acknowledges the inconclusive evidence surrounding the nature of Anna's political relationship to James. It highlights areas of their continued joint politicking and draws

attention to the absence of any documented rift or hostility between the royal couple. It argues that Anna's ability to secure a degree of separation from James was facilitated by the structure of the court, together with her strong support of the monarchy, and her alliance with James in key areas of policy. This is most evident in her determination to uphold a certain equivocalcy about her confessional identity, which this thesis argues was of significant political benefit to James. It is further illustrated by her advantageous politicking in the Stuarts' attempt to broker a marriage alliance with the Habsburgs. It contends that Anna's complex balancing act should be read as one example of her political intelligence. Additionally, it is argued that it should be seen as a result of the political and cultural polycentricism of the Jacobean court, which historians Malcolm Smuts, Linda Levy Peck, and Pauline Croft have identified as one of its defining characteristics. By analysing an array of Anna's cultural activities, locating them within the socio-political milieu of the Jacobean court, and sustaining all discussions with untapped archival research, this thesis presents a more comprehensive view of the Stuart queen consort than has previously been available.

Acknowledgements

In the completion of this dissertation, I have been fortunate enough to have incurred a large debt of gratitude to a number of family members, friends, colleagues and institutions.

I am grateful to the Faculty of Arts Doctoral Research Fund and the School of Humanities Research Fund from the University of Auckland for the financial support that enabled me to undertake two months of research in London in 2013. I am indebted to the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art for awarding me a Paul Mellon Research Grant, which facilitated the beginning of my primary research in the United Kingdom at the close of 2011. I am thankful to the ESF-RNP PALATIUM for the opportunity to participate in the 2013 Summer School in Madrid, which vastly expanded my knowledge and understanding of early modern courts, and enabled me to extend my scholarly network.

I would like to thank each individual member of my immediate family, especially my mother Sophie Field, together with my close friends, for providing me with a constant source of love and understanding, and for ensuring that life was never wholly about research. In London, I was blessed with a great network of friends. Rebekah McClean, Mariana Costa, Lydia Cowperton, and Laura Easter took gracious turns in providing me with accommodation, and Rebekah was an important source of information on public transport, directions, maps, and general travel advice. They, together with Cherie Vick and Sarah Dillon, generously supplied me with support and companionship during my research trips to the United Kingdom, making the experience more rewarding, enriching, and memorable.

I am indebted to a number of scholars and museum professionals. My sincere thanks to Professor Malcolm Smuts for helping to clarify my position on Anna of Denmark's confessional identity, for sharing work with me ahead of publication, and for promptly and informatively responding to my inquiries. I am grateful to fellow Anna of Denmark enthusiasts, Lucy Wood at the Victoria and Albert Museum, and David Taylor at the National Trust, who took the time to meet with me, and who not only discussed aspects of my work, but generously shared their own research with me. I would like to thank curators Vanessa Remington and Lucy Whitaker at the Royal Collection, and Diana Stone at Waddesdon Manor, for personally showing me a number of key portraits that were not on public

display. I would also like to give a special thanks to Associate Professors Len Bell and Iain Buchanan, who have unfailingly supported me over the years, nurturing my love for Art History, and providing me with invaluable academic teaching experience. I am thankful to Dr Emma Blomkamp, Nick Stanley, Nele De Raedt and Erika Carminati, for translating sources written in French, Spanish, Latin and Italian respectively.

I am grateful to my assistant supervisor, Sophie Tomlinson, for her rigorous proofing and high standards of academic writing, which challenged me to greatly improve my own. The final thesis was assisted by the editorial skills of Sally Conor, who I am extremely pleased and proud to call a friend and fellow academic. I am enormously indebted to my primary supervisor, Erin Griffey, who first inspired me to focus on the early modern, and who continues to stimulate and encourage me in all of my academic endeavours. Her own work on early modern courts, and her determination to be both an historian and an art historian, has provided me with a paradigm that I have aspired to follow throughout this thesis. I could never have completed this project without her assistance, intellectual assiduity, reassurance and her gracious replies to a myriad of emails.

Finally, my greatest debt of gratitude is to my husband, Jamie Nelson, who offered me unconditional love, and unfailing emotional, intellectual and financial support. It is to him that this thesis is dedicated, with much love and many thanks.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Contents	v
List of Abbreviations	viii
List of Illustrations	ix
Note to the Reader	xxi
Introduction	1
A Danish Princess	3
Scotland: The Apparent Conversion	6
Finding a Political Presence in Scotland and England	11
Methodology	15
Current Scholarship	20
Finance and Administration	27
Thesis Structure and Chapter Outline	32
Chapter One: Portraiture	37
The Scottish Portraits	39
The English Succession	40
The Joint English Coronation	44
Anna in Miniature: The Queen's Limner Isaac Oliver	49
Early English Portraits: Easel Paintings	57
The Years of Change: 1612-1614	58
The Initial Shift: The Woburn Portrait	77
Elizabethan Emulation	78
Representational Jewels	86
The Personal Motto	95

Iconographic Developments: The Portraits by Paul van Somer	101
The Italianate Element	114
Conclusion	120
Chapter Two: Dress and Jewellery	125
Princely Magnificence	127
The Tudor Wardrobe	135
Artificers of the Royal Wardrobe	137
The Wardrobe Inventories	139
Fabrics and Types of 'Fashion'	152
The Royal Jewellers and the Inventory of 1606	154
Comparison of the Accounts and the Inventory	157
The Crown Jewels and Issues of Ownership	160
Divine Right Monarchy	163
Repairing and Reconfiguring Jewels	169
Personalised Jewels	177
Religious Devotion: The Jewelled Evidence	187
Gift-giving and Exchange	194
Anna: A Figure of Largesse	197
Conclusion	203
Chapter Three: Buildings, Gardens, and Interior Décor	207
Building Magnificence	216
Somerset (Denmark) House	
The Queen's London Residence	218
Completed Renovations, a Wedding, and a Change of Name	221
Staging Identity in the Interior	227
Religious Devotions in the Privacy of the Palace	240
French-Italian Garden Design	248
The Italianate Mount of Parnassus	250

Greenwich Palace	
Royal Precedence, Royal Rituals, and Political Ambition	254
The English Births	256
Creating a Queen’s Court	261
Gardening with Tradition and Innovation	264
Salomon de Caus and the Gardens of Greenwich	268
Anna’s “Curious Devise”: The Queen’s House	271
Oatlands Palace	
Classicism in the Garden Buildings	276
Lineage, Learning, and Piety in the Interior	281
Visual and Imported Splendour	290
The Intellectual Queen Consort	292
Conclusion	296
Conclusion	303
Appendix I	316
Appendix II	326
Bibliography	344
Illustrations	376

List of Abbreviations

Research Libraries and Archives

BL	British Library.
CUL	Cambridge University Library.
ESRO	East Sussex Record Office.
NAS	National Archives of Scotland.
TNA	The National Archives, London.

Printed Sources

<i>BM</i>	<i>The Burlington Magazine.</i>
<i>BMC</i>	<i>The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs.</i>
<i>CSPD</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers Domestic.</i>
<i>CSPS</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers Scots.</i>
<i>CSP Spanish</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers Simancas.</i>
<i>CSPV</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers Venetian.</i>
<i>EHR</i>	<i>The English Historical Review.</i>
<i>HMC</i>	<i>Historical Manuscripts Commission.</i>
<i>JHC</i>	<i>Journal of the History of Collections.</i>
<i>ODNB</i>	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.</i>
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary.</i>
<i>SHR</i>	<i>The Scottish Historical Review.</i>

List of Illustrations

Chapter One: Portraiture

- Figure 1.1 Adrian Vanson, *King James VI of Scotland*, c.1595, London, Philip Mould Gallery.
Image Source: Philip Mould Gallery,
<http://www.historicalportraits.com/Gallery.asp?Page=Item&ItemID=1263&Desc=James-VI-%7C-Adrian-Vanson>
- Figure 1.2 After Adrian Vanson, *Anna of Denmark*, 1595, London, Philip Mould Gallery.
Image Source: Philip Mould Gallery,
<http://www.historicalportraits.com/Gallery.asp?Page=Item&ItemID=1264&Desc=Anne-of-Denmark-%7C-Adrian-Vanson>
- Figure 1.3 Nicholas Hilliard, *Queen Elizabeth I*, 1572, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London,
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw02073/Queen-Elizabeth-I?search=sp&sText=108&firstRun=true&rNo=0>
- Figure 1.4 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1604, Buckinghamshire, Waddesdon Manor.
Image Source: Author's own photograph.
- Figure 1.5 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1604, Buckinghamshire, Waddesdon Manor; reverse.
Image Source: Author's own photograph.
- Figure 1.6 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1605, Berkeley Castle, Berkeley Collection.
Image Source: Roy Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered, 1520-1620* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983), 152.
- Figure 1.7 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1612, London, The National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw00144/Anne-of-Denmark?LinkID=mp00110&search=sas&sText=anne+of+denmark&role=sit&rNo1>
- Figure 1.8 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1613-14, Hillerød, Fredriksborg Castle.
Image Source: Jill Finsten, *Isaac Oliver: Art at the Courts of Elizabeth I and James I* (New York: AMS, 1981), cat. no. 89.
- Figure 1.9 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1612, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O82274/portrait-of-anne-of-denmark-portrait-miniature-oliver-isaac/>

- Figure 1.10 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1612, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/420041/anne-of-denmark-1574-1619>
- Figure 1.11 Unknown Artist, *Lady Anna Livingstone*, c.1612, Scotland, Private Collection.
Image Source: Rosalind Marshall and George Dagleish, eds. *The Art of Jewellery in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1991), 22.
- Figure 1.12 Detail of Figure 1.11.
- Figure 1.13 Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Margaret Seton, Countess of Dunfermline*, 1615, Dunedin, Dunedin Public Gallery.
Image Source: Author's own photograph.
- Figure 1.14 Detail of Figure 1.13.
- Figure 1.15 Paul van Somer, *Lady Elizabeth Grey, Countess of Kent*, c.1619, London, Tate Britain.
Image Source: Tate Britain, London, <http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/van-somer-lady-elizabeth-grey-countess-of-kent-t00398>
- Figure 1.16 Nicholas Hilliard, *King James I*, c.1604, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://www.vam.ac.uk/users/node/2348>
- Figure 1.17 Nicholas Hilliard, *King James I*, c.1609-15, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/420039/james-i-1566-1625>
- Figure 1.18 Nicholas Hilliard, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1603/4, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O78669/anne-of-denmark-queen-of-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/>
- Figure 1.19 John de Critz, *James I*, c.1606, Madrid, Museo del Prado.
Image Source: Web Gallery of Art, but incorrectly attributed to Paul van Somer,
<http://www.wga.hu/index1.html>
- Figure 1.20 John de Critz, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1605, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery,
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw202589/Anne-of-Denmark?LinkID=mp00110&search=sas&sText=anne+of+denmark&role=sit&rNo=0>
- Figure 1.21 John de Critz, *James I*, c.1606, London, Dulwich Picture Gallery.
Image Source: Dulwich Picture Gallery, London
<http://www.dulwichpicturegallery.org.uk/explore-the-collection/501-550/james-vi-and-i/>

- Figure 1.22 John de Critz and Studio, *James I*, c.1605, London, Montacute House.
Image Source: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/james-i-15661625-121604>
- Figure 1.23 John de Critz, *King James I*, 1604-5, Edinburgh, Scottish National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Galleries of Scotland, Edinburgh
<https://www.nationalgalleries.org/collection/simple-search/c/artist/john-de-critz/object/james-vi-and-i-1566-1625-king-of-scotland-1567-1625-king-of-england-and-ireland-1603-1625-pg-561>
- Figure 1.24 Attributed to John de Critz, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1605, current whereabouts unknown, sold by the Weiss Gallery, London, 2012.
Image Source: Gogmsite,
http://www.gogmsite.net/the_late_farthingale_era_fr/minialbum_anne_of_denmark/ca-1605-anne-of-denmark-by-.html
- Figure 1.25 Attributed to John de Critz, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1605, Greenwich, National Maritime Museum.
Image Source: National Maritime Museum, Greenwich,
<http://www.rmg.co.uk/file/8642>
- Figure 1.26 British School, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1605, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/402736/portrait-of-a-woman>
- Figure 1.27 John de Critz, *Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury*, 1602, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London,
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw05580/Robert-Cecil-1stEarlofSalisbury?search=sp&sText=107&firstRun=true&OOnly=true&rNo=1>
- Figure 1.28 Nicholas Hilliard, *Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset*, c.1611, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London,
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw05898/Robert-Carr-Earl-of-Somerset?search=sp&sText=4260&firstRun=true&rNo=0>
- Figure 1.29 Isaac Oliver, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1609-10, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/420025/anne-of-denmark-1574-1619>
- Figure 1.30 Isaac Oliver, *Henry, Prince of Wales*, c.1610-11, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum.
Image Source: Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge,
<http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/opac/search/cataloguedetail.html?&preref=18136&function=xslt&limit=50>

- Figure 1.31 Isaac Oliver, *Edward Herbert, 1st Baron Cherbury*, c.1610, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/420022/edward-herbert-first-baron-herbert-of-cherbury-1583-1648>
- Figure 1.32 Michiel van Mierevelt, *George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham*, 1625-6, Adelaide, Art Gallery of South Australia.
Image Source: Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide, <http://www.artgallery.sa.gov.au/agasa/home/Collection/detail.jsp?ecatKey=12589>
- Figure 1.33 Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1614, Woburn Abbey, the Duke of Bedford.
Image Source: Karen Hearn, ed. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530–1630* (London: Tate Britain, 1995), 193.
- Figure 1.34 Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Anna of Denmark*, 1614, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/404437/anne-of-denmark-1574-1619>
- Figure 1.35 Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger and Studio, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1615, America, Private Collection, formerly with the Weiss Gallery, London.
Image Source: Valerie Cumming, *A Visual History of Costume: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Drama Book Publishers, 1984), 24.
- Figure 1.36 Marcus Gheeraerts, or circle of Michiel van Mierevelt, *Henry Wriothesley, 3rd Earl of Southampton*, 1614, Woburn Abbey, the Duke of Bedford.
Image Source: Oliver Millar, "Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger: A Sequel through Inscriptions," *Burlington Magazine* 105 (1963), 539. Note the portrait is incorrectly identified as Duke Ulrik of Schleswig-Holstein.
- Figure 1.37 Marcus Gheeraerts and Studio, *Henry Wriothesley, 3rd Earl of Southampton*, c.1614, Dyrham Park, National Trust.
Image Source: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/henry-wriothesley-15731624-3rd-earl-of-southampton-99820>
- Figure 1.38 Marcus Gheeraerts, *Rainbow Portrait of Elizabeth I*, c.1600-2, Hertfordshire, Hatfield House.
Image Source: Hatfield House, <http://www.hatfield-house.co.uk/feature/3/The-Rainbow-Portrait>
- Figure 1.39 Marcus Gheeraerts, "The Ditchley Portrait" of Elizabeth I, c.1592, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London, <http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw02079/Queen-Elizabeth-I-The-Ditchley-portrait?search=sp&sText=Ditchley+&firstRun=true&rNo=0>

- Figure 1.40 Simon van de Passe, *Anna of Denmark*, 1617, London, British Museum.
Image Source: British Museum, London,
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=399730001&objectId=3087295&partId=1
- Figure 1.41 Anonymous, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1610-1616, London, British Museum.
Image Source: British Museum, London,
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=3087736&partId=1&searchText=anne+of+denmark&page=1
- Figure 1.42 Possibly by William Faithorne, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1610-20, London, The National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source, National Portrait Gallery, London,
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw128179/Anne-of-Denmark?search=sp&sText=D25726&firstRun=true&rNo=0>
- Figure 1.43 Renold Elstrack, *James I and Anna of Denmark*, c.1615, London, British Museum.
Image Source: British Museum, London,
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=1503817&partId=1&searchText=anne+of+denmark&page=1
- Figure 1.44 Simon van de Passe, *The High and Mightie...*, 1616, London, British Museum.
Image Source: British Museum, London,
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=1513667&partId=1&searchText=anne+of+denmark&page=2
- Figures 1.45, 1.46 Simon van de Passe, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1616, London, Victoria and Albert Museum; and reverse.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O11024/portrait-medallion-passe-simon-de/>
- Figure 1.47 Unknown Artist, *Christian IV*, 1606, Hillerød, Museum of National History at Frederiksborg Castle.
Image Source: Steffen Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhal, 1988), 555.
- Figure 1.48 Hans Knieper or Melchoir Lorck, *Frederik II*, 1581, Hillerød, Museum of National History at Frederiksborg Castle.
Image Source: Wikipedia,
http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/1/1f/1581_Frederik_2..jpg
- Figure 1.49 Hans Knieper, *Sofie of Mecklenburg-Güstrow*, c.1572, Copenhagen, Rosenborg Castle.
Image Source: Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013), 488 and pl.18.

- Figure 1.50 Marcus Gheeraerts, or Michiel van Mierevelt, *King Christian IV of Denmark*, 1614, New Jersey, Princeton University Art Museum.
Image Source: Princeton University Art Museum Files, no.y1983-33.
- Figure 1.51 Anthonis Mor, *King Philip II of Spain*, 1557, El Escorial, Monasterio de San Lorenzo.
Image Source: Web Gallery of Art, <http://www.wga.hu/support/viewer/z.html>
- Figure 1.52 Studio of Peter Paul Rubens, *Ambrogio Spinola*, c.1630, Missouri, Saint Louis Art Museum.
Image Source: Wikimedia Commons, http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Studio_of_Peter_Paul_Rubens_-_Marquis_Ambrogio_Spinola.jpg
- Figure 1.53 Daniel Mytens, *George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham*, early to mid-17th century, Greenwich, National Maritime Museum.
Image Source: National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, <http://collections.rmg.co.uk/collections/objects/14056.html>
- Figure 1.54 Paul van Somer, *Anna of Denmark* with architectural fantasy by another artist, c.1617-18, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/405813/anne-of-denmark-1574-1619>
- Figure 1.55 Daniel Mytens, *James I*, 1621, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London, <http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw03419/King-James-I-of-England-and-VI-of-Scotland?LinkID=mp02390&search=sas&sText=james+i&role=sit&rNo=4>
- Figure 1.56 Paul van Somer, *James I*, c.1620, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/404446/james-i-and-vi-1566-1625>
- Figure 1.57 British School, *Elizabeth I*, c.1560, University of Cambridge, Queens' College.
Image Source: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/elizabeth-i-15331603-194553>
- Figures 1.58, 1.59 Unknown, *Bust of Anna of Denmark*, c.1619, London, British Museum; and reverse.
Image Source: British Museum, London, http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=952694&partId=1&searchText=anne+of+denmark&page=1
- Figure 1.60 Paul van Somer, *Anna of Denmark*, 1617, London, The Royal Collection.
Image Source: Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/405887/anne-of-denmark-1574-1619>

- Figure 1.61 Paul van Somer, *William Herbert, 3rd Earl of Pembroke*, 1617, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/12/collection/405870/william-herbert-3rd-earl-of-pembroke-1590-1630>
- Figure 1.62 Paul van Somer, *James I*, 1618, Edinburgh, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/15/collection/401224/james-vi-i-1566-1625>
- Figure 1.63 Peter Paul Rubens and Frans Synders, *Diana and her Nymphs Spied upon by Satyrs*, c.1616, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/405553/diana-and-her-nymphs-spied-upon-by-satyrs>
- Figure 1.64 Detail of Figure 1.60.
- Figure 1.65 Paul van Somer, *Elizabeth Countess of Kellie*, c.1619, New Haven, Yale Centre of British Art.
Image Source: Google Art Project, http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/e/ea/Paul_van_Somer_-_Elizabeth,_Countess_of_Kellie_-_Google_Art_Project.jpg

Chapter Two: Dress and Jewellery

- Figure 2.1 Attributed to John de Critz, *Anna of Denmark*, c.1604, London, Government Art Collection.
Image Source: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/anne-of-denmark-15741619-queen-of-james-i-12079>
- Figure 2.2 Robert Peake the Elder, *Catherine Howard, Countess of Nottingham*, c.1597, London, Weiss Gallery.
Image Source: Google Art Project, http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/3/38/English_School_Portrait_of_a_Lady_1595-1606.png
- Figure 2.3 English made, Fragment of satin embroidered with silk, silver-gilt thread and spangles, c.1600, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London, <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O85436/peppercorn-panel-unknown/#>
- Figure 2.4 School of Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Elizabeth Vernon, Countess of Southampton*, 1622, Glasgow, The Burrell Collection.
Image Source: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/elizabeth-vernon-15721655-countess-of-southampton-84076>

- Figure 2.5 *The Layton Jacket*, made 1610-1615, altered England 1620, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O11095/the-layton-jacket-jacket-unknown/>
- Figure 2.6 Detail of Figure 2.5.
- Figure 2.7 Pair of gloves, English made, 1603-1625, London, Victoria & Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O77421/pair-of-gloves-unknown/>
- Figure 2.8 Detail of Figure 2.7.
- Figure 2.9 Detail from British School, *Lady Bowes*, 1630, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Anna Reynolds, *In Fine Style: The Art of Tudor and Stuart Fashion* (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2013), 51.
- Figure 2.10 Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Margaret Leyton*, c.1620, London, Victoria & Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O69443/margaret-layton-formerly-laton-painting-gheeraerts-marcus-the/>
- Figure 2.11 William Larkin, *Susan Villiers, Lady Fielding, later Viscountess Fielding and Countess of Denbigh*, 1616? Pulborough, Parham House.
Image Source: Gogmsite, http://www.gogmsite.net/the_late_farthingale_era_fr/ca-1616-susan-feilding-nee-.html
- Figure 2.12 Detail of Figure 1.60.
- Figure 2.13 Nicholas Hilliard, *Elizabeth I, the "Phoenix Portrait,"* c.1575, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London,
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portraitLarge/mw02074/Queen-Elizabeth-I?LinkID=mp01452&search=sas&sText=elizabeth+i&role=sit&rNo=4>
- Figure 2.14 Antonis Mor, *Queen Mary I*, 1554, Madrid, Prado Museum.
Image Source: Web Gallery of Art,
http://www.wga.hu/html_m/m/mor/3marytud.html
- Figure 2.15 After Jacopo da Trezzo, *Queen Mary I*, c.1555, London, National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Portrait Gallery, London,
<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw04267/Queen-Mary-I?LinkID=mp02995&search=sas&sText=mary+i&role=sit&rNo=3>

- Figure 2.16 Attributed to Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Lady Croke, nee Brigitte Hawtrej*, c.1605-10, Buckinghamshire, Collection of the Chequers Trust.
Image Source: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/lady-croke-15881638-nee-brigitte-hawtrej-last-of-the-hawtr56131>
- Figure 2.17 Daniel Mytens, *King Charles I*, 1628, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/404448/charles-i>
- Figure 2.18 Detail of Figure 2.17.
- Figure 2.19 Unknown Spanish maker, *The Pelican in her Piety*, c.1550-1575, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O72012/the-pelican-in-her-piety-pendant-unknown/>
- Figure 2.20 Unknown maker, *The Hunsdon Ship Pendant*, c.1580, London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
Image Source: Victoria and Albert Museum, London,
<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O124996/pendant-ship/>
- Figure 2.21 Unknown Spanish maker, *Hand Pendant*, 1600-1650, New York, Metropolitan Museum.
Image Source: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York,
<http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/207270>
- Figures 2.22, 2.23: Ascribed to Alessandro Masnago or his workshop in Milan, *Pendant Cameo of Noah's Ark*, c.1575 with Danish mounting c.1640, onyx, gold, and enamel, 3.7cm (height), Rosenborg Castle, Copenhagen, Danish Royal Collection (3.123); and reverse.
Image Source: Steffen Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhal, 1988), 176.

Chapter Three: Buildings, Gardens, and Interior Décor

- Figure 3.1 The Trefoldighedskirke (Holy Trinity Church), Kristianstad, Sweden, built by Christian IV, 1617-1628.
Image Source: Wikimedia Commons,
<http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Trefaldighetskyrkan-Kristianstad.jpg>
- Figure 3.2 The Stock Exchange, Copenhagen, Denmark, built by Christian IV, 1609-1640.
Image Source: Steffen Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhal, 1988), 462, 488.

- Figure 3.3 Frederiksborg Castle, Hillerød, Denmark, built by Christian IV, c.1600-1620.
Image Source: Det Nationalhistoriske Museum, Hillerød, Copenhagen, <http://www.dnm.dk/dk/index.htm>
- Figure 3.4 Designed by Simon Thurley and drawn by Melissa Beasley, *Plan of the Ground Floor of Somerset House in c.1620*.
Image Source, Simon Thurley, *Somerset House: The Palace of England's Queens, 1551-1692* (London: London Topographical Society Publication, 2009), 22.
- Figure 3.5 Hans Vredeman de Vries, *Christ in the House of Mary and Martha*, 1566, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London, <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/405475/christ-in-the-house-of-martha-and-mary>
- Figure 3.6 Heinrich Hansen, *The Oratory of Christian IV in the Chapel of Frederiksborg Castle before the fire in 1859*, no date, oil on canvas, 40.5 x 56cm, Frederiksborg Castle, Hillerød, Denmark.
Image Source: Steffan Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhed, 1988), 65.
- Figure 3.7 Detail of Figure 3.6 showing the painting in the top right of the oratory featuring the penitential Christian IV kneeling before a vision of the crucified Christ.
- Figure 3.8 Ebony and silver-gilt altarpiece, 1606-8, Chapel of Frederiksborg Castle, Hillerød, delivered by Hamburg goldsmith Hans Mores.
Image Source: Michael Anderson, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen, and Hugo Johannsen, eds. *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective* (Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark, 2011) 326.
- Figure 3.9 Reinholdt Timm? *Ecce Homo: Christian IV's Vision at Rothenburg Castle on 8 December 1625*, oil on canvas, 63 x 52.5cm, Rosenborg Castle, Danish Royal Collection.
Image Source: Steffan Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhed, 1988), 64.
- Figure 3.10 Albrecht von Horn, *The Duchess Augusta of Gottorp's House Altar*, 1620, ebony and partly silver gilt, 260cm (height), København, Denmark, Nationalmuseet.
Image Source: Steffan Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhed, 1988), 203.

- Figure 3.11 North German or Danish made, *Duchess Augusta of Gottorp's Altar Set*, 1632, gold, enamel and gems, Rosenborg Castle, Copenhagen, Danish Royal Collection.
Image Source: Steffan Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhal, 1988), 204.
- Figure 3.12 Detail of Figure 1.33 showing the garden in the top-left corner.
- Figure 3.13 Detail of Figure 1.35 showing the garden in the top-left corner.
- Figure 3.14 Robert Smythson, *Plan of Somerset House and Garden, the Strand, London, c.1609*, pen and sepia on paper, 28 x 26.6cm, London, Royal Institute of British Architects.
Image Source: Roy Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1979), 88.
- Figure 3.15 Salomon De Caus, design for a Mount Parnassus with River God, Problem XIII, published in *Les raisons des forces mouvants*, Paris, 1624. London, British Library.
Image Source: Luke Morgan, *Nature as Model: Salomon De Caus and Early Seventeenth-Century Landscape Design* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 118.
- Figure 3.16 Salomon de Caus, design for a Mount Parnassus with the Nine Muses, Problem XIII, published in *Les Raisons des forces mouvantes*, Paris, 1624. London, British Library.
Image Source: Roy Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1979), 89.
- Figure 3.17 Salomon de Caus, design for an aviary, Problem VIII, published in *Les raisons des forces mouvantes*, Paris, 1624. London, British Library.
John Bold, *Greenwich: An Architectural History of the Royal Hospital for Seamen and the Queen's House* (London: Yale University Press, 2000), 43.
- Figure 3.18 Salomon de Caus, design for a grotto and aviary, Probleme VIII, published in *Les raisons des forces mouvantes*, Paris, 1624. London, British Library.
John Bold, *Greenwich: An Architectural History of the Royal Hospital for Seamen and the Queen's House* (London: Yale University Press, 2000), 43.
- Figure 3.19 Inigo Jones, *Preliminary elevation for the east or west sides of the Queen's House, Greenwich, 1616*, Worcester College.
Image Source: John Harris and Gordon Higgott. *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (London; New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 71.
- Figure 3.20 Inigo Jones, *Preliminary design for the north or south facade of the Queen's House, Greenwich, 1616*, London, RIBA Library Drawings Collection.
Image Source: John Harris and Gordon Higgott. *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (London; New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 69.

- Figure 3.21 Inigo Jones, *Elevation for the front (outer) side of the Vineyard gateway, Oatlands Palace, Surrey, 1617*, London, RIBA, Jones & Webb 62.
Image Source: John Harris and Gordon Higgott. *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (London; New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 77.
- Figure 3.22 Inigo Jones, *Elevation and plan for the rear (inner) side of the Vineyard gateway, Oatlands Palace, Surrey, 1617*, London, RIBA, Jones & Webb 64.
Image Source: John Harris and Gordon Higgott. *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (London; New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 79.
- Figure 3.23 Detail of Figure 1.60.
- Figure 3.24 Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Tom Derry, Jester to Anna of Denmark, 1614*, Edinburgh, Scottish National Portrait Gallery.
Image Source: National Galleries of Scotland
<https://www.nationalgalleries.org/collection/artists-a-z/g/artist/marcus-gheeraerts-the-younger/object/tom-derry-fl-1614-jester-to-anne-of-denmark-pg-1111>
- Figure 3.25 Flemish School, *A Boy Looking through a Casement, c.1550-60*, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/404972/a-boy-looking-through-a-casement>
- Figure 3.26 Hugo van der Goes, *The Trinity Altarpiece panels, 1478*, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/403260/the-trinity-altarpiece-panels>
- Figure 3.27 Follower of Marinus van Reymerswaele, *The Moneylenders, 1548-51*, London, Royal Collection.
Image Source: Royal Collection, London,
<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/1/collection/405707/the-misers>

Note to the Reader

A number of manuscripts and printed primary sources from the early modern period are cited and quoted throughout this thesis. Printed material has been quoted verbatim, and I have attempted to retain the original capitalisation, spelling, and punctuation of all archival material. Some normalisations have been adopted for readability, such as the silent extension of contractions, or the interchangeable use of letters i and j, u and v, and y, c, and t. Where interchangeable letters do not seem to obstruct the legibility of the word, they have been left in their original form.

Introduction

Writing to the Doge and Senate in 1607, Nicolo Molin, the Venetian ambassador in England, states that the queen consort, Anna of Denmark “likes enjoyment and is very fond of dancing and of fêtes. She is intelligent and prudent; and knows the disorders of government.”¹ Molin’s summary of the English queen consort makes a crucial observation: Anna was both culturally active and politically relevant. While this may seem a simple point to make, it has been all but forgotten. Over the course of the following four hundred years, the dominant historiography has cast Anna as a vain, vacuous woman whose superficial penchant for jewels, dresses, and dancing spelled disaster for crown revenue.² It is only recently that this characterisation of the queen has begun to be re-evaluated, most notably by literary historians.³ The central aim of this thesis is to demonstrate that Anna was an important and sophisticated cultural agent who used social activities, material goods, architecture, and the visual arts for aesthetic and political ends.

¹ CSPV, vol. 10, 513, no. 739. This thesis uses the Danish variant of the queen’s name, referring to her as “Anna” rather than the anglicised version of “Anne.” As Barroll points out, when she was invested as the Queen of Scotland in 1590, it was under the name “Anna” and she continued to sign her name as such during her time in England, see Leeds Barroll, *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography* (Philadelphia: University Press, 2001), 173, note 1. A significant number of scholars, however, continue to use the English spelling of “Anne.”

² For example, Frye notes that “Anne has been ignored and even denigrated throughout the twentieth century, often by otherwise reliable historians,” see Susan Frye, “Anne of Denmark and the Historical Contextualisation of Shakespeare and Fletcher’s *Henry VIII*,” in *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700*, ed. James Daybell (Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 181.

³ Most notably James Knowles, “‘To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise’: Anna of Denmark, Elizabeth I and the Images of Royalty,” in *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, ed. Clare McManus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, “Anne of Denmark and the Subversion of Masquing,” *Criticism* 35 (1993); Frye, “Anne of Denmark and the Historical Contextualisation”; Sophie Tomlinson, *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: University Press, 2005); Leeds Barroll, “The Court of the First Stuart Queen,” in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: University Press, 1991); “Theatre as Text: The Case of Queen Anna and the Jacobean Court Masque,” *Elizabethan Theatre* 14 (1996); *Anna of Denmark*; Clare McManus, “Memorialising Anna of Denmark’s Court: Cupid’s Banishment at Greenwich Palace,” in *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, ed. Clare McManus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Placed between the popular and lengthy reign of the iconic Elizabeth I (1533-1603), on the one hand, and the fascinating case of regicide on the other, the Jacobean court has long been characterised by history as insignificant, corrupt, and debased.⁴ This view was developed in the Commonwealth era as a means of justifying the execution of King Charles I (1600-1649), and the dissolution of monarchy.⁵ While such a teleological reading has prompted critical objections, the historiography has nevertheless persisted. Even relatively recently, the Jacobean court was deemed by David Starkey to be “one of the least attractive courts in history.”⁶ It was only in the 1980s that the historiography of the Jacobean court and its figurehead, King James I and VI started to be seriously challenged and revised.⁷ However, while James and his heir Prince Henry (1594-1612) have since been the subject of extensive research by political, social, and cultural historians, there still remains a gap in the

⁴ This point has also been raised by Roper, who states that “perhaps because it falls between the two stools of the ‘Elizabethan Era’ and the doomed reign of Charles I, rather less attention has been focused on the politics of the Jacobean period,” see Louis Roper, “Unmasking the Connections between Jacobean Politics and Policy: The Circle of Anna of Denmark and the Beginning of the English Empire, 1614-18,” in *High and Mighty Queens’ of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 47. Similarly, Peck notes that the Jacobean court is consistently “subsumed by extending the Elizabethan up to 1618, or absorbed by the Caroline,” Linda Levy Peck, “The Mental World of the Jacobean Court: An Introduction,” in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1-2.

⁵ Peck, “An Introduction,” 1-2.

⁶ David Starkey, *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London; New York: Longman, 1987), 2; and quoted in Peck, “An Introduction,” 1.

⁷ See in particular Peck, *Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I* (London; Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1982); *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990); “Court Patronage and Government Policy: The Jacobean Dilemma,” in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, ed. G. Lytle and S. Orgel (Princeton: University Press, 1981); Jenny Wormald, “James VI and I: Two Kings or One?” *History* 68 (1983); R. Malcolm Smuts, “The Political Failure of Stuart Cultural Patronage,” in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, ed. Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel (Princeton University Press, 1981); “Art and the Material Culture of Majesty in Early Stuart England,” in *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, ed. R. Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Starkey, *English Court*; David Bergeron, *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991); David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and His Circle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985); Maurice Lee Jr., *Great Britain’s Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana University of Illinois Press, 1990); Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628* (London; New York: Longman, 1981); *James VI and I* (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1998); William Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Perry Curtis, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

literature concerning Anna's role, influence, and cultural agency, which the present study seeks to fill.

This study recognises that Anna's highly cultured Danish childhood and her experiences at the Scottish court would have influenced her ideas and attitudes concerning the uses and potential of cultural patronage and collecting. Due to space constrictions, however, this thesis focuses on Anna's time in England (1603-1619). It was during her English period that Anna's cultural pursuits were fully established, arguably perhaps because it was in England that she finally gained the financial means to realise her ambitions. As I discuss in Chapter One, late sixteenth-century Scotland was beset with financial difficulties, and James had to borrow men, foodstuffs, and material goods from Edinburgh, noble Scots, and Queen Elizabeth in preparation for Anna's arrival in 1590. By comparison, England was financially robust and as a result, the most pronounced and conclusive examples of Anna's cultural agency are found during her time in England. Accordingly, while a summary of Anna's upbringing and her Scottish period is given below, it will only feature in the subsequent chapters when directly pertaining to her cultural activities in England.

A Danish Princess

In order to understand Anna's cultural agency in England, it is necessary to provide an overview of the patronage model and courtly experience that she gained in Denmark, and her political role and her suspected change in faith while queen of Scots. As a princess of Denmark, Anna was raised in an environment of European splendour and cultural sophistication. By the end of the sixteenth century, Denmark was one of the most affluent

countries in Europe, and Anna's own family provided her with plentiful models for cultural patronage, particularly in the realms of theatre and architecture.⁸ As discussed in more detail below, music, drama, tournaments, and dance formed a standard component of Danish courtly entertainment, and Anna's parents, King Frederik II of Denmark (1534-1588), and Sofie of Mecklenburg-Güstrow (1577-1631), were avid supporters of history and learning.⁹ During Anna's childhood, Frederik rebuilt the medieval castles of Kronborg and Frederiksborg, transforming them into sumptuous Renaissance palaces; he cultivated a humanist culture akin to that in Italy by patronising historians to research the Danish culture of the Middle Ages, and he actively sought to populate the court with renowned figures of painting, sculpture, history, science, and theology. As a result, the famed historian Anders Sørensen Vedel (1542-1616), astronomer Tycho Brahe (1546-1601), painters Melchior Lorck (c.1526-after 1583) and Hans Knieper (d.1587), sculptor Johan Gregor van der Schardt (c.1530-1581) and architect Hans van Steenwinckel (c.1550-1601) were constant presences at Frederik's court.¹⁰ Furthermore, Anna's younger brother Christian (1577-1648), who acceded to the Danish throne in 1588, was an important and passionate patron of the arts and architecture.¹¹ The two remained close throughout Anna's life, constantly exchanging letters and tokens, while as the reigning king of Denmark, Christian became an important source of honour, power, and status for Anna.¹² Although little concrete evidence remains

⁸ Meikle and Payne, "Anne (1574–1619)" *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/559> (accessed 23 July 2012).

⁹ For a discussion of the patronage activities of Anna's parents and the cultural climate of the sixteenth-century Danish court more generally, see Mara Wade, "The Queen's Courts: Anna of Denmark and Her Royal Sisters – Cultural Agency at Four Northern European Courts in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, ed. Clare McManus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 52-3, 55; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 15-17.

¹⁰ Steffen Heiberg, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe: Denmark* (Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhed, 1988), 73, 464-46; Wade, "Queen's Courts," 52-53.

¹¹ Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 463-64.

¹² The pair exchanged numerous letters, jewelled miniatures, gifts and tokens, which are discussed in Chapters One and Two below.

concerning the nature of Anna's education, her skill with languages is a clear indicator of a gifted and accomplished princess. By the time of her move to England in 1603, Anna was proficient in six languages, and she subsequently enlisted John Florio (1553-1625), Groom of the Privy Chamber, as her Italian reader and tutor.¹³ Considering the regal opulence and aesthetic refinement of the Danish court, it is unsurprising that Anna's natal lineage remained a continuing source of pride for the queen and indeed, as I argue in Chapter One, it came to form a marked aspect of her visual persona.¹⁴

On 20 August 1589, the fifteen-year-old Anna became queen of Scots in a proxy ceremony in Helsingør (Elsinore), Denmark. A Scottish-Danish match had been first proposed in the early 1580s, but by 1588, protracted negotiations meant that James VI of Scotland had to settle for the second princess.¹⁵ Anna's older sister, Elisabeth (1573-1626), was promised to Duke Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1564-1613), and they married on 19 April 1590. Although the eldest daughter would have been preferable for James, a Danish princess was still a highly attractive option. Denmark was a very prosperous country, controlling the important shipping channel through the Øresund strait, which meant that James's marriage could result in toll concessions for Scottish merchants and a large dowry.¹⁶

¹³ Wade, "Queen's Courts," 56; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 27; Desmond O'Connor, "Florio, John (1553–1625)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/9758>, accessed 23 July 2012.

¹⁴ Wade, "Queen's Courts," 51-55. For an overview of early modern Danish culture, see Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, especially 73-151, 301-51.

¹⁵ The negotiations were hampered by a number of issues: Queen Elizabeth I and the Lord Chancellor of Scotland, John Maitland, Lord of Thirlestane (1537-1595), deliberated over a French match for James; the Danish initially wanted control of Orkney and Shetland as part of the marriage contract, and there was the question of Mary, Queen of Scots, who remained a prisoner in England. For a succinct summary of the marriage negotiations, the voyage to Scotland, and Anna's arrival and coronation in Scotland, see Meikle and Payne "Anne," *ODNB*.

¹⁶ James received £150,000 as dowry payment, see Maureen Meikle, "'Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule of the House': Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Politics, 1589–1603," in *Women in Scotland, c.1100–c.1750*, ed. Elizabeth Ewan and Maureen M. Meikle (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1999), 105-106. For a comprehensive discussion of the role of the queen consort as an agent of cultural transference in the movement from her

The young Danish princess entered Scotland on 1 May 1590, where she remained as queen of Scots for almost thirteen years before moving to England when James inherited the English crown in 1603.¹⁷

Scotland: The Apparent Conversion

It was during her time in Scotland that Anna is thought to have converted to Catholicism.

The reasons for Anna's conversion, and the logistics of being a covert Catholic in a Protestant country, have generated a wide body of scholarship. Almost without exception, however, scholars have asserted that Anna's conversion was a personal and private matter, undertaken without regard for the political consequences, which apparently embarrassed her husband.¹⁸ Throughout her time in Scotland and England, Anna's Catholicism was

natal to marital court, see R. Malcolm Smuts and Melinda J. Gough, "Queens and the International Transmission of Political Culture," *The Court Historian* 10 (2005). See also Caroline Hibbard, "'By Our Direction and for Our Use': The Queen's Patronage of Artists and Artisans Seen through Her Household Accounts," in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, ed. Erin Griffey (Aldershot, Eng., Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 116; Olwen Hufton, "Reflections of the Role of Women in the Early Modern Court," *The Court Historian* 5 (2000): 3-5.

¹⁷ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 17.

¹⁸ On Anna's Catholicism, see chronologically Father Joseph Stevenson, "Gleanings among Old Records: III. Anne of Denmark, Queen of Great Britain," *The Month* LXVI (1879); W. Plenkers, "Er Frederik II's datter Anna, Dronning af Storbritannien, gaaet over til Katholicismen?" ("Was Frederick II's Daughter Anna, Queen of Great Britain, a Convert to Catholicism?"), *Historisk Tidsskrift* vi/1 (1887-8); Adolphus William Ward, "Review of W. Plenkers, 'Er Frederik II's Datter Anna, Dronning of Storbritannien, Gaaet over Til Katholicismen?'" *EHR* 3 (1888); W. Bliss, "The Religious Belief of Anne of Denmark," *EHR* 4 (1889); Canon Alphons Bellesheim, *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland, from the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Day*, IV vols., vol. III (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1889); Adolphus William Ward, "James VI and the Papacy," *SHR* 2 (1905); George Warner, "James VI and Rome," *EHR* 20 (1905); Helen Georgia Stafford, *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England* (New York: Appleton, 1940); Hubert Chadwick, "Crypto-Catholicism, English and Scottish," *The Month* 178 (1942); Friar Leo Hicks, "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part I," *Recusant History* 5 (1961); "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part II," *Recusant History* 5 (1961); "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part III," *Recusant History* 6 (1962); "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part IV," *Recusant History* 7 (1963); Albert Joseph Loomie, "Toleration and Diplomacy: The Religious Issue in Anglo-Spanish Relations, 1603-1605," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 53, part 6, New Series (1963); "King James I's Catholic Consort," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 34 (1971); Peter E. McCullough, "Preaching to a Court Papist? Donne's Sermon before Queen Anne, December 1617," *John Donne Journal* 14 (1995); Peter Davidson and Thomas M. McCoog, "Father Robert's Convert: The Private Catholicism of Anne of Denmark," *Times Literary Supplement* 5095 (2000); Helen Payne, "Aristocratic Women and the Jacobean Court, 1603-1625" (PhD diss., University of London, 2001); Maureen M. Meikle and Helen Payne, "From Lutheranism to Catholicism: The Faith of Anna of Denmark (1574-1619),"

therefore never publicly acknowledged. The queen consistently maintained a rigorous show of outward conformity, and awareness of her professed Catholicism was limited to James, a handful of Catholic dignitaries, and a select number of elite Scottish and English Catholics. As a result, the nature of Anna's personal beliefs and the date of her conversion was cloaked in an element of ambiguity, which gave rise to misgivings and doubt among both Catholic and Protestant contemporaries. Indeed, a certain level of ambiguity remains, and the 'evidence' concerning Anna's conversion and confessional identity needs to be treated with caution. Indeed, the existing argument that Anna played the devout Protestant in public, but was a genuine Catholic convert who practiced her faith in the privacy of her household, has three specific problems: the conflicting dates of Anna's supposed conversion; the cited reasons for her conversion; and most importantly, the questionable nature of the evidence.

In the first instance, historians have been unable to pin down a specific date or clear reason for Anna's conversion and have not explored the wider implications of this difficulty.

Generally, most scholars accept that under the guidance of the Scottish Jesuit priest Father Robert Abercromby (1533-1613), Anna converted to Catholicism around 1600. The evidence for this view rests on a letter written eight years later by Abercromby, in which he claims to have facilitated her conversion. According to Abercromby, this was occasioned by the Calvinist conversion of Anna's Danish Lutheran Chaplain, Johann Seringius (1589-1619), which was so abhorrent to Anna's Lutheran sensibilities that she turned to Catholicism.¹⁹ In

The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 64 (2013); Cynthia Fry, "Perceptions of Influence: The Catholic Diplomacy of Queen Anna and Her Ladies, 1601-1604," in *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe*, ed. Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

¹⁹ This view was first put forward by Father Joseph Stevenson in "Gleanings among Old Records," which includes a transcript of Abercromby's letter; the original is Fonds Lat. MS 6051, fol.49, 50, formerly Colb. 3236. Stevenson's claims were strongly supported by historians Plenkens, Bellesheim, Ward, and Warner op. cit., in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

contrast, Meikle and Payne suggest that Anna converted in 1592/3 under the influence of her friend and confidant, the Catholic Henrietta Stewart, Countess of Huntly (c.1593-1642).

Similarly, the evidence marshalled for this argument is a letter from a Jesuit to another.

Writing to Father Robert Persons (1546-1610) on 15 December 1593, the intelligencer

Richard Verstegan [formerly Rowlands] (1550-1640), reports that Anna

seemeth to be very well enclined unto Catholique religion, beeing thereunto partly perswaded by the Lady Huntley, of whome she hath received a Catholique Cateschisme in French, which she much esteemeth; and hath told unto thesaid lady that she was in her youthe brough up with a kinswoman of hers that was a Catholique.²⁰

Meikle and Payne also counter the earlier view that Anna's crisis of faith stemmed from Seringius's conversion, asserting that it was more likely due to the fact that the "Scottish Catholics were far friendly than the Presbyterians," or "the lack of an heir to the throne," for at this time she had not borne any children.²¹ Further, it should be noted that Seringius accompanied Anna to England and remained in her household as her "minister of the Dutch [Danish] tongue" until her death.²² There is also a significant difference between being friendly with Catholics and perhaps even attending a Catholic Mass and fully converting to the faith; and it is highly unlikely that the comparatively "friendly" nature of the Catholics would have inspired conversion.

While the date and motive of Anna's conversion shifts between scholars, and both conversion dates cannot be correct, the third and fundamental problem with both cases is

²⁰ Anthony Petti, ed. *The Letters of Richard Verstegan*, vol. 52 (Catholic Record Society, 1959), 196, no.46; quoted in Meikle and Payne, "Lutheranism to Catholicism," 48. The "Catholique" lady from Anna's youth remains unidentified.

²¹ Meikle and Payne, *ibid.*

²² TNA, PRO: LR6/154/9; TNA, PRO: SC6/JASI/1646; TNA, PRO: SC6/JASI/1648; TNA, PRO: SC6/JASI/1650; TNA, PRO: SC6/JASI/1653; TNA, PRO: SC6/JASI/1655.

that they rely on letters as evidence. These letters are then supported by a series of claims in subsequent letters, reports, rumours, and dispatches by Spanish ambassadors such as Alonso de Velasco (*d.*1620) and Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Count of Gondomar (1567-1626), by Catholic officials including Father Robert Abercromby (1533-1613), Cardinal Scipione Borghese (1577–1633) and Pope Clement VIII (1536–1605), and significantly, by Anna herself. In each case, context and recipient are important. These are not the pieces of objective historical evidence that they are frequently assumed to be. While Meikle and Payne acknowledge the “largely indirect and questionable” nature of the evidence for Anna’s Catholicism they conclude, together with other scholars such as Albert Loomie, Barbara Lewalski, and Peter McCullough, that this is due to the “necessarily covert nature” of Anna’s Catholic faith in Protestant Scotland and England.²³

There is no doubt that Anna consistently played the devout Protestant in public. Yet, based on the current evidence, it is not possible to definitively determine the nature of the devotions that Anna carried out in the privacy of her own palaces, or her genuine religious belief. As a result, McCullough, Meikle, and Payne, conclude that Anna was a “church papist,” which in Jacobean England was someone, in McCullough’s words, “for whom routine compliance with the Church of England and committed Catholicism were not mutually exclusive.”²⁴ This may well have been the case, for it was not an uncommon position in England, and it was one that was tacitly supported by Rome.²⁵ However, rather

²³ As quoted in Meikle and Payne, “Lutheranism to Catholicism,” 61; Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 241-55.

²⁴ *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 170. See also Meikle and Payne, “From Lutheranism to Catholicism,” 46, 62; Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 241-55.

²⁵ On church papistry in early modern England, see Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1993), especially Chapter 3, 50-72.

than trying to prove Anna's personal piety in the absence of fact, it is important to focus on what the ambiguous nature of the evidence does reveal: Anna's political judgement.

Irrespective of her personal beliefs, Anna assiduously sought to lend public support to the Jacobean institution, thereby allowing James to maintain his popular reputation as an earnest Protestant leader. Further, I would contend that Anna strategically maintained a certain equivocacy about her faith for political gain. For, rather than a merely personal matter that James tried to keep hidden, Anna's rumoured Catholicism brought certain advantages for herself and her husband, especially in international politics. Her apparent Catholicism was used to promote four significant political aims: firstly, balancing the Kirk and the aristocratic Catholic faction in Scotland; secondly, James's political accession to the English throne; thirdly, brokering of the Anglo-Spanish peace, and lastly, the English bid for a Spanish match.²⁶ Anna's role in these confessionally delicate acts of political diplomacy are discussed in the following chapters.

In addition, I use Anna's household accounts, jewellery bills, and the inventories of her main palaces and jewellery collection to show that the queen owned a quantity of religious items, but that only a very few of those could possibly be considered Catholic. For the most part, Anna's devotional pieces are in keeping with the goods owned and used in the Reformed Church services of Elizabeth I and her strongly Protestant husband and two sons, and they further accord with those belonging to her Lutheran siblings, Christian IV, and Augusta, Duchess of Gottorp (1580-1639). I argue that the paucity of contentious items should be read as a sign of Anna's political discernment. In the highly sensitive political climate of

²⁶ For an analysis of the extant evidence, and a discussion of the political consequences of Anna's confessional identity, see Jemma Field, "Anna of Denmark and the Politics of Religious Identity at the Jacobean Court (1603-1619)," unpublished paper, 2014.

Jacobean England, it was crucial that Anna continued to be seen as a devoted member of the Church of England and a supporter of the monarchy. The possibility that Anna did own Catholic devotional goods, which were protected by Catholic members of her household is discussed below, drawing upon Meikle and Payne's recent argument that Anna's ability to apparently practice Catholicism during her time in England was largely facilitated by servants of the Bedchamber.²⁷

Finding a Political Presence in Scotland and England

As well as reportedly suffering a crisis of faith during her time in Scotland, Anna is generally held to have maintained a key political role at the Scottish court and was regarded as an important influence on her husband.²⁸ Scholars have been quick to note that following her move to England, the structure and comparative stability of the English court, together with the absence of her Scottish faction forced Anna to withdraw from politics and focus her energy on cultural projects.²⁹ While there is a discernible change in Anna's manner of political engagement, and level of cultural enterprise, I contend that a more nuanced and contextual method is required to comprehend the implications and significance of this shift. In order to successfully identify, understand, and evaluate Anna's role as a cultural agent, it is necessary to consider her actions within the specific socio-political milieu of Jacobean England. In line with the work of historians Pauline Croft, Linda Levy Peck, and Malcolm

²⁷ Meikle and Payne, "Lutheranism to Catholicism," 61-69.

²⁸ For a discussion of Anna's important political role at the Scottish Court with specific examples of her interventions, manipulation, and influence, see Maureen M. Meikle, "A Meddlesome Princess: Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Politics, 1589-1603," in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000): 126-40.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 127; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 34-35.

Smuts, I assert that the Jacobean court was peripatetic, dynamic, and polycentric.³⁰ In this study, the term “Jacobean court” is used to refer not only to the court of the king, but to the satellite courts of his queen and heir. It further encompasses the London residences of prominent courtiers, the Inns of Court, and all central administrative bodies, which collectively comprised the heterogeneous nature of the court, as people, goods, and policy continually moved between these physically distinct areas.³¹

Fundamental to this study is the acknowledgement that political and cultural polycentrism was one of the central defining features of the Jacobean court. There were always three separate centres of power: the courts of James, Anna, and Henry, who was followed by Charles as Prince of Wales.³² This study recognises, however, that while distinguishable from each other, these courts were nevertheless inseparable, as they were interconnected through various staff members, court departments, and the practicalities of finance. It is stressed throughout this thesis that James, Anna, and Henry presided over separate residences, maintained separate establishments, supported different policies and

³⁰ Pauline Croft, “Robert Cecil and the Early Jacobean Court,” in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: University Press, 1991), 135-38, 142-43; Peck, “An Introduction,” 3-4; *Court Patronage and Corruption*, 68-74; Smuts, “Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I,” in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 104-105; *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 10, 65.

³¹ Smuts asserts that Salisbury House and York House were almost as central to the court as Whitehall. He further notes that Arundel House, and Prince Henry’s palace of St James operated as important centres for the development of taste, style, and beliefs that were distinct from James’s, and which sometimes opposed royal policy and favourites, see Smuts, “Cultural Diversity,” 104-105. I extend Smuts’s contention by arguing that Anna’s main residences of Denmark House and Greenwich Palace should also be acknowledged as key sites in sustaining the heterogeneous nature of the court, as she too shepherded artists, artisans, poets, playwrights, and political opinions that were typically cast aside in James’s court. Anna’s important role in this regard is also noted by Payne and Knowles: Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 16; Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 23.

³² Following the premature death of the eldest son, Prince Henry in November 1612, Prince Charles became heir to the crown. His court consequently rose in importance, and like Henry’s before him, it operated as an adjunct to his parents’ courts in terms of factions, favourites, personnel, and policy.

favourites, and patronised different artists and artisans. As a result, I will distinguish, on occasion, between the courts of the king, the queen consort, and the prince.

Importantly, while I acknowledge that there was a degree of competition between James and Anna, I do not agree with scholars such as Karen Hearn, Jennifer Hallam, Barbara Lewalski, and Clare McManus, among others, who claim that Anna directly opposed the king.³³ As I discuss in Chapter One, I am not aware of any evidence to suggest that James viewed Anna's independent cultural and political activities and self-styling as a threat or a challenge. Rather, the available evidence points to a couple with different dispositions and interests. I suggest that Anna's distance from James was, in part, sanctioned by the fact that it was largely played out in the cultural, rather than the political realm. For the pair were united on aspects of foreign policy, with Anna helping to broker an Anglo-Spanish match, and upholding an ambiguous confessional position for James's political benefit. It is also possible that Anna's support of the oppositional Pembroke-Southampton network, played to James's advantage. This would have enabled Anna to act as a conduit for the king, allowing James to align himself with the Howard-Carr faction while preserving favourable relations with the powerful court rivals. Certainly, Anna is likely to have performed such a role at the Scottish court, assisting James in a particularly delicate balancing act between

³³ See for example, Jennifer Hallam "Re-Presenting Women in Early Stuart England: Gender Ideology, Personal Politics and the Portrait Arts" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2004): 288-303; Karen Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts: Elizabethan Artist* (London: Tate Publishing, 2002), 31-35; Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), 4-5, 15-41; Clare McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court (1590-1619)* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), 98-111, 136-42, 166-82; "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court," 84-89.

opposing religious groups.³⁴ Where cultural activities were concerned, however, James and Anna differed. The king was passionate about theology, hunting, and literature, while Anna pursued garden design, architecture, portraiture, and theatre. Despite their differences, James definitely trusted his wife. In 1605, James decreed that during his absences from London for “open air and exercise,” the Privy Council was to meet before the queen consort at her residence, and, in 1617, James chose to appoint Anna, together with a council of five, to rule England during his Scottish Progress.³⁵ Therefore, in line with the literary historian James Knowles, I argue that Anna’s ability to protect and maintain differences in faction and aesthetics was crucial in sustaining the characteristic diversity of the Jacobean court.³⁶

While asserting that the Jacobean court was innately polycentric, this thesis highlights that it was also strictly patriarchal and hierarchical, made up of a complex network of patron-client relationships, and governed largely by traditions of status, ceremony, and etiquette. It affirms that all aspects of social life in court society, from intimate gatherings to matters of state ceremony, were inherently political and, in addition, that material objects and buildings, as Norbert Elias has rightly stressed, were used as potent signifiers of “rank and status.”³⁷ It is a central tenet of this thesis that in the early modern period politics and culture were intricately related. I acknowledge that, operating in a patriarchal society, royal and elite women were required to use alternative routes in order to access political power. As such, while they were excluded from judicial, political, and diplomatic office, they were

³⁴ For a systematic analysis of the intricacies of James VI’s domestic and foreign policy in the 1590s, see Malcolm Smuts, *England, Scotland and the Battle over Erastian Episcopacy*, unpublished paper, 2014. My sincere thanks to Professor Smuts for sharing his work with me in advance of publication.

³⁵ TNA: PRO, SP14/12, fols.20r-v; also noted by John Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance under James VI and I, 1603-1625* (Woodbridge, U.K.; Rochester, NY: The Boydell Press for The Royal Historical Society, 2002), 56. These points are discussed in Chapter One.

³⁶ Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 23.

³⁷ Norbert Elias, *The Court Society*, trans. Edmund Jephcott, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), 53.

able to strategically utilise kinship and friendship networks, material objects, and social mores to achieve a degree of political presence and power.³⁸ In line with other studies of female patronage of visual and material culture, this thesis asserts that female cultural patronage can be used effectively to explore and better understand issues of female agency and identity in the early modern period.³⁹

Methodology

Influenced by the work of art historians Tarnya Cooper and Erin Griffey and historians including Caroline Hibbard, Malcolm Smuts, and Linda Levy Peck, the methodological approach of this thesis locates the study of material and visual culture within the socio-political, religious, and spatial framework of the Jacobean court.⁴⁰ It recognises that issues of display, proximity, and audience can determine the significance of a material object. The following discussions of objects associated with Anna therefore seek to understand where they were displayed, what objects were placed nearby, who would have seen them, and

³⁸ Smuts and Gough, "Queens and the International Transmission," 1.

³⁹ A similar approach that underlines the interconnectedness of female patronage with agency and identity is found in Sheryl E. Reiss and David G. Wilkins, eds., *Beyond Isabella: Secular Women Patrons of Art in Renaissance Italy* (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 2001). See especially the prologue and introduction, which summarise the goals and issues of this method, and also, Cynthia Lawrence, ed. *Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors, and Connoisseurs* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

⁴⁰ See for example, Tarnya Cooper, "Elizabethan Portraiture: Taste, Style and Patronage," in *Elizabeth I and her People*, exhibition catalogue (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2013), 10-20; *Citizen Portrait: Portrait Painting and the Urban Elite of Tudor and Jacobean England and Wales* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012); Erin Griffey, "Devotional Jewellery in Portraits of Henrietta Maria," in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage* ed. Erin Griffey (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 165-94; *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Majesty at the Stuart Court* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, forthcoming); Caroline Hibbard, "Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in 'Ancien Regime' Courts," in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2006); "Queen's Patronage of Artists and Artisans,"; Smuts, "Art and the Material Culture of Majesty,"; "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change,"; "The Structure of the Court and the Roles of the Artist and Poet under Charles I," *The Court Historian* 9 (2004): 103-17; Linda Levy Peck, *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: University Press, 2005).

how would they have been received or understood. For the art historian, the analysis of artworks, articles of jewellery and dress, garden structures, and buildings is not merely descriptive, but looks to uncover information about the financial and social status, the tastes and interests, and the connections of the patron and/or owner/recipient.

Visual court culture was, in part, shaped by the anticipated audience. Writing on the roles and reactions of audiences in Renaissance Italy, Jonathan Nelson and Richard Zeckhauser have isolated three audience types – the contemporary, future, and godly - that are similarly relevant to Jacobean England.⁴¹ Anna's contemporary audience would have been varied. It would have included, at different times, members of the English gentry and peerage, courtiers, ambassadors, and visiting foreigners of rank and title.⁴² These figures would have sought an audience with Anna at one of her palaces, or would have attended a banquet, reception, an official ceremony, court masque, or semi-public meal that she either held, or was present. During these occasions, Anna used articles of jewellery and/or clothing, or the strategic placement of material objects for political ends. They were marshalled, for example, to communicate her support of the Spanish, to announce her factional and familial connections, and to demonstrate her interests and learning. For Anna, advertising these elements would have been increasingly important as she moved to distance herself from the faction, favourites, and cultural activities of James's court. In this, she seems to have been successful, for contemporaries frequently made note of her ancestral pedigree and pride, her favour of the Spanish, and her alliance with the Pembroke/Southampton faction.

⁴¹ Jonathan Nelson and Richard Zeckhauser, *The Patron's Payoff: Conspicuous Commissions in Italian Renaissance Art* (Princeton: University Press, 2008), 28-31. See also Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

⁴² Smuts, "Art and the Material Culture of Majesty," 93.

Modes of courtly display, and their central place in Jacobean politics, have been explored by Malcolm Smuts in a seminal essay from 1996.⁴³ Challenging the centrality of paintings in discussions of court culture, Smuts focuses on the significance of more ephemeral forms of display such as jewellery, clothing, buildings, textiles, and furniture.⁴⁴ Read and understood as visible symbols of power, rank, and affluence, Smuts argues that such material forms were central in the dissemination of the “official image” of kingship and were therefore innately political.⁴⁵ As queen consort, Anna was a symbol of the monarchy. As such, she was expected to engage with inherited forms of display – sumptuous clothes, jewels, and furnishings – to convey her wealth, status, and honour, which translated to the power and cachet of the Stuart dynasty.⁴⁶ Contemporary correspondence, which is discussed in the following chapters, indicates that Anna amply fulfilled this duty. Letters and dispatches of the period contain accounts of the richness and splendour of Anna’s appearance, and that of her palaces, which is expressly connected to the power and prestige of the monarchy. Beyond generic magnificence, however, such material goods operated as “complex visual codes,” which could be used for specific political or personal ends.⁴⁷

More research needs to be carried out on the political and spatial import of visual display at the Jacobean court.⁴⁸ However, the work of Erin Griffey, Tara Hamling, and John Peacock, provides a fruitful foundation for an examination of the varied purposes, audience types, and receptions of display. While Smuts rightly points to the over-centrality of paintings in

⁴³ Smuts, “Art and the Material Culture of Majesty.”

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 87, 90-93, 96.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 86-87.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 90-94, 107.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 112.

⁴⁸ This is also noted by Griffey, who calls for a “systematic analysis of broader issues around display” in order to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of how artworks “contributed to the overall dynamics of space at the Stuart court,” see her *On Display*, forthcoming.

assessments of the visual culture of the Stuart courts, they were, nevertheless, important for advertising the piety, taste, learning, and the dynastic and factional alliances of the owner. Certainly, although limited, Peacock's consideration of portraits at the Caroline court affirms that portraits functioned as "statements of relationship and alliance." Further, he emphasises the importance of location and manner of display to the meaning of any given portrait and concludes that "groups or series" of portraits were typically displayed in a "calculated and tendentious" fashion.⁴⁹ This is extended by Griffey, who examines artworks in relation to the governing conventions of access and proximity at the Stuart court and asserts that all furnishings and objects were ordered according to the specific function and intended audience of the given room. She also notes that display was rarely static, and that pictures, textiles, and pieces of furniture moved between rooms, and between palaces, in accordance with ceremonial protocols, but also personal preference.⁵⁰

Suitability was a central principle of display. Looking to gentry, farm, and town houses in post-reformation England, Hamling maps out the typical sequence of rooms, noting their social purpose and the decorative programme that was "appropriate to their importance."⁵¹ While Hamling focuses on the middle classes and does not include court spaces, her use of interior decoration as an index to an owner's rank, wealth, and education and the connections she draws between function, audience, and adornment, sets up an important framework for analysing Anna of Denmark's forms of visual display. Building on the work of Smuts, Peacock, Griffey, and Hamling, and acknowledging the interrelationship between

⁴⁹ John Peacock, "The Politics of Portraiture," in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, eds. Kevin Sharpe and Stephen Zwicker (Stanford: University Press, 1993), 213, 215-16.

⁵⁰ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

⁵¹ Tara Hamling, *Decorating the 'Godly' Household: Religious Art in Post-Reformation Britain* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2010), 67-85, and chapter four, 121-219, which discusses individual rooms in sequence; quotation from 71.

location and object, the following discussions of Anna's palace interiors look to uncover the significance of her material goods by considering their placement, their surroundings, and their potential audience.

My approach to and understanding of the ways in which elite and royal women were able to engage with and influence court politics has been invaluabley shaped by the work of literary and court historians, specifically Melinda Gough, Erin Griffey, Barbara Harris, Caroline Hibbard, Olwen Hufton, and Malcolm Smuts. These scholars pertinently question what constituted "the political" in early modern England, arguing for a move away from traditional definitions that have distinguished between the public and the private; the domestic and the political. Indeed, Harris argues that as a patronage society in Tudor England, ordinary female social roles such as the creation of and participation in patronage networks, the maintenance of kinship ties and friendships, and the practice of gift exchange, were filled with political implication. She further outlines that common sociability patterns, such as personal visits and seemingly casual conversations and dinners, were always politically charged and, crucially, that elite women used these channels to advance their political aims.⁵² Looking to royal women, Gough, Griffey, Hibbard, Hufton, and Smuts have approached the early modern court through the queen consort. Like Harris, they call for a reconsideration of traditional notions of politics, as well as a review of the balance of power in royal relationships, and the control of patronage, appointments, access, and profit.⁵³

⁵² Barbara J. Harris, "Women and Politics in Early Tudor England," *The Historical Journal* 33 (1990): 260, 65-68, 74, 76. The use of the term "sociability patterns" to denote informal methods of contact and communication exploited by women for political ends is derived from Hufton, "Reflections of the Role of Women," 1.

⁵³ See for example, Caroline Hibbard, "The Role of a Queen Consort: The Household and Court of Henrietta Maria, 1625-1642," in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility*, ed. Ronald Asch and Adolf Birke (Oxford: University Press, 1991); "Translating Royalty: Henrietta Maria and the Transition from Princess to Queen," *The Court Historian* 5 (2000); "Henrietta Maria in the 1630s"; "Queen's Patronage of Artists and Artisans"; Griffey,

While these scholars are concerned with the Tudor or Caroline periods, their work provides an appropriate model for considering the wider political implications of Anna's extensive cultural interests and social activities.

Current Scholarship

Anna's cultural pursuits have started to receive scholarly interest. In particular, she has been considered by literary historians as an important patron of the Jacobean theatre through her participation in, and popularisation of, the court masque. These luminous annual spectacles have been the subject of extensive secondary source literature by scholars such as Leeds Barroll, Clare McManus, and Sophie Tomlinson, who have considered their political and social importance.⁵⁴ While the masque was indeed a significant site of Anna's cultural interest, the tendency to use it to evaluate both the queen's cultural contribution and the role of elite women at court has resulted in an over-magnification of the centrality of the masque within the cultural climate of Jacobean England. The extensive breadth of socio-political and literary scholarship in this area means that for the purposes of this thesis, masques will only be considered in this study insofar as they reinforce aspects of Anna's personal iconography, or specific elements of her material and cultural choices.

"Introduction," in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage* ed. Erin Griffey (Aldershot: 2008); "Devotional Jewellery in Portraits of Henrietta Maria,"; *On Display*, forthcoming; Smuts and Gough, "Queens and the International Transmission"; Hufton, "Reflections of the Role of Women," 5.

⁵⁴ The Stuart masque has been the subject of extensive research. Publications that discuss the importance of Anna and the political significance of her entertainments include: Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*; Lewalski, "Anne of Denmark and the Subversion of Masquing"; Tomlinson, *Women on Stage*; Barroll, "Court of the First Stuart Queen"; "Theatre as Text"; "Inventing the Stuart Masque," in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque* ed. David Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: University Press, 1998); *Anna of Denmark: Cultural Biography*; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark"; Martin Butler, *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Barbara Ravelhofer, *The Early Stuart Masque: Dance, Costume and Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*; "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court"; Karen Lee Middaugh, "'The Golden Tree': The Court Masques of Queen Anna of Denmark" (PhD diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1994).

In addition to her theatrical patronage, Anna has also received mention from architectural historians – most notably John Bold, Gordon Higgott, John Harris, and Simon Thurley. However, the majority of scholarship is focused on Inigo Jones (1573-1652), while giving little, if any attention to the importance of Anna’s role in the building projects.⁵⁵ Absent from the scholarship is a systematic consideration of the nature and significance of Anna’s cultural mediation, which would in turn provide a more comprehensive and measured view of the structure and character of Jacobean court politics. Some scholars, however, have noted instances of Anna’s innovative patronage, or have commented on the potent meaning of aspects of her personal iconography. In his publication, of 2009, on the role played by Somerset (Denmark) House as the principal residence of successive queens consort, Thurley credits Anna with the conversion of the palace into “one of the great buildings of seventeenth-century England” and a principal “cultural centre” of royal London.⁵⁶ Thurley argues that with the king absent from London for most of the year, Anna was granted a large amount of freedom, and the unique form and function of Denmark House came to be seen as a physical expression of Anna’s independence from James.⁵⁷ The suggestion that Anna used Denmark House to showcase her individuality is further explored in this thesis. Thurley’s reconstruction of the layout and function of the palace is analysed in conjunction with the published 1619 inventory of Denmark House. In turn, this is considered

⁵⁵ See in particular John Harris, “Disneyland in Greenwich: The Restoration of the Queen’s House,” *Apollo* 122 (1990); John Harris, Stephen Orgel, and Roy Strong, *The King’s Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court* (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1973); John Harris, “Inigo Jones and the Courtier Style,” *Architectural Review* 154 (1973); John Bold, *Greenwich: An Architectural History of the Royal Hospital for Seamen and the Queen’s House* (London: Yale University Press, 2000); John Harris and Gordon Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (London; New York: Harper & Row, 1989).

⁵⁶ *Somerset House: The Palace of England’s Queens, 1551-1692* (London: London Topographical Society Publication, 2009), 31.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 31, 36.

together with inventories and accounts connected to the building and refurbishments carried out at her other two principal residences: Greenwich Palace and Oatlands Palace. This material provides a more holistic understanding of the ideological purposes, and the iconographic and symbolic meanings of these projects to Anna's wider visual identity. In considering these new archival sources, I show how Anna was able to articulate her cultural and intellectual prowess, her values and interests, and her illustrious dynastic connections by directing the architects and artists, the architectural features, the interior decoration, and the entertainments, that were staged in her palaces.⁵⁸

The examination of the physical form and interior decoration of Anna's three main residences extends into the work that she had carried out in the surrounding gardens. In each case, inspiration was taken from French or Italian precedents, and Anna commissioned artisans such as the French garden designer and engineer Salomon de Caus (1576-1626). In their work on De Caus's English period, Roy Strong and Luke Morgan consider the ambitious projects that he carried out under Anna's aegis: a large garden structure of a grotto fountain of Mount Parnassus at Denmark House, and a grotto aviary, possibly with automata, as well as a gilded fountain at Greenwich Palace.⁵⁹ While Strong is primarily concerned with De Caus's influence on the development of the English Mannerist garden, and Morgan is focussed on isolating the key tenets of De Caus's practice, both scholars briefly touch on the

⁵⁸ My understanding of the politics of palace ownership, decoration and use is indebted to Elizabeth Chew's demonstration of how Aletheia Talbot, Countess of Arundel (1584-1654) was able to use her London villa of Tart Hall to express aspects of her identity and articulate her independence from her husband, see Chew, "The Countess of Arundel and Tart Hall," in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. Edward Chaney (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2003), especially, 285.

⁵⁹ Roy Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979); *The Artist and the Garden* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Luke Morgan, *Nature as Model: Salomon De Caus and Early Seventeenth-Century Landscape Design* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

potential symbolic significance of the Parnassus to its patron. I provide new insights by examining their divergent interpretations of the Parnassus within the context of Anna's wider cultural programme and personal iconography. In doing this, I show that De Caus's work at Denmark House and Greenwich Palace was a logical manifestation of Anna's visual identity and patronage, which was consistently marked by an internationalist outlook that repeatedly favoured Italianate styles.

In addition to architecture and gardens, a pertinent site that Anna used to express her natal identity and support for an Anglo-Spanish marriage alliance was her own body. In turn, this was commemorated in her portraits. Anna's penchant for jewels and apparel has become ubiquitous with her name, and is still used by scholars to dismiss her as a queen who merely "loved jewellery (and) fine clothes."⁶⁰ It is shown in Chapter Two, however, that as a clear indicator of status and wealth, Anna's high level of adornment was decidedly strategic, and it was a necessity in matters of Jacobean diplomacy and ceremony. While some research has been completed on seventeenth-century costume, there is no specific work on female costume in the Jacobean period, although Aileen Ribeiro's book *Fashion and Fiction* addresses male and female costume of the period, and includes brief references to Anna.⁶¹

⁶⁰ Aileen Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 26.

⁶¹ The work of costume historians Valerie Cumming and Patricia Wardle provides pertinent information concerning the manufacture, usage, value, supply and the rather perplexing terminology of seventeenth-century dress, but makes little mention of Anna of Denmark. Cumming's book on seventeenth-century dress provides only passing mention of Anna, while her article on Stuart dress is based on the 1649 Commonwealth inventories. Wardle examines early Stuart England, but looks exclusively at male dress. See Valerie Cumming, "'Great Vanity and Excesse in Apparell.' Some Clothing and Furs of Tudor and Stuart Royalty," in *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, ed. Arthur MacGregor (London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989); *A Visual History of Costume: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Drama Book Publishers, 1984); Patricia Wardle, "'Divers Necessaries for His Majesty's Use and Service': Seamstresses to the Stuart Kings," *Costume* 31 (1997); "John Shepley (1575-1631), Embroiderer to the High and Mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales," *Textile History* 32 (2001).

However, Riberio's decision to exclude inventories and manuscripts results in a rather skewed and fanciful account of costume that is based purely on contemporary letters, diaries, and paintings.⁶² The most informative publication on early modern dress remains Janet Arnold's work on Queen Elizabeth. Arnold outlines the construction, the symbolic and cultural value, the economic worth, and the social circulation of apparel, based on archival material, existing articles of dress and portraits.⁶³ Although Arnold's work is based exclusively on the Tudor queen, her meticulous and detailed research provides an invaluable model for approaching the significance of Anna's material patronage, her practice of gift-giving, and her visual persona.

Comparable to the work of costume history, there is a small body of literature on early modern jewellery. For the most part though, it is much too broad and descriptive to be of particular value to the present study.⁶⁴ The only research focussed directly on the Jacobean period is the work of Diana Scarisbrick.⁶⁵ Her article, from 1986, on Anna's jewellery collection is relevant to this thesis in its consideration of Anna's individual taste in gems, motifs, and designs, her choice of jewellers and the symbolic role that jewels could play.

⁶² Riberio, *Fashion and Fiction*.

⁶³ Janet Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd: The Inventories of the Wardrobe of Robes Prepared in July 1600* (Leeds: Maney, 1988).

⁶⁴ See for example: Hazel Forsyth, *The Cheapside Horde: London's Lost Jewels* (London: Museum of London, 2013); Philippa Glanville, *Silver in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1990); Yvonne Hackenbroch, *Renaissance Jewellery* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1979); Rosalind Marshall and George Dalglish, eds., *The Art of Jewellery in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1991); Charles Oman, *British Rings, 800-1914* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1974); Diana Scarisbrick, "Symbols of Rank and Riches, Jewellery in the Portraits at Woburn," *Country Life* 179 (1986); *Jewellery: Makers, Motifs, History, Techniques* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989); *Rings: Symbols of Wealth, Power, and Affection* (New York: Abrams, 1993); *Rings: Jewellery of Power, Love and Loyalty* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2007); *Portrait Jewels: Opulence and Intimacy from the Medici to the Romanovs* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2011); Hugh Tait, *Catalogue of the Waddesdon Bequest in the British Museum* (London: British Museum Press, 1986).

⁶⁵ See in particular Diana Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery: The Old and the New," *Apollo* 122 (1986). Other publications by Scarisbrick on Jacobean jewellery include "Jewellery in Tudor and Jacobean Portraits at Newhaven," *Apollo* 127 (1987); *Jewellery in Britain, 1066-1837: A Documentary, Social, Literary and Artistic Survey* (Norwich: Michael Russell Publishing, 1994); *Tudor and Jacobean Jewellery* (London: Tate Publishing, 1995).

Scarisbrick's article is too short to examine the extent to which Anna used jewellery as a political conduit, the role that jewellery played in the articulation of her identity, or the scale of her patronage of jewellers and goldsmiths. However, the points that Scarisbrick raises are re-evaluated and extended in the present study.⁶⁶ Due to the relatively small quantity of extant jewels and articles of dress from the early modern period, costume and jewellery historians commonly use contemporary portraits to provide supplementary information on the assemblage, construction, and appearance of certain elements. In the present thesis, portraits of the period are used in a similar manner. It should be noted, however, that it is often difficult to match documentary records with painted representations.⁶⁷ The possible reasons, and significance of this repeated mismatch are discussed in detail in Chapter Two. In Chapter One, Anna's own portraits form the basis of a sustained analysis of how she shaped her personal iconography to articulate her position as a cultural agent, a member of the House of Oldenburg, and a royal woman with interests and values beyond those of her husband.

As well as being used for illustrative purposes by costume and jewellery historians, Anna's portraits have also received some limited attention from literary and art historians - most notably, James Knowles and Lucy Wood.⁶⁸ To date, Knowles's chapter on the

⁶⁶ While providing scant information on the Jacobean period, the 1980 Victoria and Albert Museum exhibition catalogue and A. Jefferies Collins's 1955 work on jewellery and plate in the Tudor period, do provide relevant supplementary material concerning the political usage, function, type, worth and fate of jewels in the Renaissance. See Anne Somers Cocks, "The Status and Making of Jewellery, 1500-1630," in *Princely Magnificence: Court Jewels of the Renaissance 1500-1630*, ed. Anne Somers Cocks (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1980); A. Jefferies Collins, *Jewels and Plate of Queen Elizabeth I: The Inventory of 1574* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955).

⁶⁷ The discordance between catalogued and portrayed jewels is also noted by Griffey in her chapter on the implications of the presence, or the conspicuous absence of, religious jewellery in portraits of Henrietta Maria, see Griffey, "Devotional Jewellery," 166.

⁶⁸ Knowles, "Anna of Denmark"; Lucy Wood, "The Portraits of Anne of Denmark" (MA report, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1981). More commonly, literature on Jacobean portraiture either

entertainments associated with Anna's progress of 1613 is one of the most considered engagements with Anna's cultural patronage and visual iconography.⁶⁹ Knowles is primarily concerned with Anna's use of neo-Elizabethanism and her patronage of theatre, but he does consider Anna's visual iconography and her broader cultural pursuits, which he argues were coloured by a complex amalgamation of neo-Elizabethan, avant-garde, and Italianate elements.⁷⁰ Knowles builds on points raised in Wood's MA Thesis (1981), which is the only piece of scholarly work dedicated to cataloguing and discussing Anna's portraits.

Nevertheless, by focussing only on portraits, Wood provides a very narrow view of Anna's patronage that does not consider the wide range of Anna's artistic and intellectual interests, or the political weight of her cultural and visual choices. As yet, Knowles's chapter is the most detailed and thought-provoking consideration of Anna's patronage. While it is unfortunately too short to do justice to the considerable range and potential meanings of Anna's cultural mediation, Knowles's arguments are examined and extended in the subsequent discussions.

In general, the narrow approach in existing scholarship has veiled the extent of Anna's intellectual and artistic pursuits.⁷¹ It has also meant that, like other contemporary royal and elite women, Anna's use of cultural avenues and common social mores to advance political agendas has gone largely unnoticed. Anna's importance as a cultural agent and political

excludes portraits of Anna, or mentions them superficially. For example, see Roy Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography*, 3 vols. (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK ; Rochester, NY, USA: Boydell Press, 1995); *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture*, Studies in British Art (London, New York: Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art; Pantheon Books, 1969); *The Elizabethan Image: Painting in England, 1540-1620* (London: Tate Gallery, 1969); Karen Hearn, ed. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (London: Tate Britain, 1995).

⁶⁹ Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 21-48.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 27-28.

⁷¹ This limited approach in scholarship is also observed by Knowles, *ibid.*, 24, and in the *ODNB* entry on Anna.

figure in Jacobean England cannot be overlooked. I aim to redress the balance by examining how Anna, like other queens consort operating in a patriarchal patronage society, used everyday social practices and material goods for political ends.⁷² My thesis explores how Anna was able to express aspects of her personal identity, such as her Danish lineage, her passion for the Italianate, her alignment with the Pembroke-Southampton faction, and her support of an Anglo-Spanish marriage, through her choice of artists and artisans; the objects, textiles, and furniture that she acquired and displayed; the strategic utilisation of aspects of Elizabeth's iconographic legacy; and visual and verbal references to her genealogy. This thesis further demonstrates how Anna used these elements to assert a position that was often very distinct from the aesthetics and factions associated with James's court.⁷³ As a result, Anna's court and household is accorded greater relevance to Jacobean politics than has hitherto been observed. It is acknowledged as an integral player in sustaining the cultural diversity, factional politics, and patron-client relationships that underpinned the Jacobean court.

Finance and Administration

A central challenge for this thesis has been the diffuse and fragmented nature of the archival material. It would be expected that as queen consort, sources delineating patterns of Anna's spending, commissions, patronage, and gifts would be extensively documented. However, given the hierarchical structure and patriarchal nature of the Jacobean court, this is not the case. As mentioned above, even though Anna was granted more freedom and

⁷² This argument is cogently made by Frye, who, in her discussion of the political significance of the play *Henry VIII*, unequivocally states "that as queen consort her every action carried political weight, from giving birth to going on progress, from entertaining ambassadors to following the intrigues of dynastic marriage." See Frye, "Anne of Denmark and the Historical Contextualisation," 182.

⁷³ This aspect of Anna's agency is also articulated by Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 22-25.

independence than most queens consort of the period, her court was still tied to her husband's through shared offices of finance and administration. As a result, a large quantity of warrants and records would have been drawn up and declared through centralised offices, such as the Exchequer. Therefore, unless items were specifically paid for through Anna's Privy Purse, or were recorded by her Receiver-General as they entered her household (which was not often), they remain unknown to us, lost in the wider gamut of Jacobean court office.

The financial system of Anna's household is complex and unclear. From what I have been able to ascertain, unlike her successor, Henrietta Maria, Anna did not have a treasurer attached to her household.⁷⁴ As a result, there is not a concise account of her expenditure. It appears that Anna's Receiver-General, George Carew (1555-1629), was responsible for accounting for her income, although the sums disbursed to her Privy Purse do not seem to have been fixed or regular.⁷⁵ Some concrete evidence concerning the nature of Anna's financials can be found in Sir Edward Coke's (1552-1634) plan, in 1616, to repay Anna's debts, decrease her expenses, and increase her income, for it includes a summary of her revenue and arrears.⁷⁶ Coke's review "to be kept to her Ma^{tie} her selfe," notes that Anna's annual revenue, as documented by her Receiver General, Carew, totalled £25,930. Of that, Coke states that Anna received £1,000 a month to her Privy Purse "for her owne use

⁷⁴ The different duties assigned to the Receiver-General and the Treasurer in the early modern period are not definitive, but it seems likely that the Treasurer accounted for all outgoings, while the Receiver-General noted all incoming money. They were evidently separate posts, for Carew was to serve Henrietta Maria in both roles, succeeding Jean Caille in 1626, and remaining in the post until his death in 1629. At this time, Sir Richard Wynn was appointed as Henrietta Maria's treasurer, see Hibbard "Queen's Patronage of Artists and Artisans," 119-20; Ute Lotz-Heumann, "Carew, George, earl of Totnes (1555-1629)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/4628>, accessed 2 May 2015.

⁷⁵ TNA: PRO, SP14/86, fol.172r (24 March 1616).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, fol.173r (24 March 1616). For a list of some tradespeople and their bills to be paid by the queen, see TNA: PRO, SP14/86, fol.100r (9 February 1616).

accordinge to her good pleasure,” which was “to be impressed unto one of her Ma.^{ts} Servants for her highnes use.” In addition, Anna spent £4,930 per annum on wages.⁷⁷ According to Coke’s calculations, this left Anna with £9,000 “to be sett out towards the paym^t of her Ma.^{ts} debts yerely,” which he estimated to be between £30,000 and £40,000.⁷⁸ However, while Anna’s Privy Purse allocation was supposedly fixed, the evidence suggests that Anna also issued warrants throughout the year for varying amounts of money to be paid to her Privy Purse by the Exchequer. These were then accounted for by members of her Bedchamber. On 20 March 1604, for example, Margaret Hartside, one of Anna’s chamberers, signed for the delivery of £1,700 to the Privy Purse.⁷⁹

As well as the Privy Purse allocation, Anna’s annual revenue included income from the value of her jointure estates, from feudal tenancies, and from her lease of import duties on sugar.⁸⁰ In 1603, Cecil notes that Anna’s jointure in England was set at £6,376 per annum, which did not include her Scottish jointure of £4,541 Scots for the residences of Dunfermline, Fife, and Linlithgow, which brought the total to around £6,755 sterling.⁸¹ At

⁷⁷ Ibid., fols.173r-174v.

⁷⁸ Ibid., fols.173r, 175r.

⁷⁹ TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9.

⁸⁰ TNA: PRO, SP14/86, fol.175r. Coke puts Anna’s annual income from sugar impositions at £5,000 per annum. Anna was presumably granted the licence in 1608, or early 1609, for a warrant issued on 3 March 1609 states that Anna is to receive 12*d.* per hundredweight of Muscovado sugar, and 10*d.* per hundredweight of sugar imported from St Thomas in the Caribbean. See CSPD, vol.10, 496; TNA: PRO, SP 14/40, fol.12 (undated, 1608?). On the common law and the provision of a bride’s dowry and jointure in Tudor England see, Barbara Harris, *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers* (Oxford: University Press, 2002), 22-24, 44-58.

⁸¹ Rents and revenues from some of Anna’s lands and tenements are listed at the end of her household accounts for 1603-05, although they appear to be incomplete, amounting to only £3,155.9s.5*d.*, see TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9. For a clearer outline of Anna’s English jointure see extracts from the Cecil Papers published in Edmund Lodge, ed., *Illustrations of British History, Biography and Manner... &c.*, vol. 3, (London: 1791), online edition, *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, STC T148778 (accessed 20 April 2015), 206-207; For Anna’s Scottish jointure see Thomas Riis, *Should Auld Acquaintance Be Forgot... Scottish-Danish Relations c.1450-1707*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (Odense: University Press, 1988), 272, table 11.1; Meikle, “Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule,” 106. Anna’s Scottish jointure included the additional provision of foodstuffs such as wheat, barley, oatmeal, oats, capons, hens, and geese. It is unclear what happened to these entitlements in England, but for

this time, it was noted that Anna was expected to use her jointure income to pay for all of her servant's wages, cover any extraordinary rewards, and purchase her own clothing, while James was expected to cover all other costs relating to her household and stables.⁸²

Evidently, though, Anna's income was insufficient for her needs, for privy seals were frequently issued by the Exchequer (signed by James) to provide Anna with additional sums of money to settle her debts with her jeweller.⁸³ In 1611 and 1612, the Exchequer was also required to settle several bills she had incurred with London-based tradespeople for articles of clothing.⁸⁴ Perhaps more expectedly, the Exchequer also paid for a quantity of jewels, which Anna used as diplomatic gifts.⁸⁵

A more detailed breakdown of Anna's income and jointure is provided by Coke in March 1616. In this summary, however, the annual value of Anna's jointure has decreased with Coke listing the "mannors and lands granted to her Matie" as yielding £4,224 per annum. He has perhaps used a different allocation system to Cecil, for he adds that Anna's "fee farm rents" totalled £16,546 a year.⁸⁶ The level of control Anna had over this revenue is uncertain though, as is the system that James used to supplement her income. Accordingly, in order to evaluate Anna's role as a cultural agent, I follow the example set by Griffey, Hibbard, Sheryl

the specific amounts attached to each residence while in Scotland see Riis, *ibid.* In 1603, the exchange rate between the Scots pound and the pound sterling was fixed at 12:1, see A. Gibson and T. C. Smout, *Prices, Food, and Wages in Scotland, 1550-1780* (Cambridge England; New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 7. Conversely, Thurley states that by 1609, Anna's jointure amounted to £9,376, but he does not provide any reference, see Simon Thurley, "Architecture and Diplomacy: Greenwich Palace under the Stuarts," *The Court Historian* 11 (2006): 130.

⁸² Lodge, ed., *Illustrations of British History*, vol.3, (accessed 20 April 2015), 207.

⁸³ At least eight privy seals were issued to cover Anna's debts with her jeweller, see TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.70r, which is discussed in Chapter Two. In 1605, several privy seals were issued to help alleviate Anna's debt, to cover the charge of two masques, and to provide for a New Year's gift for the king, see TNA: PRO, SP14/14, fol.131r (June? 1605).

⁸⁴ BL Lansdowne 165/31, fols.162r-163r. This is discussed in Chapter Two.

⁸⁵ TNA: PRO, SP14/14, fol.131r (June? 1605). This is discussed in Chapter Two.

⁸⁶ TNA: PRO, SP14/86, fol.175r.

Reiss and David Wilkins, who have called for a reconsideration of the conventional model of patronage.⁸⁷ Wilkins and Reiss expand “the study of patronage” by arguing that it includes “those who requested and/or needed the work, as well as those who were intended to use it.”⁸⁸ Using the phrase “the dynamics of conjugal patronage,” Reiss and Wilkins emphasise the importance of the “potential buyers and users” of any work, object, or commission, rather than traditional definitions, which have only considered the person who paid for the goods.⁸⁹

Irrespective of whether money was disbursed by the queen, or by central Crown office, it is clear that Anna took a directorial role in relation to the creation of her visual persona, the articles of jewellery and dress that she ordered, the building and refurbishment work that was carried out on her jointure properties, and the material goods that furnished those properties. Consequently, in order to move beyond the socio-cultural restrictions placed on Anna as a woman, and the way in which court finances were structured and controlled in the Jacobean period, the concept of “conjugal patronage” is employed throughout this study. By utilising this approach, I provide a more comprehensive evaluation of Anna’s role and significance as a cultural patron, which is not hampered by narrow models, or obscured by the bureaucratic mechanics of courtly financial control and distribution.

⁸⁷ Reiss and Wilkins, *Beyond Isabella*, xvi, see also the Prologue and Introduction; Hibbard, “Queen’s Patronage of Artists and Artisans,” 115-16; Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming. My thanks to Erin Griffey for sharing her work with me in advance of publication.

⁸⁸ Reiss and Wilkins, *ibid.*, 12.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, xvii.

Thesis Structure and Chapter Outline

The central aim of this thesis is to challenge the dominant historiography that has characterised Anna of Denmark as a “largely anonymous woman,” who “had neither the brains nor the education to satisfy the Scottish Solomon.”⁹⁰ To achieve this, it analyses Anna’s body of portraiture, her choice of artists and artisans, her architectural and horticultural decisions, and her carefully cultivated visual persona. These analyses show how Anna strategically used material goods, architecture, visual arts, and social avenues to express her personal and political identity, and to fashion a space that was distinct from, but connected to James’s court. This thesis acknowledges the degree of competition and distance between the households of the king and queen, but, as noted above, it does not accept that Anna was ever in direct conflict with James, or that their relationship was ever inimical. Reference is regularly made to scholarship on James, in order to demonstrate that Anna was often aesthetically and factionally distinct from, yet not opposed to, her husband.

The thesis is structured in three chapters, each focusing on a different aspect of Anna’s cultural agency: portraits in miniature and in large; jewellery and costume; and the building projects, gardens, and interiors of Anna’s three main palaces. The present chapter provides an introduction to the thesis, offering an overview of current literature, providing contextual information on Anna’s life prior to her arrival in England, and detailing the central argument of this dissertation. Chapter One sets the stage for the rest of the study by providing a detailed examination of Anna’s visual persona. Anna’s body of miniature and easel portraits are considered in relation to contemporaneous portraits of her husband, and are set within

⁹⁰ Michael Lynch, *Scotland: a New History* (London: Century, 1991), 233; Maurice Ashley, *The House of Stuart: Its Rise and Fall* (London: J M Dent & Sons Ltd., 1981), 116.

a wider socio-political context. Addressing the portraits in chronological order, this chapter isolates a distinctive shift in Anna's visual self-representation around 1614. It argues that this significant change occurred in conjunction with Anna's decision to actively distance herself from James's court, as death, divorce, and factional politics caused a substantial realignment of power, patronage, and kinship networks. Sustained analyses of two seminal portraits of the queen: Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger's (1561/2-1636) portrait from 1614 (figure 1.27) and Paul van Somer's (c.1577-1621) hunting portrait from 1617 (figure 1.50), show how Anna used the portrait arts to express her difference from James by highlighting her personal cultural interests, her natal lineage, and by deliberately fashioning herself as the inheritor of Elizabeth I's iconographic legacy. I argue that Anna's visual persona was marked by a level of autonomy, internationalism, and innovation - features which are traced through subsequent chapters in other areas of her patronage and collecting.

While elements of Anna's jewellery and dress are mentioned in Chapter One, a more thorough exploration of her patronage of material goods is offered in Chapter Two. This chapter examines the artificers that Anna patronised, the types of goods she bought and had restored, her involvement in the politicised custom of gift exchange, and the concept of her appearance as a point of diplomacy. The discussion is based on two separate inventories of Anna's wardrobe goods, and the inventory of Anna's jewels compiled in 1606, which has been published by Scarisbrick.⁹¹ Further information is drawn from Anna's household accounts and the extensive accounts and vouchers of her principal jeweller, George Heriot

⁹¹ TNA: PRO, LR2/121; CUL Dd.I.26; Diana Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery Inventory," *Archaeologia* 109 (1991).

(1563-1624).⁹² This material is supplemented by various ambassadorial dispatches, letters, and diary entries that reflect on Anna's appearance. These documents provide evidence of Anna's strategic use of inherited clothing and jewels, her individualised taste for material goods, her patterns of spending and gift-giving, and her high level of adornment. I argue that Anna's acquisition of devotional jewels and familial ciphers was politically motivated, connecting these purchases to the Anglo-Spanish marriage negotiations, and to Anna's decision to distance herself from James's court. Where possible, portraits are used for illustrative purposes. The problems associated with using portraits as visual evidence, and the challenges of matching visual images with documentary entries are discussed. Chapter Two questions the traditional view of Anna as a wantonly extravagant consort. It presents Anna as a perspicacious cultural agent, who well understood the power and magnificence attached to material goods, and who strategically used her physical appearance as a matter of Jacobean diplomacy.

Chapter Three focuses on Anna's three principal residences: Denmark House, Greenwich Palace, and Oatlands Palace. It utilises extant inventories, the declared accounts of the Pipe Office and the Office of Works, and Anna's household accounts, as well as drawings, printed plans, and eyewitness accounts to address the nature and significance of Anna's material possessions, and her considerable refurbishment and building activities. This chapter highlights Anna's understanding of the qualities and values that could be communicated through building projects. It acknowledges her appreciation of the hierarchies of space and the politics of display, and shows how Anna used her built environments to showcase her

⁹² TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1650; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1653; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1655; TNA: PRO, LR2/122.

political aspirations and social position. Furthermore, it reveals her heightened sense of ownership and prerogative as she fought for the stewardship of Greenwich Park, hosted independent entertainments at Denmark House, and ensured that during James's 1617 Scottish progress, all council meetings were held at her palace of Greenwich.

In the same manner as Chapters One and Two, Chapter Three continues the investigation of how Anna aimed to distinguish herself from the aesthetics, policies, and favourites of James's court. It shows how Anna's architectural and gardening interests were not shared by James, but were spurred by the patronage model of her natal court, and her personal penchant for the Italianate in architecture and garden design. It underscores the importance of Anna's decision to patronise innovative artisans who were not in James's employ, but who were conversant with European trends and traditions that were not yet popular in England. Further, I argue that the interior furnishings of Denmark House and Oatlands Palace identified the royal resident as a daughter of Denmark who was highly learned, cultured, and a member of the Pembroke-Southampton faction. I discuss the large quantity of religious paintings that the queen owned, but in the same manner as preceding analyses, I caution against reading these images as evidence of Anna's supposed Catholicism. The confessional ambiguity of the paintings provides further evidence of Anna's judicious approach to her religious identity, as she used material goods to uphold a level of uncertainty about her position. Chapter Three places Anna's building activities, garden structures, and interior decoration within the context of her broader cultural agency. It recognises her significance as the initiator of the "single most important and expensive royal

domestic architectural work of the early Stuart period” but highlights that this was just one aspect of her diverse cultural pursuits.⁹³

Despite the fragmentary nature of the archival material, and the almost complete absence of extant articles of jewellery and dress, there is sufficient visual and documentary material to discredit the prevailing historiography of Anna of Denmark. This thesis demonstrates that Anna was an astute cultural agent and an important political figure in the polycentric structure of the Jacobean court. It highlights her skill in negotiating a degree of separation from James as she moved, for example, to ally herself with an alternative court faction; support different candidates for court posts; patronise artists who were not in the king’s service; mark her clothes, jewels, and interior furnishings with her natal identity; and fund building projects from her Privy Purse. Even while she did this, Anna concurrently fulfilled her role as queen consort. She supported James’s decisions and aspirations, and she sought to further the success of the monarchy. This is confirmed by Anna’s assiduousness in upholding an ambiguous confessional position and strategically using her rumoured Catholicism to assist James’s efforts to secure the English throne, and to buttress the English bid for an illustrious Spanish match. Anna’s success in negotiating this balancing act is testimony to her political intelligence, and to the unique structure of the Jacobean court, which allowed for the existence of centres of power beyond that of the king.

⁹³ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 31.

Chapter One: Portraiture

The portraits of Anna of Denmark can be divided into two distinct modes. Those completed prior to 1614 espouse a generic princely magnificence through material opulence and the use of a full-length format. Around 1614, however, Anna's visual persona underwent a discernible shift with subsequent portraits being composed to announce her cultural interests and natal lineage. In this chapter, I contend that this shift was occasioned by the changing political climate of the Jacobean court. For, throughout 1612 and 1613, death, divorce, and factional realignment saw Anna distance herself from James's court and actively oppose the rising Howard-Carr faction that he favoured. The analyses in this chapter show that as a consequence of this political distancing, Anna developed a mode of portrayal that departed aesthetically from her husband's. By comparison, James's visual persona remained generic and conservative, being largely determined by visual tradition rather than personal interest or taste. From 1614, Anna's easel portraits seek to underline her distinction from James as a daughter of Denmark, as the successor to Elizabeth I's pictorial legacy, and as an architectural and horticultural agent. Anna reinforced this visual differentiation by choosing to patronise artists who were not used by James. While I argue that Anna looked to assert herself as culturally and factionally distinct from her husband, I do not allege that this self-styling was ever seen as a direct challenge, or as a rejection of the king's policies or stance. As I discuss below, there is even the distinct possibility that Anna's support of the oppositional Pembroke-Southampton faction was politically advantageous for James.

As noted in the Introduction, there is no evidence to suggest that James ever took issue with Anna's activities or position, and I would suggest that their differences should be seen as the result of varying dispositions and interests, rather than Anna being, in Lewalski's words, "directly and publicly in opposition to King James."¹ Furthermore, in line with Smuts and Knowles, this chapter argues that Anna's distance from James was a characteristic aspect of the cultural and political polycentricism that defined the Jacobean court.² Smuts's seminal discussion of Jacobean court culture argues for a "polycentric world" where the residences of powerful aristocrats such as Salisbury, Arundel, and Buckingham could serve as "focal points of opposition to royal favourites and policies." Smuts crucially adds that "such opposition did not entail rejecting the court as an institution" but that it "often represented an alternative model of the court, both in political terms and with respect to matters of taste, style and ambience."³ I follow Smuts's approach, and add that Anna's household was another crucial player in the creation and preservation of the heterogeneous structure of the Jacobean court. In addition, this chapter highlights the close relationship between Anna and her eldest son Henry, which extended to politics and aesthetics. By drawing attention to Anna's individual patronage and cultural pursuits, I argue against the scholarly tradition espoused by Roy Strong and Timothy Wilks, which has cast Henry as a precocious connoisseur and his mother as someone who blindly followed his lead. Through the analyses in this chapter, Anna emerges as a perspicacious cultural agent who clearly understood and

¹ Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 4. McManus shares Lewalski's position, arguing that Anna occupied a divergent political position to James, and often using the term "opposition." Writing of the performance of *Cupid's Banishment* in 1617, McManus states that Anna's "appropriation of the patriarchal position establishes... a female court in opposition to the performances of the King's favourites," adding that "Anna appropriated the monarch's authority," see "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court," 89. This masque and Anna's activities at this time are discussed in detail below, see pp.112-113

² Smuts, "Cultural Diversity," 104-105; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 23. I discuss this further in the Introduction above, see 12-14.

³ Smuts, "Cultural Diversity," 104-105.

valued the ability of the portrait arts to configure and promote an individualised visual persona that complemented her political position.

The Scottish Portraits

In comparison to the extant portraits of James and Anna painted in England, very few portraits of the royal couple dating to their time in Scotland have survived. A pendant of the Stuarts by the court artist Adrian Vanson (*d.*1602) from around 1595 provides a relatively rare example of Scottish royal portraiture (figures 1.1, 1.2).⁴ Executed in half-length format and richly attired in sumptuous fabrics, expensive embroidery, and opulent jewellery, the couple appear elite and wealthy. James's elaborately jewelled hat band and ermine-lined cloak do go some way to illustrating royal rank, yet the portraits do not engage with the conventions of court portraiture as codified by Titian (1485-1576) and Anthonis Mor (1517-1576) at the Habsburg court, who established the full-length format, together with elements such as tables, chairs, curtains, columns, and royal insignia, as a visual shorthand for princely majesty.⁵ Importantly, this pictorial language was certainly adopted in portraits of James and Anna completed after the English accession in 1603, discussed below. Scholars have suggested that Vanson's pendants have been cut down and were originally three-quarter length, showing James resting his left hand on his sword hilt.⁶ Even if that were the case,

⁴ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 172-73, cat. no.117. Hearn outlines that Vanson took over from Arnold Bronckorst as James's official painter before 1584, and that he regularly appears in the royal accounts in Scotland from 1582, receiving payment for portraits and decorative work associated with pageants. According to Hearn, James gave Vanson a medal in 1594 at which point he was titled "our painter," although she provides no reference for this statement.

⁵ On the visual conventions of state portraiture see Joanna Woodall, ed. *Portraiture: Facing the Subject* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), 2-3.

⁶ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 173, cat. no.117; Duncan Thomson, *Painting in Scotland 1570-1650* (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1975), 28, cat. no.14; Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010), 59.

though, it would have heightened his gentlemanly chivalrousness but it would not have specifically signalled royal status.

Following traditional gender pairing in portraiture, the pendant places James on the hierarchic right and Anna in the position of lesser power to his left. Like James's portrait, the image of Anna shows a woman who is clearly wealthy and of elite status, for she is adorned in a costly array of gold and pearls. However, it does not expressly assert that she is of royal birth or royal marriage. Barring the prescriptive painted inscription, there are no symbols, mottoes, representational jewels, or figurative elements to identify Anna as a Danish princess or a woman of regal standing. This is important to note, for these elements came to be a consistent part of the visual persona she developed in England.

The English Succession

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the question of the English succession dominated politics in England, Scotland, and Europe. In the first instance, it should be remembered that James was only one of several candidates for the throne and, as Susan Doran points out, he was not considered by many to be the strongest contender, for his claim had issues of a legal, religious, ancestral and practical nature.⁷ Perhaps more importantly, James was from a different dynasty and a different country, which incited fears around a loss of English

⁷ Susan Doran, "James VI and the English Succession," in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), 29-32. Other possible successors included the Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia (1566-1633), and Cardinal Odoardo Farnese (1573-1626). English possibilities included Lady Arbella Stuart (1575-1615), Thomas Seymour (1562/3-1600), Ferdinando Stanley, 5th Earl of Derby (1559-1594), and William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby (1561-1642). See also John Duncan Mackie, "The Secret Diplomacy of King James VI in Italy Prior to His Accession to the English Throne," *SHR* 21 (1924): 268; Loomie, "Toleration and Diplomacy," 7; Peck, *Northampton*, 18-19, 21; Pauline Croft, "Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain," in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, eds. Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 143-44.

nationalism and sovereignty.⁸ As a result, James went to considerable lengths to ensure that he would be the successful heir. Believing that if Queen Elizabeth did not name him as heir, he would need Catholic support for an unchallenged accession, James sent a number of personal letters, unofficial agents and ciphers to various Catholic leaders on the continent.⁹ The goal was always the same: to spread the promise of better treatment for English Catholics under James's rule, and to advertise the possibility of his own conversion. In the summer of 1602, with an elderly Elizabeth reportedly unwell, James even went as far as having his envoy in Rome, Sir James Lindsay, announce that if Spain would support James's claim for the English succession then James would be willing to raise his eldest son and heir, Prince Henry, as a Catholic, and together with Anna, James used the queen's rumoured Catholicism for political benefit, which is discussed below.¹⁰ James was also potentially involved in the events leading up to the disastrous Essex Rebellion of February 1601, and around this time he entered into a daring alliance and unauthorised communication with the English Secretary of State, Sir Robert Cecil (1563-1612), that lasted - without the knowledge of the aging English queen - right up to her death in March 1603.¹¹

⁸ Much has been written on the issue of the English succession; see for example, Pauline Croft, *King James* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 32-6; Doran, "James VI and the English Succession," 25-43; Conrad Russell, "1603: The End of English National Sovereignty," in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, eds. Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 1-15; Judith M. Richards, "The English Succession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England," *EHR* 117, no.472 (2002); Mackie, "Secret Diplomacy."

⁹ Notable examples of James's diplomatic tactics in this period include a letter to Pope Gregory XIII (1502-1585) on 19 February 1584 requesting support for his bid for the English crown and offering the promise of Catholic concessions in return. James was later in touch with the papacy, writing a letter on 24 September 1599, to Pope Clement VIII, requesting that William Chisholm, Bishop of Dunblane and Vaizon, be awarded a Cardinal's hat. Unofficial emissaries who were sent to the continent to determine James's reputation and work for the support for the English accession included, among others, James Ogilvy of Pourie in 1596, the Master of Gray in 1600, and Sir James Lindsay in 1602. See Mackie, "Secret Diplomacy," 271-73, 275, 277, 280; John Duncan Mackie, "A Secret Agent of James VI," *SHR* 9, no.36 (1912): 377-78; Warner, "James VI and Rome," 124-25; *CSP Spanish*, vol. 3: no. 371; Doran, "James VI and the English Succession," 32-34; Fry, "Perceptions of Influence," 274-75.

¹⁰ Loomie, "Toleration and Diplomacy," 12.

¹¹ G. P. V. Akrigg, *Letters of King James VI and I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 9-10. For James's secret letters to Cecil during this time see *ibid.*, 178-207, letters 79-92. See also Doran, "James VI and the English Succession," 39-42; Peck, *Northampton*, 18-19, who adds that other courtiers implicated in the

James was evidently capable of orchestrating a determined and ambitious programme of international diplomacy and, by this time, had been laying the groundwork for his English accession for almost two decades. However, the possibility that Anna's religious politicking assisted in the realisation of this aim cannot be overlooked.¹² On the level of high politics, Anna's purported Catholicism was marshalled for James's campaign for the English crown and helped his quest for Catholic backing in three crucial ways. Firstly, Anna's alignment with the Catholic and pro-Spanish network at the Scottish court would have assisted James in his difficult attempt to stay onside with the formidable Kirk, the Catholic faction, and the pro-English group, while offsetting them against one another.¹³ Secondly, being thought to have a Catholic wife strengthened the prospect that he would improve the situation for English Catholics. Thirdly, it increased the chance that James himself would convert.¹⁴ Crucially, Anna chose to actively use her apparent Catholicism in support of James's candidacy.

correspondence included Edward Bruce, Lord Kinloss (1548/9-1611) and John Erskine, Earl of Mar (c.1562-1634) in Scotland, and Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton (1540-1614) in England.

¹² By 1600, Catholics who are known to have been close to Anna, and suspected to have had knowledge of her Catholicism include: the Countess of Huntly; George Gordon, 6th Earl of Huntly (1562-1636); William Douglas, 10th Earl of Angus (1552-1611); Francis Hay, 9th Earl of Erroll (1564-1631); George Conn (*d.*1640); Alexander Seton, 1st Earl of Dunfermline (1555-1622); James Elphinstone, 1st Lord Balmerino (c.1553-1612); Helen Hay, Lady Livingstone (*d.*1627); Jane Drummond (c.1585-1643); Elizabeth Gordon of Gight, Countess of Dunbar (c.1575-1645); William Schaw, Master of the Works (c.1550-1602); Francis Stewart, 1st Earl of Bothwell (1562-1612); Sir James Lindsay; James Wood of Boniton (*d.*1601) and a select number of Jesuit friars including Alexander MacQuerrie and Robert Abercromby. Knowledge of Anna's Catholicism outside of Scotland extended to Catholic notables such as the Scottish Jesuit William Crichton (c.1535-1615) who was resident in Spain, Claudio Acquaviva, General of the Society of Jesus in Rome (1543-1615), John Stuart, Prior of the Monastery at Ratisbon, Pope Clement VIII (1536-1605), Cardinal Scipione Borghese (1577-1633), and Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini (1571-1621).

¹³ Fry points out that not only did James succeed in this regard, but he also managed to successfully avoid excommunication, and maintained peaceful relations with both Spain and England. I would suggest that it is highly likely that Anna assisted him in his difficult quest to appease both Catholics and Protestants, see Fry, "Perceptions of Influence," 273-74. As Smuts makes clear, we should remember that James failed to conciliate the belligerent wing of the Kirk, and he started to oppose it in 1596. James was, however, successful in getting the English to stop supporting the militants, which they had been doing for the past two years. Email communication to the author, 9 July 2014.

¹⁴ For Anna's letter to Borghese, see Warner, "James VI and Rome," 126, who includes a transcription of the letter in Latin, citing BL Add MS 37021. For Anna's letter to Clement, see Loomie, "King James I's Catholic Consort," 305, citing Biblioteca Vaticana, MSS Marberini Latini 8618, fols.15-16.

In 1601, Anna followed James's example and wrote to powerful Catholics to secure their support of James's bid for the throne. Writing to Pope Clement VIII and Cardinal Scipione Borghese, Anna strategically couched her appeals within statements of personal Catholicism. In her letter to Borghese of 31 July 1601, for example, Anna asserts she is writing "with the grace of the Holy Spirit from the heretic darkness towards the true light of the Catholics."¹⁵ As George Warner notes, the use of ambiguous personal pronouns throughout the letter works to encourage the view of James's complicity, and his possible conversion. This is heightened by Anna's statement that the messenger carrying the letter is acting as a plenipotentiary, and is able "to publicly confess the Catholic faith from *our* name towards the Holy Apostolic See."¹⁶ Thus, Anna shrewdly and privately played out her Catholic guise in Rome, away from the volatile religious climate of Scotland and England, and the disastrous consequences that any suspicions of Catholicism would have on James's accession chances. Conveniently, the secrecy of Anna's suspected Catholicism afforded James an increase in Catholic support, while concurrently allowing him to maintain his popular reputation as an earnest Protestant leader. By claiming her "Catholicism" to notable Catholic officials, Anna was able to legitimise the promises and assurances that James had already made about the Catholic question. Significantly, when James was finally announced as Elizabeth's successor on 24 March 1603, it was the first time in English history that a new dynasty had peacefully taken the throne.¹⁷ James entered London on 7 May 1603, and was later followed by Anna and their three children, Henry, Elizabeth (1596-1662) and Charles.

¹⁵ Published in the original Latin in Warner, "James VI and Rome," 126, my thanks to Nele de Raedt for the translation.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, italics mine.

¹⁷ Peck, *Northampton*, 21.

The Joint English Coronation

The coronation of the new Stuart king and his queen consort was scheduled for St James's Day, 25 July 1603. Double coronations were rare in England and it is significant that James chose to be crowned alongside Anna. In the case of Henry VIII, Maria Hayward asserts that the king strategically selected a double coronation in order to distinguish himself "from the other Tudors."¹⁸ I would argue that for James, a joint coronation was chosen to heighten his popularity and his prestige. By being crowned alongside his young Danish wife, James was able to tactfully advertise their shared youth and fertility. This would have been an explicit visual reminder of the dynastic security of the new ruling family of Stuart, and would have favourably compared to the single, childless, and aged Queen Elizabeth. Furthermore, by being accompanied by his wife, James would have been seen as not only the ruler of England, Scotland, and Ireland, but also as a member of the powerful Protestant House of Oldenburg. Thus, the couple embodied promises of wealth and trade, since the Danish controlled most of Scandinavia and the lucrative shipping channels through the Baltic.¹⁹

While Paul Lockhart asserts that Anna's father Fredrik II (r.1559-1588) "had had little use for James VI," the Scottish king actively pursued a Danish match.²⁰ Since neither Elizabeth nor the Scottish Kirk would permit James a Catholic bride, it is worth considering Denmark's position vis-à-vis European Protestant powers. Throughout the sixteenth century, Denmark's burgeoning naval power enabled it to dominate the Øresund strait (Sound) and

¹⁸ Maria Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII* (Leeds, U.K.: Maney, 2007), 43.

¹⁹ Paul Douglas Lockhart, *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause: Denmark's Role in the Wars of Religion, 1559-1596* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 3.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 311.

rule Baltic trade, extracting large tolls from all passing ships.²¹ It was also significantly rich in land mass: between 1536 and 1660 its territories were second only to the Spanish empire.²² Furthermore, Denmark boasted the beginnings of a cosmopolitan scholarly court culture and, perhaps most importantly, was one of Europe's oldest Protestant nations – converting to Lutheranism in 1536.²³ According to Lockhart, Frederik II “ruled over the largest most solidly Protestant state in all of Europe” that by the close of the sixteenth century was “viewed as a major, if not *the* major Protestant power.”²⁴ By comparison, Scotland was plagued by religious, geographic, and political instability, factionalism and impecuniousness.²⁵ Letters written prior to Anna's arrival are filled with concerns over James's inability to provide his Danish bride with a fitting degree of majesty. On 5 August 1589, Thomas Fowler lamented that Anna

Should be here the middle of next month, yet here is no provision for the marriage nor wherewithal to make any. The last tax, all that can be gotten, is gone, and the King [James] is driven to seek the Queen's [Elizabeth] help.²⁶

On the other side of the negotiations, the Danes were desirous of a Scottish match for religious and territorial reasons, and we should remember, as noted in the Introduction,

²¹ Paul Douglas Lockhart, *Denmark, 1513-1660: The Rise and Decline of a Renaissance Monarchy* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 104-105, 107.

²² *Ibid.*, 1, 88-89.

²³ In 1536, Frederik's predecessor, Christian III, issued the Reformation settlement, and Denmark officially became a Lutheran kingdom. Subsequently, for more than a century, outward conformity and an almost complete absence of conflict characterised the Danish religious climate. On the Danish Reformation and the relationship between the state, church, and the crown throughout the sixteenth century see Lockhart, *ibid.*, Chapter 3, 58-82. Denmark was territorially significant as it consisted of the Scanian lands (Skåne, Blekinge, and Halland), the Jutland peninsula, and the two island groupings around Fyn and Sjælland. In addition, Christian III forcibly annexed Norway, Iceland, and the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein to the Oldenburg state when he succeeded to the Danish throne in 1536. For a breakdown of Danish possessions and their significance to Danish wealth and power see *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause*, 21-24.

²⁴ *Denmark, 1513-1660*, 58, 83.

²⁵ Julian Goodare, “The Attempted Scottish Coup of 1596,” in *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, ed. Julian Goodare and Alasdair MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 313-16, 322-23, 325, 331-33; Laura Stewart, “Politics and Government in the Scottish Burghs, 1603-1638,” *ibid.*, 429-30, 433-36, 443; Meikle, “Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule,” 105.

²⁶ *CSP Scots*, vol. 10, 132, no.169.

that Anna was the second daughter. Frederik II's avowed fear and hatred of Catholicism meant that James's Protestantism was a necessary prerequisite to the marriage. Even more important to Frederik than religion, however, was the return of the Orkney and Shetland Islands to Danish rule. The islands had been under Scottish rule since 1468, when King Christian I of Denmark (1426-1481) pawned them to King James III of Scotland (1451-1488) in lieu of a dowry for his daughter Margrete (1456-1486).²⁷ Subsequently, the repossession of the islands had been a priority for all successive Oldenburg kings. Frederik II had been trying to negotiate with James VI for their return since 1585, and he seems to have initially considered the Scottish match as a means to regain their ownership. Even though Frederik was to die before the marriage was concluded, and the sovereignty of the Islands was conspicuously absent from the marriage treaty, the question of their rule had a formative influence on the Danish decision to accept James's marriage proposal.²⁸

In readiness for Anna's arrival, James had to beg assistance from Scottish nobles, burghs, and Queen Elizabeth. Edinburgh provided James with ships to convey him home from Kronborg, and 200 footmen to assist with Anna's Danish entourage. Foodstuffs and carriages were supplied by Scottish noblemen, and Elizabeth sanctioned 1,200 pieces of English cloth to be exported without charge.²⁹ Importantly for James, one of the Scottish clauses of the marriage was the significantly high dowry of "ten hundred thousand poundes Scottes," which was eventually settled in the Marriage Contract of 20 August 1589,

²⁷ Lockhart, *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause*, 287.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 287-88. For the terms of the treaty see the printed primary material in David Stevenson, *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1997), 79-86.

²⁹ Maureen M. Meikle, "Anna of Denmark's Coronation and Entry into Edinburgh, 1590: Cultural, Religious and Diplomatic Perspectives," in *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, ed. Julian Goodare and Alasdair MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 278. On Scotland's financial difficulties and the concerns raised over providing adequately for the new queen, see also Riis, *Should Auld Acquaintance Be Forgot*, vol. 1, 265-66.

at the sum of £150,000 Scots (£12,500 sterling).³⁰ In addition to the money, James's marriage provided him with the connections and confidence to approach the Danish regency government in the summer of 1590 with the prospect of an anti-Catholic and specifically anti-Spanish alliance that was to include the Dutch Republic, France, and some of the German principalities.³¹ Coming from a powerful and staunchly Protestant kingdom, a Danish princess was an esteemed match for the Scottish King. During the joint coronation in England, therefore, James's Danish bride functioned as a visual representation of England's strong and wealthy Protestant ally, as well as being the mother of England's future king.

In the opening years of James's English reign, Anna's rumoured Catholicism continued to be of political assistance. James was set on brokering peace with Spain, and at the level of international relations, negotiations focussed on the Catholic question. Philip III of Spain (1578-1621) was resolute that English Catholics were to be granted freedom of conscience as a term for peace.³² Accordingly, Philip sent Juan de Tassis, Count of Villamediana (1581-1622), to assess the religious climate of England, and to report on the attitudes and convictions of the English and their king. For his part, James was well aware that Tassis had to see Catholic toleration as a definite possibility and he consequently sent the Catholic Scotsman and courtier Sir James Lindsay to twice meet with Tassis. On both occasions, as Loomie notes, Lindsay was under royal order to remind Tassis of the good relationship James enjoyed with Rome and to speak specifically of Anna's Catholicism.³³ By confirming Anna's Catholicism, James was presumably looking to convince Tassis that since he allowed

³⁰ *CSP Scots*, vol. 10, 103, no.124; A. Montgomerie, "King James VI's Tocher Gude and a Local Authorities Loan of 1590," *SHR* 37 (1958): 12-13. As noted in the Introduction, in 1603, the exchange ratio of the pound Scots to the pound Sterling was fixed at 12:1, see Gibson and Smout, *Prices, Food, and Wages in Scotland*, 7.

³¹ Lockhart, *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause*, 311-12.

³² Loomie, "Toleration and Diplomacy,"; Croft, "*Rex Pacificus*," 148.

³³ Loomie, *ibid.*, 24, 27, citing Seccion de Estado, Archivo General de Simancas E 841/155.

himself a Catholic wife, he would most certainly be open to toleration for English Catholics. Importantly too, James knew that Tassis would recount his meetings to the Spanish king and Council of State, who were awaiting Tassis's reports before dispatching an embassy, led by Juan Fernández de Velasco, Constable of Castile (c.1550-1613), to negotiate the peace.³⁴ In his dispatch to Philip III, of 14 September 1603, Tassis dispelled the rumour that had been circulating in Spain for over a year that James would convert and, crucially, he confirmed Anna's Catholicism based solely on the information that he had received from Lindsay, since he had still not been granted an audience.³⁵ In addition, Anna committed to showing visible favour to the Spanish, thereby supporting the notion that the English were ready to enter formal negotiations. During the performance of *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, in January 1604, the French Ambassador Christophe de Harlay, Comte de Beaumont (c.1570-1615), reported that Anna wore "a scarf and a red streamer" to honour the Spanish ambassador, Tassis, who was similarly attired in red.³⁶

Anna was not alone in her decision to visually support Spain. Nadine Akkerman argues that Anna's staunchly Protestant lady-in-waiting, Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford, masqueraded in specifically Catholic dress during the masque. Noting that Bedford played the role of Vesta, or religion, Akkerman observes that Lucy was attired in red with a headpiece "like a nun, the cap denoting religion," which she interprets as "an act of reconciliation."³⁷ The colours and costumes that Anna and Lucy chose to wear were not

³⁴ Ibid., 25.

³⁵ Ibid., 24-25.

³⁶ Mary Agnes Sullivan, *Court Masques of James I: Their Influence on Shakespeare and the Public Theatres* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1973), 16. The original French correspondence is printed in *ibid.*, 194, appendix 6, citing King's MSS, cxxiv, fol.720. My thanks to Dr Emma Blomkamp for the translation.

³⁷ Nadine Akkerman, "The Goddess of the Household: The Masquing Politics of Lucy Harington-Russell, Countess of Bedford," in *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting Across Early Modern Europe*, Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 302-303.

indicative of their genuine faith or support of Catholicism, but rather, this Catholic role-playing is an example of religion being marshalled for politics. Following his English accession, it is clear that James stopped masquerading as a potential Catholic convert to Catholic rulers, but he continued to use Anna's apparent Catholicism to encourage the belief among Philip and his councillors that he was willing to better the situation of the English Catholics. To reinforce this perception amongst the Catholic powers more generally, James granted significant pardons to recusants in July 1603, which saw the total number of fines drop by almost 80% from the previous year.³⁸

Anna in Miniature: The Queen's Limner Isaac Oliver

Following her arrival in England, Anna enlisted the limner Isaac Oliver (c.1565-1617) to develop her visual persona. Oliver was not new to English court circles; along with his former teacher Nicholas Hilliard (c.1547-1619) he had been producing miniatures for the elite since the 1590s, but during this time it was Hilliard who completely dominated royal patronage. Hilliard completed his first miniature of Elizabeth I in 1572 (figure 1.3), and from that time, until her death in 1603, exercised a complete monopoly over her limned portrait. With the start of the Jacobean reign, however, favour visibly shifted from Hilliard to Oliver. The younger artist was able to secure the patronage not only of Anna, but also Prince Henry, Princess Elizabeth, and Prince Charles. Oliver also continued to receive commissions from a number of prestigious courtiers and nobles including, for example, Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford (1580-1627), Richard Sackville, 3rd Earl of Dorset (1589-1624) and Edward

³⁸ Ibid., 14-15, citing London Sessions Records for 1603-1604 in *Catholic Record Society* 34 (1934); Seccion de Estado, Archivo General de Simancas E 840/119 "avisos de Londres" 19 June; Frederick C. Dietz, "The Receipts and Issue of the Exchequer during the Reigns of James I and Charles I," *Smith College Studies in History*, 13 (1928).

Herbert, 1st Baron Herbert of Cherbury (1583-1648). Patently aware of the styles and trends favoured on the continent, Oliver offered a more naturalistic approach, which was achieved through the use of perspective and shadowing.³⁹ Nevertheless, Oliver did not appeal to everyone. As I discuss below, James never patronised Oliver, but chose to retain Hilliard as “goldsmith and our limner,” continuing his annual pension of £40.⁴⁰

Oliver appears to have accompanied Anna on progress in the summer of 1604. During this time, he presumably completed miniatures of the queen that could be given away as rewards, or as signs of her favour.⁴¹ Anna was evidently satisfied with Oliver’s work and on 22 June 1605, he was formally appointed “her Ma.^{ty} Painter in the Art of Lymning.” Oliver remained in this post until his death in 1617, receiving the standard annual fee of £40, which was regularly supplemented by additional payments.⁴² His earliest extant portrait of Anna is the c.1604 *ad vivum* miniature now at Waddesdon, which may have been the result of a personal sitting during the progress; or, at the very least, he completed it with visual knowledge of the queen (figures 1.4, 1.5). In this miniature, Anna’s chest and shoulders are covered in a profusion of diamond-studded pink-and-white silk rosettes, which continue onto the background. Over her exposed décolletage, she delicately places her right hand

³⁹ Katherine Coombs, *The Portrait Miniature in England* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum Publications, 1998), 44.

⁴⁰ Noel Blakiston, “Nicholas Hilliard: Some Unpublished Documents,” *BMC* 89 (1947): 189. Blakiston notes that Hilliard was appointed to his position by Elizabeth on 17 August 1599, and was paid his annual pension quarterly until Lady Day 1618, citing TNA: PRO, E/403/2453, fol.316; TNA: PRO, E403/2363-2368; TNA: PRO, E403/2368/8; TNA: PRO, E403/2368/10.

⁴¹ In Anna’s household accounts of 1605, Oliver is noted to have received £200 “for his great Charges in attending her highnes service and for certaine pourtraictures made for her Ma.^{ty} in divers places aswell heere at London as in progresse,” TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646. This has also been noted by Jill Finsten, *Isaac Oliver: Art at the Courts of Elizabeth I and James I*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (New York: AMS, 1981), 27, 121; Mary Edmond, *Hilliard and Oliver: the Lives and Works of Two Great Miniaturists* (London: R. Hale, 1983), 151; Wood, “Portraits of Anne of Denmark,” 42.

⁴² For Oliver’s appointment see TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646, which is also noted by Mary Edmond, “New Light on Jacobean Painters,” *BM CXVIII* (1976): 74; *Hilliard and Oliver*, 150. In Anna’s household accounts of 1618, Oliver is listed as receiving £40 per annum “accorde to her Ma.^{tes} Lres [letters] Patentees thereof to him made monconed in the Accompte of the third yeare of the kings Ma.^{tes} reigne,” TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1655.

over her heart in a gesture that, in conjunction with the rosettes, casts the miniature as an expression of love.⁴³ Such an association would accord with Anna's concern to have another child at this time, and she may even have been pregnant when it was painted. On 18 December 1604, John Chamberlain (1553-1628) reported to Sir Ralph Winwood (c.1563-1617), that "yt is generally held and spoken that the Quene is quicke with childe," and Anna gave birth to two daughters in relatively close succession with Princess Mary being born on 8 April 1605, and Princess Sophia on 22 June 1606.⁴⁴ While neither child survived infancy, it is significant that James and Anna wished to have more children when they already had three surviving offspring. Rather than being motivated by issues of dynasty, I would argue that they expressly wanted a child born in England for reasons of legitimacy.

The Stuarts' desire for an English-born child should be placed within the context of the succession crisis, and the three Catholic plots that James survived in the first two years of his reign. As mentioned above, James was only one of several contenders for the English throne and his success was far from guaranteed.⁴⁵ Even following a peaceful succession, James was the target of several Catholic plots, which would have heightened a sense of insecurity about his reign. In 1603, two Catholic conspiracies, the Main Plot and the Bye Plot, were uncovered and the traitors punished. While the Bye Plot looked to forcibly achieve greater toleration for English Catholics by imprisoning the king, the Main Plot

⁴³ Hallam, "Re-Presenting Women," 89. Hallam makes this observation in relation to portrait miniatures of Jacobean women who are shown with loose hair and low décolletage such as Lady Elizabeth Stanley, 1614; Elizabeth, Countess of Southampton, c.1600-10; Venetia Stanley, c.1615. I assert that such an intention can also be fruitfully applied to Oliver's portrait of Anna from c.1604.

⁴⁴ Norman Egbert McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols., vol. 1, (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), 198-99, no.67.

⁴⁵ Doran, "James VI and the English Succession," 29-32.

sought to remove James from the throne and replace him with his cousin Arbella Stuart.⁴⁶ More famously, James was later the target of further Catholic dissatisfaction when the Gunpowder Plot discovered in 1605. Engineered to rid England of the new king and all members of the House of Lords, the scheme was the most serious and significant of James's reign.⁴⁷ Subsequently, harsher penalties against recusants were instigated, although James was reluctant to punish Catholics as a whole and James's survival came to be commemorated on an annual basis.⁴⁸ It is likely that the uncertainty of James's accession to the English throne, his position as a Scots and a member of a new ruling family, coupled with the numerous conspiracies that he faced in the early years of the reign, would have encouraged James to seek further recognition and support for his kingship, and to cement his legitimacy and right to rule. An English-born prince or princess would have gone some way to achieving these aims. A royal birth had not occurred in England since Prince Edward Tudor (*d.*1553) on 12 October 1537, and would have likely increased the popularity and legitimacy of the new and foreign Stuart dynasty. Certainly, it would have contrasted favourably with the political instability surrounding Elizabeth's lack of issue, which clouded the last years of her reign. As I discuss in Chapter Three, the importance of the occasion is expressly illustrated by the large amount of work that was ordered at Greenwich Palace in preparation for the elaborate birthing rituals.

As well as the early miniature at Waddesdon discussed above, Oliver completed a second miniature from the life around c.1605, which is at Berkeley Castle (figure 1.6). This image type clearly served as the model for the miniature at the National Portrait Gallery that

⁴⁶ Alan Haynes, *The Gunpowder Plot: Faith in Rebellion* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1994), 30, 33-8; Antonia Fraser, *Faith and Treason: The Story of the Gunpowder Plot* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 63-4.

⁴⁷ Fraser, *Faith and Treason*, 98-102, 149.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 191-93, 195-56, 211-12, 283; Haynes, *Gunpowder Plot*, 119-21.

features the “S” jewel (figure 1.7) from around 1612, and I would suggest it was this image that was subsequently translated into the three miniatures held in the collections of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Royal Collection, London, and Frederiksborg Castle (figures 1.8-1.10). Anna presumably sent the latter to Denmark as a gift for either her brother or mother. With the exception of the first type at Waddesdon, all of Oliver’s miniatures dating to the first decade of James’s reign show Anna with a picture-locket pinned to her left breast. Barring the version in the Royal Collection (figure 1.10) from c.1612, all of these miniatures show Anna with her right hand placed over her heart like the work at Waddesdon. Furthermore, the majority of Oliver’s miniatures include the “S” jewel and three also show a crowned “C” jewel, which dates them to after June 1611, when Anna is thought to have received her brother’s cipher jewel, as discussed further below.⁴⁹ In all, Oliver appears to have produced at least twelve miniatures of Anna that Wood has catalogued into five distinct types, noting that the range in Oliver’s face-types was “perhaps the result of verbal rather than visual contact with the Queen.”⁵⁰ Minor variations do occur across all portraits in terms of costume and jewellery details but, for the most part, the wealth of similarities would indicate that Anna did not provide fresh sittings and the changes were made following written or verbal communication. Overall, the quantity of miniatures of Anna produced by Oliver points to the currency of Anna’s image, and the vogue among courtiers for owning miniatures of the new queen consort immediately after her arrival in England.

⁴⁹ Wood, “Portraits of Anne of Denmark,” 22, cat. nos. 2a-b, notes the similarities between these two miniatures and the presence of the “S” jewel in the NPG miniature, which is not depicted in the Berkeley miniature. This leads her to date the former to c.1611, and the later to c.1609-10. However, there is no reason to doubt the possibility that the Berkeley miniature was painted from life early in the reign and that later, in the 1610s, a copy of it was produced. On this miniature, see also Graham Reynolds, *The Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Miniatures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (London: Royal Collection, 1999), 90, cat. no.53.

⁵⁰ Wood, “Portraits of Anne of Denmark,” 22-25, 39.

The provenance of the majority of Oliver's miniatures of the queen consort have not been satisfactorily established. Yet, visual and documentary sources indicate that Anna seems to have used miniatures as gifts to faithful courtiers, favourites, and members of her natal family, which are depicted in portraits. For example, the bill of Anna's court goldsmith Heriot, for the period 30 December through to 20 September 1606, includes £136.4s. for a miniature set with diamonds that is "to be sent to her ma:^{ts} mother y^e Queene of Denmark."⁵¹ This would have likely contained a miniature of the queen consort. The 1612 portrait of Lady Anna Livingstone, Countess of Eglinton (*d.*1632), who was a Scottish woman of the Bedchamber, shows the sitter with a jewelled picture locket pinned to her left breast, which is thought to have been a gift from the queen since it bears her crowned monogram ("AR" for Anna Regina) (figures 1.11, 1.12).⁵² It is also possible that the diamond-studded miniature case worn by Margaret Seton (*née* Hay), Countess of Dunfermline (*c.*1592-1659) in her 1615 portrait by Gheeraerts was a gift from Anna, since the locket features the queen's intertwined cipher ("A") that is stamped with a heart and set under a crown (figures 1.13, 1.14). Although Lady Seton was not a member of Anna's English household, she may have enjoyed the queen's favour through her husband Alexander Seton, 1st Earl of Dunfermline (1555-1622), who was Lord Chancellor of Scotland from 1604 until his death. Seton was among the councillors appointed in July 1593 to manage Anna's finances, and he clearly developed a good relationship with the young queen, for on the occasion of Prince Charles's birth in November 1600, he was selected as the prince's governor.⁵³ Seton's early favour with Anna may have been influenced by his position as the brother-in-law of Lady

⁵¹ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, f.24r. The tablet was furnished with 16 table diamonds, 44 smaller diamonds, and one diamond on the backside of the tablet, costing £134. Heriot also charged 32s. for his labour, and 12s. for a velvet case for the tablet.

⁵² The relationship between Anna and Lady Livingstone, the latter's portrait, and the miniature represented in the portrait, are examined in Chapter Two below.

⁵³ Meikle, "Meddlesome Princess," 137; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 166-67, 170.

Jane Drummond, one of Anna's closest companions in Scotland, who travelled with the queen to England in 1603, where she became the chief gentlewoman of the Bedchamber.⁵⁴

Likewise, a surviving portrait by Van Somer from around 1619, shows Anna's lady-in-waiting Elizabeth Grey, Countess of Kent (née Talbot) (1582-1651), attired in mourning dress and wearing a diamond-set miniature locket over her left breast, which is adorned with the letters "AR" (figure 1.15).⁵⁵ Lady Grey appears to have been part of Anna's court circle since at least 1610, for she performed in the queen's masque *Tethys Festival* by Samuel Daniel (1562-1619) in June that year.⁵⁶ Later in 1617, Lady Grey's high favour with the queen was clearly announced when she was made First Lady of the Bedchamber, after the expulsion of Lady Drummond from court.⁵⁷ Before her dismissal, however, it is probable that Anna gifted her Scottish lady-in-waiting a miniature of herself, since when Lady Drummond's property was seized and inventoried by Parliament in 1644, she was noted to possess "a picture case set full of Diamonds the midle stone like a heart bigger then the rest, in it Q:Anns picture."⁵⁸ Although it cannot be definitively established, in all the above instances it is highly likely that the jewelled cases contained miniatures of Anna, and that she was also the donor. Anna evidently chose to gift miniatures of herself to her mother, her loyal servants and her favourites, which could then be worn as a sign of favour and prestige.

⁵⁴ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 170; Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 51. Seton's first wife Lilius Drummond (1580-1601) was the older sister of Jane Drummond (c.1585-1643).

⁵⁵ Cumming, *Visual History of Costume*, 37; Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 140.

⁵⁶ John Considine, "Grey, Elizabeth, Countess of Kent (1582–1651)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/11530> (accessed 11 December 2013).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 140, citing National Archives of Scotland Index to Lothian [Newbattle] Muniments, 114.

In addition to his work for Anna, Oliver was associated with Prince Henry's household early in the Jacobean reign, producing miniatures of the prince from 1608 until his death in 1612.⁵⁹ This underscores Anna and Henry's shared aesthetic. It also attests to Anna's agency in selecting and patronising artists who were then subsequently favoured by her son. By comparison, Oliver never produced any miniatures for the king, which highlights the different visual tastes of Anna and James. As I mentioned above, James continued to patronise Elizabeth's limner Hilliard, which I would suggest was an attempt by the king to connect himself with his predecessor's pictorial legacy and her exceptionally successful visual persona. The large quantity of miniatures that Hilliard completed of James are markedly consistent (figures 1.16, 1.17). Completed several years apart, these images show little change in pose, costume, or expression. James appears stiff and wooden with little concern given to verisimilitude, and his distant gaze renders him reserved and diffident. In comparison, Oliver's miniatures of Anna from roughly the same date (figures 1.4-1.10) are softly modelled, endowing her with a greater sense of presence, which is heightened through the larger scale of the queen and her direct gaze. In contrast to Hilliard's portraits of James, Oliver's numerous and subtly different miniatures of Anna underscore the queen's interest in shaping her visual persona.

While Oliver was attached to Anna's household, and was evidently her preferred choice, it is not surprising to find that Hilliard also produced miniatures of Anna. There are at least eight versions of Hilliard's portrait type of the queen (figure 1.18). It is noteworthy, however, that

⁵⁹ Records of Henry's Privy Purse and his household account books indicate that Oliver was paid for miniatures of the Prince on 26 February 1608/9, on 27 June 1608/9, and on 4 June 1610, see Finsten, *Isaac Oliver*, 28; Edmond, *Hilliard and Oliver*, 152, 154-55, citing TNA: PRO, E101/433/8, fols.6, 10; Erna Auerbach, *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth* (London: The Athlone Press, 1954), 179, citing TNA: PRO, E101/433/8, fols. 10, 13.

court payments made to Hilliard throughout James's reign generally record the sitter in each portrait, and often the intended recipient, but there appear to be no records of payments for portraits of Anna. Neither does Hilliard appear in Anna's household accounts. This raises the possibility that the extant portraits of Anna by Hilliard were the result of aristocratic, rather than royal, commission. In terms of pose, costume, and jewellery, Hilliard's portrait type of Anna (figure 1.18) holds much in common with Oliver's early Waddesdon miniature from c.1604 (figure 1.4), and I would argue it was derived from that work. Hilliard's numerous miniatures of Anna indicate the popularity of her portrait, which is likely to have been in demand among the English elite. Conversely, Roy Strong asserts that Anna "sat only once to Hilliard, presumably shortly after her arrival south in 1603," but he provides no reference for this statement and I have found no evidence to suggest that Hilliard was ever granted a sitting with the queen, or any proof that Hilliard's portrait type pre-dates that of Oliver's.⁶⁰ As mentioned above, Oliver had been working for Anna throughout 1604, and it is much more likely he was responsible for the creation of this portrait type. It is possible though, that unsatisfied with the portrait completed by Hilliard, Anna subsequently turned her attention to what Erna Auerbach refers to as "the more realistic, more cosmopolitan and... more modern" artist, Oliver.⁶¹

Early English Portraits: Easel Paintings

While it cannot be definitively proven that Oliver's portrait type was used as a source for Hilliard, I would suggest that it was likely used, in lieu of a fresh sitting, by the King's Sergeant-Painter John de Critz the Elder (1551/2-1642) to create the first full-length portrait

⁶⁰ Roy Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered, 1520-1620* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983): 147, cat. no.242.

⁶¹ Erna Auerbach, *Nicholas Hilliard* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961), 147.

of Anna in England. Dated around 1605 or 1606, it was to be paired with a portrait of James (figures 1.19, 1.20). In this portrait type, Anna is positioned in the left of the canvas and orientated to the right in order to face the paired portrait of James. This placement casts her on the traditionally subordinate side of the sinister, as a subsidiary extension of her husband. King and queen consort are seen wearing a sumptuous array of jewels, clothed in expanses of costly fabrics, and standing in richly furnished interiors. The numerous versions of this portrait type with subtle variations in dress, jewellery, and setting that were completed by De Critz's studio indicate that this was the standard pattern for the new royal couple (figures 1.21-1.26).⁶² Configured in the conventional language of court portraiture, these images are devoid of the symbolic trappings of majesty such as the crown, orb, and sceptre. They choose instead to highlight material wealth and abundance, and through the use of the pendant format, marital union. Intended to be hung side by side, De Critz's companion portraits announce that concepts of prosperity, propriety, and conjugality are the domain of the new Stuart dynasty. This would have been extremely important after the death of the childless Queen Elizabeth. It is interesting to note that the pendants give no indication of the family lineage or cultural activities of either sitter, for this was to become the hallmark of Anna's later portraits.

The Years of Change: 1612-1614

The years 1612-14 proved to be a watershed in Anna's life, and had a marked effect on her visual representation. This period saw a significant realignment of faction and influence at the Jacobean court, which was spurred largely by death. 24 May 1612 saw the death of

⁶² Hearn, *Dynasties*, 184-85, cat. no.125; Sharpe, *Image Wars*, 60. Hearn and Sharpe note this only in relation to portraits of James, but it is similarly applicable to portraits of Anna produced in the first decade of the seventeenth century.

Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, who in his capacity as Lord Treasurer, Secretary of State, and James's most trusted political advisor, had exercised a near monopoly on crown patronage (figure 1.27).⁶³ Cecil had been one of the chief councillors responsible for James's peaceful accession, and he provided a crucial link to the Elizabethan reign. During the decade of his power, he had been one of Anna's closest political advisors and allies at court, and courtiers had petitioned Anna for Cecil's favour.⁶⁴ For Cecil, aligning himself with Anna would have undoubtedly aided his quest to secure favour with her eldest son and future heir to the throne, Prince Henry. Intent on preserving his own powerful position, and attaining one for his son William (1591-1668) in the next reign, Cecil actively looked to ingratiate himself with Prince Henry through considerate gifts and conscientious service. Croft observes that from 1608, when Cecil became Lord Treasurer, his relationship with Henry "underwent increasing strain" as he attempted to maintain the prince's esteem while concurrently reducing his expenditure.⁶⁵ Given Henry's close relationship to his mother, which is discussed below, maintaining high favour with Anna would have been to Cecil's distinct advantage in his quest to ensure his family's future place at court.

As Lord High Steward, and a member of the Queen's Council, Cecil administered Anna's finances and he exercised a large degree of control over her household appointments.⁶⁶ In addition to bureaucratic ties, letters, reports, and gift-exchange indicate that they were genuinely fond of each other. On 5 August 1604, James professed to Cecil from Holdenby that "I cannot but be jealous of your greatness with my wife," and when Anna retired to Hampton Court, for a period of mourning after the death of Princess Mary in September

⁶³ Peck, *Northampton*, 26.

⁶⁴ Croft, "Robert Cecil," 142.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 141.

⁶⁶ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 40-43, 82; Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 35, 42.

1607, Rowland Whyte (died after 1626) observed that “only Lord Salisbury went... to comfort the queen.”⁶⁷ Further, following the death of Princess Sophia, on 23 June 1606, it was Cecil who James and Anna entrusted to oversee the commission of her tomb.⁶⁸ The affection was clearly reciprocated, and during Cecil’s last illness in March 1612, it was noticed that Anna visited him “every second day” and was suitably distressed by his death.⁶⁹ This is not to say that Cecil was more closely aligned with Anna and Henry than James however, for Cecil maintained a close and highly successful relationship with the king. Cecil’s decision and ability to secure favour with all three principal members of the royal family points to his dexterity as a courtier, but it also underscores the polycentrism of the Jacobean court, where Anna and Henry were both recognised as central players.⁷⁰

Cecil’s death, then, not only robbed the queen of a powerful supporter at court, but perhaps more importantly, it opened up key administrative positions and cleared the path to royal access and favour. This allowed Robert Carr, later Viscount Rochester and Earl of Somerset (c.1587-1645), to become a dominant favourite at court (figure 1.28).⁷¹ Carr had started his career in Scotland as a page to George Home, Earl of Dunbar (c.1556-1611), who was one of James’s principal favourites and chief advisors in his capacity as a Privy Counsellor, Lord Treasurer, and Master of the King’s Wardrobe.⁷² Both Dunbar and Carr accompanied James to England in 1603, where Dunbar was made Chancellor of the Exchequer and a member of

⁶⁷ Quoted in Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England, from the Norman Conquest*, New ed., 6 vols., vol. 4, Bohn’s Historical Library (London: G. Bell, 1875), 96, 98, Princess Mary died on 16 September 1607.

⁶⁸ Croft, “Robert Cecil,” 142.

⁶⁹ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 338, no. 135: London, 11 March 1612.

⁷⁰ On Cecil’s skills as a courtier see Croft, “Robert Cecil,” 139, 142-43, 146-47.

⁷¹ Carr had been a presence at the Jacobean court since as early as 1606. On 24 March 1611, Carr was created Viscount Rochester, but Cecil’s control over James had held Carr’s influence in check. See Peck, *Northampton*, 28-32.

⁷² Maurice Lee jr., “Home, George, first Earl of Dunbar (d.1611),” *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/13642> (accessed 12 December 2013).

the English Privy Council. Presumably on Dunbar's recommendation, Carr was made a Groom of the Bedchamber. Subsequently, at the Accession Day tilt in March 1607, Carr managed to captivate James and consequently enjoyed a significant increase in favour and rank, although Cecil managed to keep his influence in check. However, with Cecil's death in May 1612, Carr was afforded a dramatic rise in power that led George Calvert, Baron Baltimore (1579-1632), to assert on 1 August 1612 that Carr was now

the *primum mobile* of our court, by whose motion all the other spheres must move, or else stand still; the bright sun of our firmament, at whose splendour or glooming all our marigolds of the court open and shut.⁷³

Concurrent with Carr's rise was the consolidation of power and influence under the adroit councillor and courtier, Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton (1540-1614). A close ally of Cecil, a confidant of the king, and a leading figure in government, Northampton had been working on a relationship with Carr since 1611 and, with the death of Cecil this new connection began to greatly boost his own power, prestige, and wealth.⁷⁴

However, not everyone at court was in support of Carr and, in July 1612, Thomas Erskine, Viscount Fenton (1566-1639), reported that he "is exceeding great with his majesty, and if I should say truly, greater than any that ever I did see... yet can he not find the right way to please either the Queen or the Prince, but they are both in the conceit of this Court not well satisfied with him."⁷⁵ Indeed, as Barroll points out, Anna and Prince Henry were working together against the rising favourite. Confirmation of their politicking is clear in January 1612, when Carr was created Chief Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas and then, notably, was required to share the office with John Harington (1592-1614), one of Henry's most

⁷³ Quoted in Peck, *Northampton*, 30, citing Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Tanner Mss. 75, f.265 (1607).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 30-31.

⁷⁵ Henry Paton, ed., *Supplementary Report on the Manuscripts of Mar and Kellie, preserved at Alloa house, Clackmannanshire* (London: HMSO, 1930), 41; also quoted in Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 133.

intimate companions and the younger brother of Anna's principal lady-in-waiting Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford (née Harington) (1580-1627).⁷⁶ Anna and Henry were also noted to be unified in their support for the secretaryship. Chamberlain observed in June 1612 that "the queen and the prince are earnest in Sir Henry Wotton's behalf; and the Lord Rochester is not willing, after his late reconciliation, to oppose himself, or stand in the breach against such assailants."⁷⁷ Indeed, mother and son may have been moving towards the creation of a new faction.⁷⁸ The reason for Anna and Henry's antipathy towards Carr and the associated Howard faction has never been satisfactorily explained by scholars, and it is not clearly elucidated by any of the contemporary correspondence. It is possible that Anna's dislike of Carr may have initially arisen from his position as a client of Dunbar, whom Anna had opposed in Scotland. Writing to Cecil on 18 January 1601, Thomas Douglas reports that "the Queen and her faction" are strongly against the Earl of Dunbar.⁷⁹

Factional politics were not all that linked Anna and Henry around the time of Carr's ascendancy, for their painted representations showcase some marked similarities. Oliver's miniatures of Anna and Henry from around 1610 feature their figures on the hierarchic right, in strict side-profile facing left, and wearing allegorical dress in commemoration of

⁷⁶ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 133.

⁷⁷ Thomas Birch, *The Court and Times of James I*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (London, 1849., 1973), 177: 17 June 1612; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 134.

⁷⁸ Anna and Henry seem to have subsequently moved to support Sir Ralph Winwood for the secretariat with Chamberlain reporting that, on his return from The Hague in July 1612, Winwood visited both Anna and Henry where he "had the same usage," see McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 368, 359-60, 521; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 207-208, notes 34, 35. Winwood did eventually succeed to the secretaryship on 29 March 1614, but according to Chamberlain it was at Carr's behest, see McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 521. See also Peck, *Northampton*, 31-32.

⁷⁹ TNA: PRO, SP 52/67, f.7; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 179, note 34. Barroll adds that Anna's "faction" at this time comprised Patrick, Master of Gray (d.1612), David Lindsay, Bishop of Ross (1531-1613), and Alexander Lindsay, Lord Spynie (d.1607).

their individual patronage of the theatre (figures 1.29, 1.30).⁸⁰ Scholars have remarked on the similar format of these two portraits together with a third miniature by Oliver of the Baron of Cherbury (figure 1.31), but commentary rarely extends beyond this observation. Jill Finsten summarises the miniatures of Anna and Henry as the few instances where Oliver “seems to have been aiming specifically at the effect of antique cameo,” and they do have a marked classicising element, harking back to the profile portraits that Roman Emperors traditionally had stamped on coins and medals.⁸¹ While Henry’s choice of armour, framing niche, and pose create a blatantly regal and martial self-imaging, it is notable that Anna’s portrait is similarly authoritative, with the strict side-profile pose and the inclusion of the Italian adage “*Servo per regnare.*”

Most recently, Catherine MacLeod has translated the motto to “*I Serve by Reigning,*” which she interprets as a general confirmation of Anna’s belief in the divine rulership of the Stuart monarchy.⁸² While this may be correct, it is also possible that rather than supporting James’s notion of the Divine Right of Kings, the motto boldly articulates Anna’s regal standing as a daughter of Denmark: her own royal bloodline in the service of James. This reading fits more logically within the broader consideration of Anna’s visual persona, and the supreme pride that she took in her Danish lineage. Certainly, as I discuss below, Anna repeatedly marked her physical body, portraits, pieces of clothing, and her residences with visual references to her natal ancestry, and it would seem likely that this miniature put

⁸⁰ No evidence has yet come to light concerning the commission or the original recipient of either work. In the case of the portrait of Anna, it was first recorded in the collection of Dr Richard Mead in 1717. It was subsequently purchased by Frederick, Prince of Wales, by whom it entered the Royal Collection and is first noted in an inventory of c.1837. On this piece see, for example, Catharine MacLeod et al., *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012), 116, cat. no.43; Reynolds, *Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Miniatures*, 89, cat. no.52.

⁸¹ Finsten, *Isaac Oliver*, 11.

⁸² MacLeod et al., *Lost Prince*, 116, cat. no.43; Reynolds, *Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Miniatures*, 89-90, cat. no.52.

forward similar concerns. Further, it was around the time of this miniature that Anna verbally expressed an interest in her own self-representation and in portraiture in general, which is found in an oft-quoted letter by Jane Drummond from November 1611. Written on behalf of the queen in response to a letter from Cecil, Drummond states that “she [Anna] is more contented amongst those hemles picturs, in the paltry Gallery then your lor: is with your greate Imployments, in fair rouses all thing’s considered.”⁸³ As I discuss in Chapter Three, inventories of Denmark House and Oatlands Palace testify to Anna owning a wide range of painting types, pointing to a queen who was aware of the power of images to convey aspects of her lineage, interests, and values, and one who was well versed in the politics of display, and the hierarchies of royal space.⁸⁴

From the outset of the 1610s, it can be argued that Anna and Henry were aesthetically and politically aligned. They shared a passion for the visual arts, they patronised the same artists, were painted in similar modes, and were allied against the Howard-Carr network. In pitting themselves against a faction favoured by the king, they were, in a sense, pitting themselves against the king. As noted, however, I do not agree with Hallam, Hearn, Lewalski, and McManus, that “King and Queen ceased to cohabit in 1607,” and by 1614, they were “estranged.”⁸⁵ Lewalski attributes their “separatism” to the death of Princess Mary in 1607, and “James’s homosexuality.”⁸⁶ Yet, it is uncertain why Mary’s death would cause a rift between them, for the loss of three children prior to this date had not damaged

⁸³ TNA: PRO, SP 14/67, f.104 (November 1611); Wood, “Portraits of Anne of Denmark,” 46; Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 30.

⁸⁴ Glynde MS 320, fols.7r-9v; Glynde MS 321, fols.1r-2r; M. T. W. Payne, “An Inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark’s ‘Ornaments, Furniture, Householde Stuffe, and Other Parcells’ at Denmark House, 1619,” *JHC* 13 (2001): 36-40.

⁸⁵ Hallam “Re-Presenting Women,” 281, 289-303, 447 n.73; Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts*, 31-35; Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192, cat. no.130; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 4-5, 15-41, especially 26; McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, 139-40, 166-82; “Memorialising Anna of Denmark’s Court,” 87-89.

⁸⁶ Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 26.

their relationship, and in 1607 it was still being reported that “the king is most devoted to her [Anna].”⁸⁷ Secondly, there is no positive evidence that James was homosexual, and it is more plausible, as Curtis Perry has argued, to view contemporary accusations of homosexuality as complaints of “corrupt favouritism.”⁸⁸ Moreover, James had had close male favourites throughout his time in Scotland, and his early years in England, with no adverse effects on his relationship with Anna, so it is unclear why this would become problematic in 1614.⁸⁹

As I discuss in more detail below, James and Anna were culturally and factionally distinct, but I am not aware of any incontrovertible evidence to suggest that this resulted in disaffection or antagonism. The only reference to a lack of concord between James and Anna comes from a dispatch from the Venetian ambassador, Antonio Donato, in the month before Anna’s death. Writing to the Doge and Senate, on 7 February 1619, Donato observes that “the estrangement between their Majesties has by now become public and the separated lives they lead only encourages this.”⁹⁰ The “estrangement” that Donato writes of

⁸⁷ *CSPV*, vol.10, 513, no.739: Report on England presented to the Government of Venice in the year 1607, by... Nicolo Molin, Ambassador. James and Anna lost the following children: Princess Margaret died in 1600 aged 15 months; Robert Duke of Kintyre died 1602, aged 4 months; Princess Sophia, died 1606, aged 1 day; Princess Mary died 1607, aged 32 months. Later, in 1612, they also lost Henry, Prince of Wales, aged 18 years.

⁸⁸ Curtis Perry, “1603 and the Discourse of Favouritism,” in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, eds. Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 156-59. Maurice Lee also casts doubt on their having been any “actual physical sexual relations” between king and favourite. Lee highlights the lack of positive evidence, and draws attention to James’s enthusiasms for his favourites to get married, and the complete absence of any sexual jealousy, see *Great Britain’s Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 248-49. For a measured discussion of favourites at James’s court, see also Alastair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News, Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 27-32, and for an analysis of Carr’s role in Jacobean politics and patronage see Chapter 1, 25-73.

⁸⁹ In Scotland, James’s main favourite was Esmé Stewart, Earl and 1st Duke of Lennox (1542-1583), who was followed by James Stewart, Earl of Arran (c.1545-1596). In the early years of the English reign, the Scotsman James Hay, 1st Earl of Carlisle (c.1580-1636), and Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery (1584-1650) were noted as having James’s favour, but they did not dominate the king like their successors - Robert Carr, from around 1607, and then by the close of 1615, George Villiers.

⁹⁰ *CSPV*, vol.15, 464, no.734.

however, should be seen in the context of international diplomacy rather than marriage, for he adds that Anna “bears a remarkable affection for the most serene republic, grieves at her troubles and desires to use her influence to induce the king to render assistance.”⁹¹ Indeed, Venetian correspondence from 1615 to 1619 is filled with concerns over increasing Spanish imperialism. Initially, tensions in northern Italy were centred on hostilities between Savoy and Spanish-controlled Milan as Charles Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy (1562-1630), sought to gain control of the duchy of Montferrat.⁹² Fearing increased Spanish presence in Italy however, Venice financially supported Savoy. Already considered to be a major impediment to Spanish expansion, Venice attracted the ire of Archduke Ferdinand of Styria (1578-1637), who, in 1615, encouraged the activity of the Uskok pirates on the Venetian coast.⁹³ War between Venice and Austria broke out, while Venice also faced threats from Milan and Naples, as the Spanish governors increased military armament and activities.⁹⁴ While a peace treaty was eventually signed between Venice and Austria on 26 September 1617 the conflict did not cease, as the Viceroy of Naples, Pedro Téllez-Girón, Duke of Ossuna (1574-1624), continued to mount naval offensives against Venice into 1618.⁹⁵ Furthermore, fears of a Spanish *coup d'état* were exacerbated by the belief that the Spanish ambassador in Venice, Alfonso de la Cueva, Marquis of Bedmar (1572-1655), was working to infiltrate the Venetian government and military.⁹⁶ As late as January 1619, Venetian ambassadors were

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Hugh Trevor-Roper, “Spain and Europe, 1598-1621,” in *The New Cambridge Modern History Volume 4: The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years War, 1609-1648/49*, ed. John Phillips Cooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 274.

⁹³ Gunther Rothenburg, “Venice and the Uskoks of Senj: 1537-1618,” *The Journal of Modern History* 33, no.2 (1961): 154; Trevor-Roper, “Spain and Europe,” 275.

⁹⁴ Rothenburg, *ibid.*, 154-55, Richard Mackenney, “‘A Plot Discover’d?’ Myth, Legend, and the “Spanish” Conspiracy Against Venice in 1618,” in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilisation of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*, ed. John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 193.

⁹⁵ Rothenburg, *ibid.*, 155-56; Trevor-Roper, “Spain and Europe,” 275; *CSPV*, vol.15, no.21: 22 September 1617.

⁹⁶ Trevor-Roper, *ibid.*, 275

informing James of the “hostilities and plots of the Viceroy of Naples,” while alarm over Spain’s intentions continued, as did talk of a renewed league between the States of Holland, Germany, England, Venice, and Savoy.⁹⁷

Indeed, throughout it all, Venice remained offside with Rome and looked to the Protestant powers for support.⁹⁸ While historians still debate the reality of an orchestrated “Spanish conspiracy,” contemporary correspondence indicates that the Venetians were seriously alarmed, and several Venetian agents approached Anna to intercede with James on behalf of the republic.⁹⁹ As well as Donato cited above, Contarini, the Venetian Ambassador Extraordinary sought an audience with Anna and writing to the Doge and Senate, on 28 March 1618, he states that “after representing the present state of affairs in Italy I besought her [Anna] to exercise her influence in favour of the republic. This she seemed most ready to do.”¹⁰⁰ Later that year, he notes that Anna “evinced extreme satisfaction at your Serenity’s [The Doge] having settled your disputes with King Ferdinand [Holy Roman Emperor].”¹⁰¹ James too, was in support of Venice, but his ability to intervene was compromised by his undiminished desire to secure a Spanish bride for Charles.¹⁰² Indeed, the question of the Spanish match may have been the “estrangement” that Donato perceived. Certainly, Contarini informed the Doge and Senate, on 4 May 1618, that James “was now violently in favour of the Spaniards,” while Anna considered it “all pretence” on

⁹⁷ *CSPV*, vol.15, no.609: 10 January 1619, Antonio Donato to the Doge and Senate; *CSPV*, vol.15, no.708: 24 January 1619, the same to the same.

⁹⁸ Trevor-Roper, “Spain and Europe,” 274-75; Rothenburg, “Venice and the Uskoks,” 154-55; see, for example, the dispatches from September through December 1617 in *CSPV*, vol.15.

⁹⁹ Mackenney, “‘A Plot Discover’d?’ Myth, Legend, and the “Spanish” Conspiracy,” 185-89, 195-97; Trevor-Roper, “Spain and Europe,” 275-76; Rothenburg, “Venice and the Uskoks,” 156.

¹⁰⁰ *CSPV*, vol. 15, 183, no.295: 28 March 1618.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 307, no.525: 7 September 1618, to the Doge and Senate.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, no.34: 5 October 1617, Giovanni Battista Lionello, Venetian Secretary, to the Doge and Senate; Rothenburg, “Venice and the Uskoks,” 154.

Spain's side, as they were "devoid of any intention of a matrimonial alliance," and merely pursued it "to benefit their affairs" on the continent.¹⁰³ By the close of the month, Contarini reports that "the negotiations concerning the Spanish marriage are conducted with greater secrecy and closeness than ever," and did not include Anna for James was "aware how little her Majesty approves them."¹⁰⁴ It is unclear how serious Anna was in her turn against the Spanish marriage, and it may have been to benefit the Venetians and, on 19 December 1618, Contarini informs the Doge and Senate that Anna was "very anxious for him [Charles] to marry in Spain, and does her utmost to that end. She hates a French marriage and opposes it openly."¹⁰⁵

It is also worth asking what "estrangement" meant in the early modern period. Precedent is seen with Henry VIII's estrangement from Katherine of Aragon (1485-1536), but the evidence does not intimate that James's marriage suffered the same breakdown.¹⁰⁶ The Stuarts did maintain separate households and residences, but this was expected, and in the absence of detailed records of James's and Anna's movements, it is almost impossible to prove that they did not "cohabit," or even if this could be read as being "estranged." Rather, throughout the 1610s contemporaries continue to comment on the good relationship of the Stuarts. Writing to the Doge and Senate, on 16 March 1612, Foscarini reports on Anna's political relevance at court, stating that she knows "what is going on," for James "tells her

¹⁰³ *CSPV*, vol.15, 206-7, no.342.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 223, no.376: 31 May 1618.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 393, no.658.

¹⁰⁶ The ostensible reason for the estrangement was Henry VIII's desire for a male heir, and his growing belief that his marriage to Katherine was cursed as she was his elder brother's widow. It took six years before the marriage was formally annulled on 23 May 1533. During this time Katherine remained at court, but was rarely in the company of Henry who was publicly courting Anne Boleyn. Henry and Anne were married on 25 January 1533. For an introduction to the complexities of Henry and Katherine's estrangement and annulment see C. S. L. Davies and John Edwards, "Katherine (1485–1536)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/4891> (accessed 15 May 2015).

any thing she chooses to ask, and loves and esteems her.”¹⁰⁷ Later, on 1 August 1613, Chamberlain notes that “Love and kindness increases daily between them, and it is thought they were never on better terms.”¹⁰⁸ The following year, on 2 March 1614, Viscount Fenton asserts that “his Majesty and the Queen, I thank God, was never in better terms and liking than at this time.”¹⁰⁹ Indeed, James and Anna remained united in their use of Anna’s rumoured Catholicism to secure an Anglo-Spanish marriage alliance. Furthermore, James continued to trust Anna to some degree, for he appointed her to the six-person council that was to rule England while he completed his progress of Scotland in 1617. Thus, in accordance with Knowles, I contend that Anna played a vital role in sustaining the political and cultural polycentrism that was a defining aspect of the early Stuart court.¹¹⁰ This was not a situation unique to England though, and it had been a central aspect of Jacobean court culture in Scotland as well, where Anna had opposed James’s favoured court faction, but helped him to carry out a confessionally problematic domestic and foreign policy in his quest for the English throne.¹¹¹

While Anna expressed factional and aesthetic differences from James, she seems to have been united with Henry on these matters. Unfortunately though, Henry’s premature death on 6 November 1612 put paid to any concord between queen consort and prince, and robbed Anna of her eldest son to whom she was particularly close. On the other hand, Timothy Wilks claims that Anna and Henry “had little significant contact, as Sir Thomas

¹⁰⁷ CSPV, vol.12, 312, no.462.

¹⁰⁸ Birch, *Court and Times*, 261: Letter to Carleton.

¹⁰⁹ Paton, ed., *Manuscripts of Mar and Kellie*, 59: letter to John, Earl of Mar.

¹¹⁰ Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 23.

¹¹¹ On Anna’s politicking in Scotland and her opposition to the faction favoured by James see, for example, Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 14-35; “Court of the First Stuart Queen,” 197; Meikle, “Meddlesome Princess,” 126-40, esp.130-37. On Anna’s support of James’s foreign policy in Scotland see Smuts, *England, Scotland and the Battle over Erastian Episcopacy*, unpublished paper, 2014; Field, *Anna of Denmark*, unpublished paper, 2014.

Chaloner (1559-1615) and his powerful allies successfully manoeuvred to save Henry from Anna's potentially ruinous influence."¹¹² He further adds that from 1604 "until Henry neared his sixteenth birthday, he and Anne of Denmark saw each other infrequently."¹¹³ Wilks's evidence for this assumption is a letter from Chaloner to Anna's Chamberlain, Robert Sidney, Viscount Lisle and later Earl of Leicester (1563-1626), where he outlines that Nonsuch, while appropriate for Henry's household, would not be suitable for the queen's lodgings.¹¹⁴ While Chaloner may have written as much, it does not prove that Anna was kept from visiting Henry, and Wilks offers no further evidence of their distance, or the reception that Chaloner's letter received. Conversely, in addition to Henry and Anna's above-mentioned joint politicking, what emerges from the documents is quite a different story. Initially, Henry had been installed in his own household at Oatlands with a court of noble male youths, which was, as Wilks notes, headed by Chaloner. However, writing to Mary Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury (1556-1632), in October 1604, Elizabeth Darcy, Lady Lumley (1581-1651) reports that

The Prince's Household is dissolved, and I perceive there will be great industry used to get Mr. Murray [out] of his place: Sir Thomas Chaloner's board is quite taken away... There was a speech that the Prince should have an able man to look to him in Court... but now I hear the Queen will look to him herself.¹¹⁵

Similarly, Barroll notes that by 1604, "Anna had obviously assumed virtual control of the young Prince's circumstances," and she "had almost constant access to Henry from the time he was ten until his accession as Prince of Wales at the age of sixteen when he acquired his

¹¹² Timothy Wilks, "Art Collecting at the English Court from the Death of Henry, Prince of Wales to the Death of Anne of Denmark (November 1612– March 1619)," *JHC* 9 (1997): 42.

¹¹³ Timothy Wilks, "The Court Culture of Prince Henry and his Circle, 1603-1613" (PhD diss., The University of Oxford, 1987), 290.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 289-90, citing A. Collins (ed.), *Letters and Memorial of State relating to the Sidney Family* (1760), vol. 2, 307-308.

¹¹⁵ Lodge, ed., *Illustrations of British History*, vol. 3, 234-5, no. xxxv; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 119.

own palace.”¹¹⁶ Barroll concedes it is difficult to gauge the degree of intimacy between a royal mother and her son in the early modern period, but it appears that Anna was consistently attentive to Henry and the two were often aligned on political opinion and aesthetics.¹¹⁷ While scholars have repeatedly interpreted Anna’s attempts to gain custody of Henry and control his household in strictly maternal terms, it is more likely political power would have been her impetus. As a royal mother, Anna’s level of maternal intimacy with her children would have been slight, for they were mainly reared by appointed guardians. Anna would have been pertinently aware of the political leverage that she could attain through a close relationship with the future heir, and this would undoubtedly have influenced her conduct. Certainly, Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador in England, remarked to the Doge and Senate on 4 July 1607 that Anna “is devoted to him [Henry] and never lets him away from her side.”¹¹⁸ The political motivation behind Anna’s attentions was perceived by Marc’ Antonio Correr, who reports on 20 May 1609 that “the Queen especially caresses him [Henry] and tries by every means in her power to secure his good-will, her object is to secure her fortune and increase her income in case of accidents.”¹¹⁹

Anna was evidently granted considerable access to Henry, and her opinion as to the nature of his education and household was considered, but this does not indicate that James was disinterested. Recent scholarship has shown that James was personally involved in the curriculum, tutors, and development of an intellectual courtly environment for his heir. The king was also heavily invested in the creation and maintenance of Henry’s reputation as an ideal Renaissance prince who was learned, heroic, and pious. Aysha Pollnitz states that

¹¹⁶ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 119.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 119-20; Barroll, “Court of the First Stuart Queen,” 205.

¹¹⁸ *CSPV*, vol. 11, 5, no.8; also quoted in Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 120.

¹¹⁹ *CSPV*, vol. 11, 276, no.511.

“father and son actually worked together to cultivate their compl[e]mentary images as philosopher-king and student prince.”¹²⁰ Again, the evidence does not indicate that Anna sought to antagonise or reject James’s position or his policies. Rather, it underscores the dynamic and heterogeneous nature of Jacobean court culture and the existence of three distinct royal households: James largely based at Hampton Court, Anna at Denmark House, and Henry at Richmond, which facilitated the co-existence of diverse opinions, policies, aesthetics, and factions.¹²¹

By the close of 1612, Anna’s position against the Howard-Carr faction had been considerably weakened by the deaths of Salisbury and Prince Henry. In the wake of their deaths, Carr continued to rise in power, rank, and royal favour. On 3 November 1613, Carr was created Earl of Somerset and, on 26 December 1613, he formalised his relationship to the Howards with his marriage to Northampton’s newly divorced niece, Frances Howard (1590-1632).¹²² Despite suffering the loss of two key supporters at court, Anna remained steadfast in her opposition to the Howard-Carr faction that persistently advanced under James’s esteem. She logically turned her support to the opposing network that was headed by William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke (1580-1630) and Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton (1573-1624). Anna’s connection to members of the anti-Howard faction was multi-faceted and long-standing. It was largely facilitated through the personnel of her household, and their relatives by birth and marriage, but I would argue that the alliance was cemented by the

¹²⁰ Aysha Pollnitz, “Humanism and the Education of Henry, Prince of Wales,” in *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, ed. Timothy Wilks (London: Southampton University, 2007), 31.

¹²¹ Smuts, “Cultural Diversity,” 104-105.

¹²² Peck, *Northampton*, 31-37; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 135-36.

events of 1612.¹²³ McCullough asserts that Anna's alignment with this faction influenced the "religious temper" of Anna's household preachers, and was responsible for the queen patronising "a militant, anti-Catholic Protestantism."¹²⁴ Anna's alliance with the Pembroke-Southampton group also materialised in her visual persona, and her subsequent easel portraits were completed by artists who also painted the Earls of Pembroke and Southampton, while portraits of the earls were hung at two of Anna's palaces: Denmark House and Oatlands.¹²⁵

Evidence of Anna's continued antipathy to the Howard-Carr faction and her alignment with the Pembroke-Southampton group is apparent throughout 1613 and 1614. During this time she hosted wedding celebrations to compete with those of Robert Carr and Frances Howard; entered into a bitter rivalry with Northampton over the Keepership of Greenwich Park; played an active role in the advancement of George Villiers (1592-1628) as a possible replacement for Carr; and significantly, she selected Gheeraerts, who was also favoured by Southampton, to reconfigure her visual persona.¹²⁶ Over the course of 1614, the Southampton-Pembroke network moved to weaken the Howard-Carr faction by finding an alternative to Carr who was not affiliated with the Howards.¹²⁷ In July 1614, Sir William Sanderson (1586-1676), secretary to Henry Rich, Earl of Holland (1590-1640), recounted

¹²³ On the intricacies of this network, the identities of influential members, and their connections to Anna see Barroll, "Court of the First Stuart Queen," 200-205; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 40-44, 51-53, 135-36; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 23-25; Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 35, 38-44.

¹²⁴ McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 173.

¹²⁵ An inventory of Denmark House from 1619 indicates that a portrait of Southampton was hanging in the Great Gallery, Payne, "Inventory," 38, fol.21v. The portrait of Pembroke at Oatlands is discussed in detail below, and both portraits are contextualised in my account of Anna's interior furnishings in Chapter Three.

¹²⁶ Anna's competition with Northampton and the wedding celebrations that she hosted in opposition to the Howard-Carr marriage are discussed in detail in Chapter Three below.

¹²⁷ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 144-45; Roper, "Unmasquing the Connections," 45-46. Barroll poses the question as to whether "the old Essex group" was "now Anna's faction?", and Roper goes as far as to state that Anna "was one of the leaders – if not *the* leader – of the anti-Howard group."

that members of “the family of Herberts, Hertford, and Bedford” met at Baynard’s Castle to discuss “the design to bring in Villiers.”¹²⁸ Subsequently, on 3 August 1614, Villiers was introduced to James at Althorp, and by the following month he was already being described by Viscount Fenton as “in favour with his Majesty.”¹²⁹ George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury (1562-1633), testified to Anna’s part in promoting Villiers, stating that

The King began to cast his eye upon George Villiers, who was then Cup-bearer, and seemed a modest and courteous youth. But King James had a fashion, that he would never admit any to nearness about himself, but such an one as the Queen should commend unto him, and make some suit on his behalf... In the end, upon importunity, Queen Anne condescended and so pressed it with the King, that he assented... And when the King gave order to swear him [Villiers] of the Bed-chamber, Somerset, who was near, importuned the King with a Message, that he might be only sworn a Groom: But my self and others that were at the door, sent to her Majesty, that she would perfect her work, and cause him to be sworn a Gentleman of the Chamber.¹³⁰

The placement of Villiers was infinitely successful (figure 1.32). James quickly lavished him with prestigious offices, pensions, lucrative estates, and noble titles, and the new favourite came to dominate royal access, patronage, and affection.¹³¹ As Villiers rose and Somerset fell, Anna strategically developed and maintained an affable relationship with the advancing favourite, addressing him in her letters as “my kind dog.”¹³² Anna’s role in Villiers’s triumph was later recalled by the Venetian agent Foscarini, who noted that “since the fall of her [Anna’s] enemy, the Earl of Somerset, Mr Villiers has risen, supported by her and dependent

¹²⁸ Quoted in Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 145, citing Sanderson *Aulicus Coquinariae* (London, 1650), sigs. M3^v-M4. Barroll adds that Sanderson himself was present at the castle and the persons to whom he refers were the Earls of Montgomery, Hertford, Pembroke, and the Countess of Bedford.

¹²⁹ Lodge, ed., *Illustrations of British History*, vol.3, 56, letter of 2 September 1614; also quoted in Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 145-46 although no reference is provided; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 12.

¹³⁰ John Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State...etc.* (London, 1721), online edition, *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, vol. 1, 456-57, http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=auckland_ecco&tabID=T001&docId=CB3330996096&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCI. Abbot’s account is often cited by scholars, see for example Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 146; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 24-25; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 19-20.

¹³¹ Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 20, 25-28.

¹³² Henry Ellis, ed. *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, 3 vols. (1824., repr., London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1969), first series, vol. 3, 100-101, nos. CCLXII, CCLXIII.

on her.”¹³³ Indeed, Villiers’s debt to Anna is perhaps evident in his visual persona, which seems to have been influenced by her aesthetic. Earlier portraits of courtiers such as Cecil and Carr (figures 1.27, 1.28) show the sitter positioned in the manner of the consort – they are on the side of lesser power being in the left of the canvas and orientated to the right, which shows their deference to the king. By contrast, Villiers’s portrait by Mierevelt from 1625 (figure 1.32) shows the duke occupying the place of higher power on the hierarchic right, following the self-determining gesture seen in Anna’s portrait by Gheeraerts from around 1614 and discussed below (figures 1.33-1.35). A striking parallel is further seen between the portraits of Anna and Villiers with the abundance of pearls, which are rather unusual in a male portrait. There is the distinct possibility that Villiers was not only grateful to Anna for his rise in power, but in crafting his own visual persona, the duke took his cue from Anna’s authoritative self-representation.

It is clear the dramatic changes that occurred at the Jacobean court between 1612 and 1614 provided impetus for Anna to oppose, then distance herself from, the factional politics of James’s court. It is my contention that these shifts also had a formative effect on Anna’s self-representation. From this point onwards she chose to patronise easel portraitists Gheeraerts and Van Somer, the former of whom had been favoured by Elizabeth I, and both of whom were patronised by members of the Pembroke-Southampton faction, but had not yet been employed by James. Furthermore, the portraits they produced of Anna underscored her distinction from James as a daughter of Denmark, a successor to Elizabeth, and a patron of architecture and garden design.¹³⁴ Again, however, Anna’s aesthetic

¹³³ CSPV, vol. 15, 393, no.658.

¹³⁴ Interestingly, Griffey makes a similar observation about Henrietta Maria, noting that her portraits moved from standard representations to more personalised images. Griffey writes that prior to 1632, Henrietta

difference and her alliance with the oppositional Pembroke-Southampton network does not seem to have angered James. Indeed, her factional ties may have been to the king's distinct advantage. For, having his wife connected to the anti-Howard network would have allowed James to keep abreast of any developing intrigues and discontents, and to thereby maintain a level of peace, which was one of the defining characteristics of his kingship.¹³⁵ In any case, just as James tacitly accepted Anna's factional divergence, so too did he remain onside with the leaders of the rival network. Pembroke had been an early favourite of the king and although displaced in James's affections by Carr, and then Villiers, James continued to show favour to the earl, frequently visiting him at Wilton, appointing him to the Privy Council in 1611, and finally supporting Anna's bid to make him Lord Chamberlain in 1615.¹³⁶ On the other hand, Southampton had a more turbulent relationship with James, but his prominent position in the Essex rebellion, his strong support base in the Commons, and his dedication to colonial enterprise seems to have ingratiated him with the king. In 1617, Southampton was selected to accompany James on his Scottish Progress, and in 1619 the king made him a Privy Councillor.¹³⁷ Thus, while James endorsed the Howard-Carr faction, the political opposition does not seem to have been markedly disadvantaged, for Pembroke and Southampton continued to receive court offices and perquisites.

Maria's portraits "are conspicuous in their adherence to generic court portrait formulae," but around 1636 she took "a bigger role in the staging of her visual persona," choosing to include references to her Catholic piety by way of devotional jewellery, which Griffey relates to the changing politico-religious context. See Griffey, "Devotional Jewellery," 168, 175.

¹³⁵ James's pacifist ideologies are commonly held to have governed much of his domestic and foreign policy, which I would suggest are likely to have extended to factional politics. See for example William B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 293-99, 334-40; Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714*, 3rd edn., (Harlow and London: Longman, 2003), 124-33; Roger Lockyer, *James VI and I* (London and New York: Longman, 1998), 138-57; Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon*, 263-93.

¹³⁶ Victor Slater, "Herbert, William, third Earl of Pembroke (1580-1630)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/13058> (accessed 29 August 2014).

¹³⁷ Park Honan, "Wriothesley, Henry, third Earl of Southampton (1573-1624)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/30073>, (accessed 30 August, 2014).

The Initial Shift: The Woburn Portrait

The shift in Anna's visual image coheres for the first time in a full-length portrait by Gheeraerts that was painted around 1614 (figure 1.33).¹³⁸ Held in the collection at Woburn Abbey, the portrait casts Anna as a member of the Pembroke-Southampton faction and the inheritor of Elizabeth's powerful visual legacy. It also celebrates her individual cultural interests, her support for the Anglo-Spanish match, and underscores her natal identity through the presence of familial cipher jewels. It is notable that Anna's decision to reconfigure her visual persona saw her move away from De Critz, the King's Sergeant-Painter, and after sitting to Gheeraerts for this portrait, Anna never again sat for De Critz. However, Anna is thought to have sat to Gheeraerts as early as 1609, for a signed and dated portrait of the queen consort was documented at Frederiksborg Castle, suggesting that the portrait had been sent to her brother, Christian IV. Unfortunately though, the portrait was destroyed in a fire in 1859, along with a full-length portrait of James.¹³⁹ More concrete evidence survives for Anna having sat to Gheeraerts in 1611, for the Fleming was paid for a set of three portraits of James, Anna, and Princess Elizabeth, which were sent to the Margrave of Brandenburg, presumably as either expressions of friendship, or more likely, to accompany early marriage talks for the Princess.¹⁴⁰ It would be expected that both portraits of Anna followed the type established by De Critz around 1605, for they would have been intended as pendants to portraits of James and would have accordingly shown the queen on

¹³⁸ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 14. The parameters for dating this portrait rest on Christian IV gifting Anna his monogram jewel on 9 June 1611 (*CSPV*, vol. 12, 161-62, no.250), which she wears in the portrait, and the half-length version in the Royal Collection that is dated 1614 (figure 1.34).

¹³⁹ Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 17, 44-6, citing N. L. Høyen, *Frederiksborg Slots Beskrivelse*. Dansk Ugeskrift nr.5-11 (1831), nos.173, 962, 696.

¹⁴⁰ TNA: PRO, E351/543, f.268v; Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 36. I am not aware of the current whereabouts of these portraits. I would suggest that the Margrave in question is John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg (1572-1619), and his eldest son and heir George William (1595-1640) would have been the potential match for Princess Elizabeth. Notably, John Sigismund's sister, Anne Catherine of Brandenburg (1575-1612), was Anna's sister-in-law having married King Christian IV of Denmark in 1597.

the sinister left and in a complementary mode of portrayal to James.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, when Anna decided to reshape her self-representation around 1614, she retained Gheeraerts and her choice may have been predicated by her previous relationship with him. Not incidentally though, Gheeraerts had also painted Queen Elizabeth on several occasions (for example, figures 1.38, 1.39), which may have further endeared him to Anna. As I discuss below, Anna perhaps saw one of Gheeraerts's most famed portraits of the Tudor queen, and sitting to the Fleming would have assisted Anna in her quest to distinguish herself from James by stressing a visual continuity with the former queen regnant of England.

Anna clearly held Gheeraerts's portrait in high regard, for it became her most widely-circulated image. Numerous copies were produced in full and half-length format (figures 1.34, 1.35), and in print and medallion (figures 1.40-1.46), which indicates the esteem that Anna had for the representation since she is likely to have condoned its repetition and dispersal.¹⁴² Furthermore, a miniature by Oliver based on this portrait type is held in the Danish Royal Collections at Frederiksborg Castle, and was presumably sent by the queen to her mother Sofie, or her brother Christian IV (figure 1.8).

Elizabethan Emulation

One of the most striking differences between the earlier portraits by De Critz (figures 1.20, 1.24-1.26) and the Woburn portrait (figure 1.33) is the alteration in position. Anna is now placed in the left of the painting and turned to the right, which obviates the portrait from

¹⁴¹ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 36.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 14-15. Wood isolates four painted "types" to have been derived from the Woburn full-length original, along with eight prints. For the details of each work, including the location and a brief description, see *ibid.*, 14-16. In addition, the Photographic Reference Archive at the Scottish National Portrait Gallery in Edinburgh, details a three-quarter length version, measuring 129.55 x 101.6cm, which was sold at Christie's, 22 April 1960 (lot 6) and attributed to Gheeraerts (Sph II 7-32).

functioning as a pendant. Wood acknowledges this change in orientation, but underestimates its importance, noting that it needs to be read in conjunction “with a number of self-assertive gestures,” otherwise it may be “too far-fetched to see this as a deliberate expression of independence.”¹⁴³ Looking to portraits of Anna’s successor however, the significance of this re-orientation is apparent. For, as Gundrun Raatschen observes, portraits of Henrietta Maria show the queen consort in “three-quarter view looking to the left,” thereby placing her on the sinister and facing the space where a portrait of her husband would have hung.¹⁴⁴ I would argue that Anna’s decision to change her position should be seen as a definite step towards self-determination, which is reinforced by her adroit utilisation of aspects of Elizabethan iconography in order to emphasise her difference from James.¹⁴⁵

Scholars of the Stuart masque have been quick to isolate Anna’s appropriation and refashioning of Elizabethan elements. This reading can be strengthened by extending it to include Anna’s visual persona, for as Knowles has rightly stated, the use of a framing archway is similarly found in Gheeraerts’s earlier ‘Rainbow portrait’ of Elizabeth I from c.1600-2 (figure 1.38). More obviously, Anna’s voluminous French farthingale and diminutive feet can be seen to repeat the appearance of Elizabeth in her ‘Ditchley portrait’

¹⁴³ Ibid., 50.

¹⁴⁴ Gundrun Raatschen, “Merely Ornamental? Van Dyck’s Portraits of Henrietta Maria,” in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, ed. Erin Griffey (Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), 142.

¹⁴⁵ See Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 23-24. I completely disagree with Hallam’s assertion that “Anne’s reliance on Elizabethan precedent in painted portraits... has received no sustained analysis” and that Knowles’s work in this area “is shallow at best,” see Hallam, “Re-Presenting Women,” 283, 447, note 79. As discussed in the Introduction, I do concede that the length of Knowles’s essay prevents him from doing justice to the topic, but the points that he raises are insightful, valid, and thought-provoking.

from 1592, which was also painted by Gheeraerts (figure 1.39).¹⁴⁶ It should be remembered that by the time of the Woburn portrait, the drum-shaped farthingale was no longer fashionable, and Anna's decision to retain this style of dress should be seen as an attempt to draw visual parallels with Elizabeth.¹⁴⁷ Certainly, the use of Elizabethan modes of dress as a means to palpably invoke the Tudor queen can be observed in early Jacobean theatre, indicating that certain articles of apparel, particularly the wheel farthingale and high sleeveheads, were rapidly becoming synonymous with her rule.¹⁴⁸ There is also the interesting possibility that Anna was personally familiar with the Ditchley portrait. In September 1603, James and Anna were at Woodstock in Oxfordshire and visited Sir Henry Lee (1533-1611) at the lodge in his Ditchley estate.¹⁴⁹ Later, in his letter of 27 September 1608, Chamberlain informs Carleton that "the queen before her going out of this countrie dined with Sr Henry Lee at his litle Rest, and gave great countenance."¹⁵⁰ The "litle Rest" was Lee's lodge near the manor house in Ditchley, and it is quite possible that Anna was also granted access to the main house, where the portrait of Elizabeth had remained since Lee commissioned the work in 1592.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁶ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 49-50; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 24; Sharpe, *Image Wars*, 66. On the portrait of Elizabeth see also Roy Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (New York, N.Y.: Thames and Hudson, 1987), 157-61.

¹⁴⁷ Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (Oxford, UK; New York: Berg, 2003), 35; Anna Reynolds, *In Fine Style: The Art of Tudor and Stuart Fashion* (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2013), 42.

¹⁴⁸ Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: University Press, 2002), 50, 57. These articles of dress are discussed in more detail in Chapter Two.

¹⁴⁹ Edmund K. Chambers, *Sir Henry Lee: An Elizabethan Portrait* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), 209; Lodge, *Illustrations of British History*, vol.3, 177. On Lee's lands and properties in Oxfordshire see Chambers, *ibid.*, 54-57.

¹⁵⁰ TNA: PRO, SP 14/36, fol.125.

¹⁵¹ Chambers, *Sir Henry Lee*, 241; Ewan Fernie, "Lee, Sir Henry (1533–1611)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/16288> (accessed 15 April 2015). Roger Lockyer, "Villiers, George, first Duke of Buckingham (1592-1628)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/28293> (accessed 11 October 2014).

In relation to this last pairing, Knowles recapitulates that Elizabeth's positioning demonstrates her reign over England; however, when imitated by Anna in the Woburn portrait, the positioning articulates her control over her own domain.¹⁵² This is symbolised by the arch and garden, which is thought by Hearn and Strong to be that of Denmark House.¹⁵³ The 'Ditchley portrait' is the largest full-length portrait of Elizabeth to survive, and presents the Tudor queen in highly symbolic terms.¹⁵⁴ The flat iconic style of the painting, the distortions in scale, and the mask-like visage of the ageing queen remove her from the world of the living and elevate her into the celestial realm. Elizabeth's divinity is reiterated by the jewel in the shape of an armillary sphere that hangs from her right ear, while the inscribed sonnet carefully spells out that the thundery tempestuous sky on the left, and the sunny brilliant sky on the right, symbolise her power and glory.¹⁵⁵ By comparison, Anna is depicted in a much more naturalistic manner in the Woburn portrait. She realistically occupies space, and is positioned within a believable setting (possibly Denmark House) that is devoid of the complex symbolism that accompanies Elizabeth. It is clear that while Anna chooses to borrow from Elizabeth's visual legacy, she shapes it for her own aesthetic and political ends.

While the connection to Elizabeth furthers our understanding of Anna's approach to, and management of, her self-representation, she was not unique in her use of Elizabethan iconographies. Indeed, James too borrowed elements of his predecessor's visual legacy,

¹⁵² Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 24.

¹⁵³ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192, cat. no.130; Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 88.

¹⁵⁴ Hearn, *ibid.*, 89, cat. no.45.

¹⁵⁵ Much has been written on this elaborate portrait. See for example *ibid.*, 89-90, cat. no.45; Strong, *English Icon*, 289, cat. no.285; Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, vol. 1, 104-105, cat. no.256; David Starkey and Susan Doran, *Elizabeth: The Exhibition at the National Maritime Museum* (London: Chatto & Windus in association with the National Maritime Museum, 2003), 91, 180, 185-87; Strong, *Gloriana*, 9, 21, 135-40; Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 10-14, 27, 34, 40, 64, 81, 110, 123, 132 and especially 42-46; Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts*, 31-35.

choosing to appear beneath the Tudor rose in a late portrait by Daniel Mytens (c.1590-1647/8) discussed below (figure 1.55) and, as mentioned, retaining Elizabeth's old-fashioned miniaturist Hilliard, in an attempt to connect himself with the Tudor queen. James also sought to cast himself as Elizabeth's legitimate and reverent successor by preserving and cultivating her memory. To that end, James spent extravagant sums on Elizabeth funeral; he did not enter London until after her burial; he sanctioned the continued celebrations of the anniversary of her accession day; and, in 1605, he erected a lavish tomb in her honour.¹⁵⁶

On the other hand, as scholars including James Knowles, Susan Doran, Thomas Freeman, Michael Dobson and Nicola Watson have pointed out, Elizabethan ideologies were highly flexible, and during the early Stuart period they were not only used in support of the monarchy but were readily employed to criticise James and his policies. As these authors point out, during the first decade of the Jacobean period, Elizabeth was gradually transformed into an idealised figure of Protestant purity, militant heroism, and English nationalism.¹⁵⁷ In this manner, Elizabeth became a focal point for anxieties about a foreign king, and she was used to criticise James as a weak and popish ruler: where Elizabeth had led England to victory against the Spanish Armada in 1588, James's pacifist philosophy saw him seek peace with Spain, and a Catholic marriage for his heir, Henry, followed by Charles. Moreover, while Elizabeth was held to have implemented her father's reforms and

¹⁵⁶ D. R. Woolf, "Two Elizabeth's? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory," *Canadian Journal of History* 20 (1985): 168-69, 172-80; Anne Barton, "Harking Back to Elizabeth: Ben Jonson and Caroline Nostalgia," *English Literary History* 48 (1981): 710, 713-19; Dobson and Watson, *England's Elizabeth*, 46, 49.

¹⁵⁷ Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 22-23; Dobson and Watson, *England's Elizabeth*, 4-7, 15-17, 44-48, 60-68; Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman "Introduction" in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 2, 6-9, 16, 21 note 11.

established the independent Church of England, James's ecumenical approach to the management of the church saw limited persecution of recusants and no further reforms.¹⁵⁸

Elizabethanism was evidently utilised by a variety of people to support a variety of positions, but it is still significant that Anna was repeatedly conceptualised within the bounds of Elizabeth's iconographic legacy. This occurred in the realms of painting, poetry, and theatre. Not only were Anna's painted likenesses shaped after the visual legacy of Elizabeth, but she also directly used Elizabeth's clothes in a theatrical context. Anna's first court masque, *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* was written by Samuel Daniel and performed by the queen and a select number of ladies on 8 January 1604, at Hampton Court. For the performance, warrants were issued to allow Anna and her ladies to use garments in the Tower of London that had originally belonged to Elizabeth.¹⁵⁹ McManus notes that this was not an uncommon practice, but what makes Anna's decision to use her predecessor's garb - to

¹⁵⁸ On James's pacifism, his approach to the church, and concerns about a foreign ruler see, for example, Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*, 46-51; Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I," *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), especially 170-71, 173-76, 181-85, 195-96, and for the effects of foreign affairs on James's ecclesiastical policies see *ibid.*, 198-206; Russell, "1603: The End of English National Sovereignty," 1-3; Doran, "James VI and the English Succession," 37, 42; Lockyer, *James VI and I*, 103-110, 138-46; Coward, *Stuart Age*, 124-33; Thomas Cogswell, "England and the Spanish Match," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London and New York: Longman, 1989), 111-15.

¹⁵⁹ Edmund Kerchever Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols., vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 210. Chambers provides no reference for this statement. Arnold also cites Chambers, *Unlock'd*, 176. note.120. See also McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, 107; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 30. McManus and Lewalski suggest that there are no surviving drawings of masque costumes for *Vision*, because all performers were attired in clothing taken from Elizabeth's wardrobe. Like Chambers, neither author appears to have consulted Anna's household accounts. The accounts indicate that Anna bought apparel from a silk-man and mercer for a masque in January 1604. The sums are too large to indicate mere alterations and must have been paid for new clothes. Concerning the warrant issued to Walsingham and Suffolk, McManus cites a letter written by Arbella Stuart to her uncle, Gilbert Taylor, Earl of Shrewsbury (1553-1616) on 18 December 1603, in which she stated that "the Queene intendeth to make a mask this Christmas to which end my Lady of Suffolk and my Lady Walsingham have warrants to take of the late Queenes best apparell out of the Tower at theyr discretion." McManus states that as the Keeper of the Queen's Wardrobe, Walsingham would have been acting on Anna's direct orders. The original letter is printed in Sara Jayne Steen (ed.), *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 197.

embody her - important is that spectators were able to recognise them.¹⁶⁰ Writing of the spectacle to Chamberlain, on 15 January 1604, Dudley Carleton (1573-1632) relates that, for their attire, the female performers “were beholden to Queen Elizabeth’s wardrobe.”¹⁶¹ Carleton’s comment about Anna’s gown, which he states was “not so much below the knee but that we might see a woman had both feet and legs, which I never knew before,” suggests that Anna may have had Elizabeth’s clothes altered for the performance, indicating that just as she modified Elizabeth’s visual persona, Anna was happy to adapt her predecessor’s material goods for her own ends.¹⁶² In *Vision*, Anna and her circle of ladies were visually and powerfully conflated with the persona of Queen Elizabeth and her courtly body.¹⁶³

In *Vision*, Anna not only appropriated the late queen’s clothing, but her iconographic identity as well. As Lewalski and McManus both comment, Anna explicitly chose to appear in the guise of Pallas Athena, the goddess of warfare and wisdom and “a singularly Elizabethan icon.”¹⁶⁴ By appearing in Elizabeth’s recognisable clothing and as one of her primary personae, Anna effectively fashioned herself as the successor of Elizabeth’s legacy of female courtly power; this was an alignment that audience members would not have failed to notice. Literary scholars, such as Lewalski and Knowles, have noted that even before Anna’s first masque, her persona had been conceptualised within the confines of Elizabeth’s iconography. From as early as 1603, poets had chosen to address Anna in strictly Elizabethan terms. Elizabethan appellations such as “Oriana” were subtly refashioned for

¹⁶⁰ McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, 107.

¹⁶¹ Maurice Jr. Lee, ed., *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1972), 55, no.21.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

¹⁶³ McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, 107-108.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 109; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 30.

the new queen consort, or deities commonly associated with Elizabeth, such as Diana and Cynthia, were reused.¹⁶⁵ In the Woburn portrait too, Anna sought to align herself with Elizabeth: she chose Gheeraerts, who had painted Elizabeth, and aspects of Anna's dress, pose, and background echo those found in Gheeraerts's portraits of Elizabeth. Moreover, it is important, as mentioned above, that Anna's decision to reconfigure her visual persona by sitting to Gheeraerts around 1614, is likely to have influenced Southampton. That same year, Southampton sat to Gheeraerts for a powerful full-length portrait that bears some remarkable visual parallels in pose and costume to Anna's portrait, and as such seems to advertise their alliance.

In theatrical, poetic, and pictorial terms, it is clear that Anna endorsed a connection to Elizabethan iconography. Connections to Elizabeth and Southampton's modes of self-representation were strategically used by Anna to communicate her aesthetic and factional distance from James. I would argue, however, that the use of this imagery in the Woburn portrait is only one of many self-determining steps. Here, the viewer is also being greeted with other aspects of her identity: her interests, her family lineage, and her support for the Spanish match. The use of the classical arch in combination with the strictly regular and raised garden serve to highlight Anna's cultural activities that differed from those of James. In contrast to James, Anna placed a marked importance on architecture and garden design, and she initiated both restorative and new work at her three principal residences: Denmark House, Greenwich Palace, and Oatlands Palace. Significantly, Anna is credited with introducing and popularising the symmetrical patterned garden in England, and it is an

¹⁶⁵ Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 18; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 21, 34. For a comprehensive and succinct analysis of Anna's adroit use of Elizabethan imagery during her progress in 1613 see Knowles, *ibid.*, 33-42.

example of this type of garden that is recorded in the background of the Woburn portrait.¹⁶⁶

These two key areas of Anna's cultural agency are considered in Chapter Three, but it is worth noting here that they are repeatedly commemorated in her visual persona. Together with elements of Elizabethan iconography, they served to highlight Anna's distinction from James and advantageously strengthened the power and autonomy of her own image.

Representational Jewels

The articulation of a visual persona that was distinct from James's is further compounded in the Woburn portrait through the prominence of familial jewellery, which explicitly presents Anna as a member of Danish royalty. As perceptible signs of affluence, rank and, in the case of hereditary or figurative jewels, of ancestral prestige, the wearing of jewellery performed an innately political purpose, and it was one that Anna strategically marshalled in both her everyday appearance and in her portraits.¹⁶⁷ As the "daughter, sister and wife of a king" in addition to being the mother of the future king of England, Anna was of significantly high standing, so it is perhaps unsurprising to find jewelled symbols of her immediate family in her portraits.¹⁶⁸ However, it is only between 1612 and 1614 that Anna chose to prominently include references to her natal lineage in her visual imagery. I argue that this can be seen as a response to the political climate, first occurring in her miniature portraits (figures 1.7-1.10) from c.1612, before being translated into the Woburn portrait around 1614 (figure 1.33).

¹⁶⁶ Strong, *Artist and the Garden*, 14. Strong outlines that this new style was comprised of a series of manicured compartments that were arranged into elaborate designs.

¹⁶⁷ The frequent repairs that Anna's jeweller Heriot had to carry out on Christian's miniature cases indicates that they must have been frequently worn, and they perhaps formed a part of Anna's everyday toilette. The large quantity of familial jewels that Anna owned, and the repairs that Heriot completed, are discussed in Chapter Two below.

¹⁶⁸ CSPV, vol. 15, 392, no.658.

In the Woburn portrait, Anna wears two representational jewels that are explicitly representative of her genealogy. The “C4” jewel, topped with a crown and set with diamonds, which is pinned to her hair, is the monogram of her brother Christian IV (figure 1.47). The diamond-studded and crowned “S” jewel, which hangs on a ribbon from her standing lace collar, is a reference to her mother Sofie (figure 1.49). Anna’s mother was well educated, politically and culturally active, and would have served as a powerful model of emulation for Anna, one who could be invoked to underscore her prestigious ancestry.¹⁶⁹ Evidence of Sofie’s agency is apparent in the events following the death of her husband Frederik (figure 1.48). On 4 April 1588, Sofie petitioned the Danish Council of State for Regency, and ordered that she be granted all of Frederik’s liquid assets. The Council refused, and appointed a Regency government. However, the tenacity of the dowager queen resulted in her being allocated a large cash pension as a form of compensation, which was in addition to the land, property, and money that she had already been allocated as Frederik’s widow.¹⁷⁰ As a trustee of Schleswig and Holstein during Christian’s minority, Sofie repeatedly challenged the Council, the Dukes of Gottorp, Parliament, and later, Christian himself, to re-partition the duchies so her two younger sons could become dukes.¹⁷¹ Establishing her own court at Nykøbing Castle on Falster, Sofie continued to receive ambassadors while devoting herself to the lucrative breeding of livestock, and pursuing her interests in chemistry, astronomy, history, and Danish folk ballads.¹⁷² Her shrewd management of money, cattle, and property meant that she ended up being one of the richest individuals in Europe, and was able to operate as a moneylender to her son,

¹⁶⁹ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192; Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 24; Wade, “Queen’s Courts,” 52.

¹⁷⁰ Lockhart, *Denmark, 1513-1660*, 56.

¹⁷¹ Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 27; Lockhart, *ibid.*, 42, 129-30; Wade, “Queen’s Courts,” 53.

¹⁷² Wade, *ibid.*, 52-53; Barroll, “Court of the First Stuart Queen,” 193.

Christian IV.¹⁷³ In her mother then, Anna had a female role model who was learned, cultured, financially savvy, and politically involved. Anna's decision to have the "S" jewel as one of the cornerstones of her visual persona, between 1612 and 1614, testifies to the esteem that she had for her mother and the pride she felt as a member of the Oldenburg dynasty.

I am not aware of any documents relating to the "S" pendant, but the "C4" jewel is thought to have been gifted by Christian to Anna in 1611, for in their dispatch to the Doge and Senate, on 9 June 1611, Foscarini and Correr report that the Danish king had sent Anna some jewellery among which was a jewel "of splendid diamonds forming a C. and a 4, C. for the first letter of his name, and a 4 because he is the fourth of that name."¹⁷⁴ Wood suggests that the "S" jewel was also given at this time, but this is unlikely since Christian's gifts were expressly intended as keepsakes on the eve of his invasion of Sweden.¹⁷⁵ As Foscarini and Correr's dispatch elucidates, Christian's letter to Anna, which accompanied the gift, stated that he was

with the army, ready for the march, and as he is going in person he sends the Queen his Band for which he will have no use at the wars; then he enlarges on the successes he hopes for by land and sea, and expresses himself with the greatest tenderness towards his sister. He adds that he sends her some jewels to keep for his sake.¹⁷⁶

The following month (July), Anna granted Foscarini an audience during which time he claimed that the queen "talked mostly about... the greatness of her house."¹⁷⁷ This verbal articulation of her own exalted dynasty is visually declared in the Woburn portrait, and leads Wood to suggest that the painting could have been specifically commissioned by Anna to

¹⁷³ Wade, *ibid.*, 53; Lockhart, *Denmark, 1513-1660*, 133.

¹⁷⁴ CSPV, vol. 12, 162, no.250; Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192; Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 234.

¹⁷⁵ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 52. The dating of the "S" jewel is discussed below.

¹⁷⁶ CSPV, vol. 12, 162, no.250.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 184-86, no.284.

mark her possession of these two jewelled pieces.¹⁷⁸ Certainly, Gheeraerts was paid for portraits of James, Anna, and Princess Elizabeth on 4 July 1611.¹⁷⁹ The Woburn portrait cannot be counted among them, however, since it would be almost impossible for Gheeraerts to paint the portrait and be paid by the crown within the space of two months.¹⁸⁰ Conversely, I would suggest that the Woburn portrait was painted in 1614, at the same time that Gheeraerts painted similar full-length portraits of Anna's brother, Christian IV (figure 1.50), and one of her principal allies at court, the Earl of Southampton (figures 1.36, 1.37).¹⁸¹ As I suggested above, Anna's choice of Gheeraerts is likely to have influenced Southampton, and I would add that Anna's decision to have a new portrait was possibly inspired by her brother's visit in 1614, for a number of elements in the painting directly commemorate Christian, and the two portraits of Anna and Christian work to underscore the siblings' joint support for a Spanish match.

Christian arrived at Denmark House on 22 July 1614, remaining in London until the first week of August.¹⁸² Three days after his arrival, the Danish king was installed as a knight of the Order of the Garter. It is generally held that it is this occasion that is commemorated in Gheeraerts's portrait, where Christian appears wearing the insignia of the Order with a magnificently bejewelled Lesser George, and the Garter on his left leg. In addition, I would

¹⁷⁸ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 52.

¹⁷⁹ TNA: PRO, E351/543, fol.268v; Wood, *ibid.*, 36. These portraits are also discussed above, 77-78.

¹⁸⁰ The problematic timing is noted by Wood, who concedes that "it would be surprising to find the Crown paying so promptly," *ibid.*

¹⁸¹ The authorship of Christian's portrait has not been satisfactorily resolved. Steffen Heiberg, curator of the Frederiksborg Museum, suggests that it is the work of Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, while Thomas DaCosta Kauffman posits that it is a copy by Michiel van Mierevelt after a lost portrait by Gheeraerts. Both attributions are based on stylistic grounds. Email communication from the Princeton University Art Museum to the author, 8 and 15 June 2013. On this portrait see Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 21, cat. no.3; Thomas DaCosta Kauffman, "Review of 'Christian IV and Europe'," *Konsthistorisk tidskrift* (Stockholm, 1989), 20.

¹⁸² J. Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*, 4 vols., vol. 3 (London, 1828), 13-18.

suggest that the portrait commemorates Christian's support of the Spanish match, as illustrated by the sizeable red favour. Tied around his left arm is a large red ribbon, which is similarly found in Gheeraerts's portrait of Anna, and can be seen as a symbol of their shared support of an Anglo-Spanish marriage alliance.¹⁸³ Red bands, ribbons, or sashes were worn in a variety of forms by Spanish kings, high-ranking military officials, and soldiers as a symbol of the Spanish empire, for the red band was derived from the red St Andrew's cross of Burgundy, which was chosen as the emblem of the Spanish Habsburgs by the Burgundian Duke and first Habsburg king in Spain, Philip the Handsome (1478-1506).¹⁸⁴ Examples of the use of the red band tied around the arm as a visual marker of Habsburg power and allegiance can be clearly seen in portraits of King Philip II of Spain (1527-1598), and the famed military commander Ambrogio Spinola Doria (1569-1630) (figures 1.51, 1.52). In this context it is worth touching on Mytens's full-length portrait of Villiers where the duke is seen with a vibrant red band around his left arm (figure 1.53). Standing on the hierarchic right, Villiers's position and pose connects the portrait with Gheeraerts's earlier paintings of Anna and Christian (figures 1.33, 1.50). Although undated, I would suggest that Villiers's portrait was completed in 1619, commemorating his appointment as Lord Admiral in January of that year, and his backing of the Anglo-Spanish union that James was attempting to secure.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ Hallam, "Re-Presenting Women," 282-83, reads Anna's red favour, in conjunction with the ring on her left hand, as signs of her married status, and states that red is the symbolic colour of love. This is a rather simplistic reading, and it should be noted that wearing a ring on the fourth finger of the left hand was not indelibly associated with marriage in seventeenth-century England. Furthermore, as Hayward rightly points out, red was more commonly associated with status and wealth at this time, for it was by far the most expensive dye, see Maria Hayward, "Crimson, Scarlet, Murrey and Carnation: Red at the Court of Henry VIII," *Textile History* 38 (2007): 136-37.

¹⁸⁴ Geoffrey Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659: the Logistics of Spanish Victory and Defeat in the Low Countries' Wars*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 2004), 139, citing BRB MS. 12622-31, fols.177-200v, Edict of 27 May 1596, clause 41; see also Ignacio and Iván Notario López, *The Spanish Tercios, 1536-1704* (Oxford: Osprey, 2012), 42, 45, 47.

¹⁸⁵ Lockyer, "Villiers, George," *ODNB* (accessed 11 October 2014).

Supporting this reading of the red favour is that fact that Anna had previously worn red to illustrate favour to the Spanish, and she had been encouraging a match between her eldest son Henry and the eldest Infanta of Spain, Ana Maria (1601-1666) from as early as 1604.¹⁸⁶ As noted above, during the performance of *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, in 1604, Anna wore “a scarf and a red streamer” to honour the Spanish ambassador, indicating her support for the Anglo-Spanish peace.¹⁸⁷ Later, during the *Masque of Beauty*, in 1608, Anna again fashioned her physical appearance to indicate Spanish favour. This time she wore the jewelled collar inherited from Mary Tudor (1516-1558) that was adorned with the ciphers “P” and “M” that Philip II had given to the Tudor queen – an express reminder of the previous Anglo-Spanish marriage.¹⁸⁸ Anna’s desire for a Spanish marriage alliance continued unabated even after the setbacks of 1612, which saw Ana Maria betrothed to Louis XIII of France (1601-1643) and the calamitous death of Prince Henry on 6 November. James and Anna promptly sought another Spanish bride, but this time it was to be Philip III’s second daughter Maria Anna (1606-1646) and the groom was to be Prince Charles, the new heir to the English throne. Following an audience with Anna in March 1614, the Spanish ambassador, Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Count of Gondomar (1567-1626), relayed to Philip III that the queen consort was not interested in a match with France as she was still hopeful for a marriage with Spain.¹⁸⁹ It is highly possible it was around this time of Spanish favour that the Woburn portrait was commissioned.

¹⁸⁶ Loomie, “Catholic Consort,” 306.

¹⁸⁷ Mary Agnes Sullivan, *Court Masques of James I: Their Influence on Shakespeare and the Public Theatres* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1973), 16. The original French correspondence is printed in *ibid.*, 194, appendix 6, citing King’s MSS, cxxiv, fol.720. My thanks to Dr Emma Blomkamp for the translation.

¹⁸⁸ Scarisbrick, *Tudor and Jacobean Jewellery*, 14, 53, 75-76; Gustav Ungerer, “Juan Pantoja De La Cruz and the Circulation of Gifts between the English and Spanish Courts, 1604-5,” *Shakespearean Studies* 26 (1998): 156-57.

¹⁸⁹ Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 234-35, citing Beretta (ed.), *Documentos Ineditos*, vol. 111 (Madrid, 1944), 307-308.

While several scholars, such as Albert Loomie, have repeatedly mentioned that Anna favoured a Catholic match for her children due to her own Catholic convictions, I would argue that this desire can also be seen to have stemmed from political considerations.¹⁹⁰ In seventeenth-century Europe, the most prestigious, powerful, and wealthy states were predominantly Catholic: France, Spain, and those belonging to the Holy Roman Empire. Seeking an advantageous alliance in terms of money and status, therefore, meant seeking a Catholic alliance. Anna was well aware of the rank and precedence attached to the Habsburgs, and throughout her time in England she repeatedly reminded foreign emissaries of her Austrian connections: in 1515, Anna's cousin Christian II of Denmark (1481-1559) had married Isabella of Austria (1501-1526), sister of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V (1500-1558).

Anna's investment in a Spanish match was presumably threefold: of all the European powers, the Habsburgs were possessed of a pre-eminently illustrious lineage; as an extremely wealthy kingdom, the Stuarts could hope to gain a larger dowry than that offered by Savoy, Tuscany, or even France; and thirdly, as mentioned above, Anna was exceptionally proud of her own Austrian Habsburg connections, which is likely to have coloured her attitude to potential matrimonial candidates.¹⁹¹ Like his sister, Christian IV seems to have

¹⁹⁰ Loomie, "Catholic Consort," 309.

¹⁹¹ When Sir John Digby (1580-1654) was attempting to finalise the Anglo-Spanish match in December 1617, James was expecting to receive a staggering two million crowns (£600,000 sterling). By comparison, Tuscany was prepared to offer 600,000 ducats (£150,000 sterling) during negotiations in October 1611. A match with Savoy was being discussed in September 1613, at which time James was offered a dowry of 800,000 ducats (£200,000 sterling). The following year saw a match being canvassed between Prince Charles and the French Princess Christine Marie (1606-1663), and it was reported that James would receive 800,000 ducats (£200,000 pounds sterling). See John Duncan Mackie, *Negotiations between James VI and I and Ferdinand, Duke of Tuscany* (Published for St. Andrews University by Oxford University Press, 1927), 72; Samuel Rawson Gardiner, ed. *Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty* (Printed for the Camden Society, 1869), 109-12, 137, 139, 155.

been similarly inclined towards an Anglo-Spanish match and it was even thought that the express purpose of his visit to England in 1614 was

To treat with his majesty about a match which is now in parley between his son and the younger daughter of Spain. This is certain, that after the leave taken between the two kings, the Spanish ambassador was four hours privately with him in his ship, and honoured at his departure with 150 great shot.¹⁹²

Similarly, on 8 August 1614, Foscarini asserted to the Doge and Senate that Christian had spoken “about marrying the prince here to a daughter of Spain, and that the queen is in favour of it.”¹⁹³

For Christian, an Anglo-Spanish marriage in 1614 through his nephew would have cemented his ties to the Habsburgs and bolstered his position vis-à-vis Denmark’s traditional enemy of Sweden. Earlier that year, Sweden had brokered an anti-Danish treaty with the Northern Netherlands that was severely curtailing Christian’s plans for expansion, and he may well have been looking to increase his own leverage with Spain through an Anglo-Spanish match.¹⁹⁴ Consequently, I would suggest that Gheeraerts’s two full-length portraits of Anna and Christian were both completed in 1614, and that in part, they are concerned to visually announce their mutual backing of an Anglo-Spanish matrimonial union. It should be pointed out that scholars usually claim that Anna gifted the Woburn portrait to her strongly Protestant Lady of the Bedchamber, the Countess of Bedford, and that it has remained at Woburn by descent.¹⁹⁵ However, this is only a matter of speculation, for there is no record of early provenance, and the portrait is conspicuously absent from Charles Tough’s list of paintings at Woburn that was compiled in 1727. The portrait of Anna is not recorded at the

¹⁹² Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. 1, 342-43. Lorkin to Puckering: 6 August 1614.

¹⁹³ CSPV, vol. 13, 171-72, no.356.

¹⁹⁴ Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 59.

¹⁹⁵ Wood, “Portraits of Anne of Denmark,” 14; Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192.

Abbey until 1890, and it is only since this time that it has passed by descent.¹⁹⁶ As such, the argument that the Woburn portrait announces Anna's support of the Spanish match cannot be discounted by the suggestion that the queen gave the portrait to the Protestant and anti-Spanish Countess of Bedford.

While neither of the symbolic jewels worn by Anna in the Woburn portrait can be definitively identified in the inventory of Anna's jewels, which was compiled in 1606 and annotated through to 27 April 1612, or in the accounts spanning of her principal jeweller Heriot, which cover the years 1605 to 1615, the queen did own and continue to commission a number of pieces that pointed to her brother or her mother.¹⁹⁷ As pertinent illustrations of her status and dynastic cachet, the diamond-crowned "C4" and "S" jewels seen in the Woburn portrait emphasise her position as a princess of Denmark. Notably, as aforementioned, familial jewels only appear in portraits of Anna that were painted between 1612 and 1614. There are subsequent easel portraits of the queen that show her wearing the same jewels, such as Van Somer's portrait of c.1617-18 (figure 1.54), but these are clearly copies after the Woburn type. I would argue that the appearance of the jewels in Anna's visual persona between 1612 and 1614 is intricately connected to the changing socio-political milieu. During this time, as discussed above, the Jacobean court was home to a series of significant deaths and consequent factional realignment. The rise of James's favourite Carr, and the associated Howards, led Anna to side with the opposing Pembroke-Southampton network, and to openly show her displeasure with James's appointments, opinions, and favourites. This is evident in her decision to host a set of wedding festivities to

¹⁹⁶ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192.

¹⁹⁷ The inventory has been transcribed and published in Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory." The accounts cover the period 1605-1615 and are in TNA: PRO, LR2/122. Anna's collection of jewellery and her patronage of Heriot are considered in greater detail in Chapter Two below.

rival James's celebration of the Carr-Howard marriage; to challenge Northampton's Keepership of Greenwich Park; and finally, to replace Carr in James's affections with the introduction of George Villiers. It is perhaps unsurprising that Anna's adversarial stance spilled into her visual self-representation.

The Personal Motto

Representational jewels were not the only items that Anna employed in her visual persona to signal her dynastic prestige at this time. The Woburn portrait is the first painted portrait to include Anna's personal Italian motto "*La mia grandezza dal eccelso*," which translates to "My power is from the most high," and can be seen extending along the wall (figure 1.33). Although Wood has remarked that Anna's "threefold claim to greatness" was "bizarrely tied up with her use of the Italian motto," I would argue that it was an astute amalgamation of the earthly and celestial.¹⁹⁸ It allowed Anna to pay homage to the power and status of her male kin, but it also allowed her to make a claim for her position being the result of her illustrious birth, rather than the sole derivation of her marriage. Indeed, in his summation of England in 1618, the Venetian Ambassador, Antonio Foscarini, relates that "She [Anna] is daughter, sister and wife of a king, which cannot to-day be said of any other. She claims that her greatness comes not from the king but from God alone and her motto runs, My Power is from the Most High."¹⁹⁹ As such, while Wood goes on to say that "what the status and sense of this motto was is far from clear," I would posit that it was an explicit articulation of Anna's belief in her own exalted status.²⁰⁰ The Woburn portrait is the first example of Anna's personal motto being tied to her visually, and it subsequently appears in her

¹⁹⁸ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 51.

¹⁹⁹ CSPV, vol. 15, 392, no.658: 19 December 1618.

²⁰⁰ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 51.

engraved and medallion portraits, thereby forming a central feature of her iconography (figures 1.33, 1.34, 1.40, 1.43-1.46, 1.58-1.60). The motto is a relatively late addition to Anna's visual persona, and I would argue that along with the familial jewellery, it served to visibly announce her difference from James at a time when she was looking to distance herself from his court, and to oppose the faction he favoured.

Anna's use of a single personal motto seems to have been quite unusual. James, by comparison, was associated with at least four personal mottoes, but only *Beati pacifici* (Blessed are the peacemakers), occurs in his visual iconography.²⁰¹ This appears behind the king in his 1621 portrait by Daniel Mytens (figure 1.55), as well as two engraved portraits, and a silver medal by Simon van de Passe (c.1595/6-1647) from c.1616-1624.²⁰² Much more common in images of James is the appearance of the British Royal Arms within the Garter that bears the traditional Latin motto of English monarchy: *Dieu et mon droit* (God and my right).²⁰³ This occurs in James's iconography as early as 1603, and continues to be present in his visual imagery throughout the 1620s (figure 1.56).²⁰⁴ Similarly, Queen Elizabeth was represented with identifying adages, and she had at least eight personal mottoes, but like James, these were not a consistent feature of her visual persona. Only two painted portraits include mottoes: the 'Rainbow Portrait' bears her motto *Non sine sole iris* (No rainbow

²⁰¹ L. G. Pine, *A Dictionary of Mottoes* (London; Boston: Routledge & K. Paul, 1983), 23.

²⁰² Ibid.; Arthur Mayger Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: The Reign of James I*, 3 vols., vol. 2 (Cambridge: University Press, 1955), 259-60, 91, 79, plates 154, 176, 164.

²⁰³ Pine, *Dictionary of Mottoes*, 53, 100. *Dieu et mon droit* had been used by English rulers since it was established as the royal motto by Edward III (1312-1377) in 1340. James had previously appeared with the Royal Arms motto of the Order of the Garter as early as 1603 (Hind plate 10), and with both mottoes as early as 1613 (Hind, plate 14b). See also Robert Gerard and Antony Griffith, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689* (London: British Museum Press, 1998), 46-47, cat. no.6; Hind, *Engraving in England*, vol. 2, 181-82, cat. no.37; also noted by Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 51, citing Hind.

²⁰⁴ See for example the engraving of James by Laurence Johnson from 1603 reproduced in Hind, *Engraving in England*, vol. 2, 35-36, no.1, plate 10; and for the engraving of James on horseback from 1621, see *ibid.*, 60, plate 30.

without the sun) (figure 1.38), while the Latin motto, *Semper eadem* (Always the same), is seen in a painted portrait by an unknown artist from c.1560 (figure 1.57). This motto also appears in several engravings, but again, like James, Elizabeth's printed image seems to have been most commonly paired with the monarchical motto *Dieu et mon droit*.²⁰⁵ Thus, while Elizabeth and James were associated with a variety of maxims, including the traditional monarchical motto, Anna chose to be consistently connected to one specific personalised motto: one that stressed her exalted royal bloodline. Furthermore, it was one that she conscientiously sought to incorporate into her visual persona.

In Elstrack's double portrait of the Stuarts from c.1615 (figure 1.43), Anna stands next to the Danish Royal Arms with her personal Italian motto *La mia grandezza dal eccelso* appearing on the scroll beneath. The following year, Van der Passe completed an equestrian portrait of Anna wherein her personal motto is shown in a similar manner (figure 1.44). Further similarities are seen in the figure, which has been closely modelled on the Woburn type, and the acknowledgement of her tripartite power source stemming from her royal father, royal brother, and royal husband.²⁰⁶ In Van de Passe's portrait of Anna from 1617, which was included in the *Bazilicologia* series and published in 1618, the script at the bottom of the print honours her as "a threefolde Qveene, A threefold Christi-Anna," and her motto can be

²⁰⁵ Pine, *Dictionary of Mottoes*, 66, 200, 208. Examples of engraved images of Elizabeth accompanied by *Dieu et mon droit*, or *Semper eadem*, or the Royal arms within the Garter can be found, for example, in Arthur Mayger Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: The Tudor Period 1552-64*, 3 vols., vol. 1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1952), 282-83, 285, plates 140, 141, 144. See also the portrait of Elizabeth from 1569 in the Royal Collection (RCIN 403446), which includes the queen's initials on the archway, and the Royal Arms encircled by the Garter with the motto of English monarchy in the painted frieze behind.

²⁰⁶ Hind, *Engraving in England*, vol. 2, 248-49, cat. no.3; Gerard and Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, 56, cat. no.13. This engraving showing Anna on horseback with Windsor in the background, was part of a series of three equestrian prints with the other two depicting James in front of Whitehall, and Charles in front of Richmond. Written across the bottom of Anna's engraved image in both French and English is the verse: "Great Emperesse of the North, admired Queen / Thy like in Britain, hath never yet bene seene. / The Daughter, Wife and Sister to a King: / Greatnesse and Goodnesse from thy Grace doth Spring."

seen spelled out in a curling ribbon in the top-right corner, with the Danish Royal Arms in the opposite corner (figure 1.40).²⁰⁷ Around this time too, Van de Passe produced an engraved silver portrait medal of Anna, which was again based on the Woburn pattern, with the reverse bearing her motto on a scroll (figures 1.45, 1.46).²⁰⁸

In addition to colouring her visual image, Anna had her motto, along with her letters and crown, embroidered on suites of hangings and on her clothing, which is discussed in Chapter Three. By repeatedly having her motto, initials, or the Danish arms painted on her portraits, engraved on her medals, and stitched onto her soft furnishings, Anna drew attention to her individual person and her natal identity, rather than referencing what would perhaps be more commonly expected of a queen consort: her husband James and her marital country of England. Indeed, under the crowned, full-bearing pine tree on the reverse of the medal that was issued on the occasion of her death is a swirling ribbon that bears Anna's Italian motto, testifying to the fact that by 1619 it had become indelibly linked to her visual persona (figures 1.58, 1.59).²⁰⁹ While Anna employed aspects of her natal lineage in her visual persona, especially around the years 1612-1614, it is worth pointing out that she was not unique in this manner, and other English queens consort looked to their natal lineage as a point of identity. An example is found with Anna's successor, Henrietta Maria (1609-1669), who as a French Bourbon princess chose to have the fleur-de-lis incorporated into the

²⁰⁷ Hind, *Engraving in England*, vol. 2, 115-20, 132, no.26, pl.64b.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 279, cat. no.4, pl.164f. This medal was also part of a series that included a pendant medal of James and a group portrait of James, Anna, and Charles as Prince of Wales. The set also included portrait medals of Elizabeth I, Frederick V, Count Palatine (1596-1632) and a group portrait of Frederick V with Elizabeth Stuart and their son Frederick Henry (1614-1629). All of the portraits were made from impressions on paper, so they were reversed. See *ibid.*, 278-79, nos.1-8, pls.164a-165f.

²⁰⁹ E. Hawkins, A. W. Franks, and H. A. Grueber, eds., *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, 4 vols., vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1885), 221, cat. no.75.

interior decoration at the Queen's House at Greenwich.²¹⁰ Furthermore, like Anna, Henrietta Maria included aspects of her natal identity in her visual self-representation. For example, in her full-length portrait by Sir Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) from 1637 (Schlossmuseum, Oranienburg), the Caroline queen appears in robes of state with the pearls on her bodice configured into the fleur-de-lis, which works to underscore her position as a member of the Bourbon dynasty. It should be pointed out, however, that Henrietta Maria is not known to have had a personal motto.²¹¹

From 1614 onwards, Anna strategically used her personal motto as a way of announcing her difference from James, his policies, and his court. As such, her motto appears in her portraits and on her personal belongings. Wood has even gone so far as to propose that it may have been "a claim to a 'divine right of queens' on her own account rather than James's," while Hearn states that it was "an assertion of her independence from her husband James, from whom she was by now [1614] estranged."²¹² As mentioned above, the available evidence does not indicate that Anna and James were never "estranged," and furthermore, when Anna's motto is considered within James's formulation of the Divine Right of Kings, it assumes an adroit ambiguity.

James's opinion on the theory of divine-right monarchy was first articulated in his 1598 treatise, *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*. As Jenny Wormald argues, James did not espouse autocracy or absolutism, but sought to reject contractual kingship on the grounds

²¹⁰ Susan Alexander Sykes, "Henrietta Maria's 'house of delight': French Influence and Iconography in the Queen's House, Greenwich," *Apollo* 133 (1991): 332-33.

²¹¹ My thanks to Erin Griffey for discussing these points with me. For the portrait see Griffey, "Devotional Jewellery," 180.

²¹² Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 51; Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts*, 35; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 26.

that kings preceded parliaments, and therefore should be seen as the original and true makers of law.²¹³ He wholly believed, however, that his position as the legitimate reigning king of England was expressly ordained by God, and as such, that he was answerable only to God.²¹⁴ As well as receiving literary expression, James's view of kingship coloured his visual persona and his c.1620 portrait by Van Somer is a clear pictorial statement of his supreme secular power and authority (figure 1.56). Presented in full-length format, the crowned king of England is magnificently attired in robes of state, and is shown holding out the orb and sceptre as explicit symbols of his kingship. Further regal posturing is found in the inclusion of the traditional motto of the English monarchy emblazoned across the window panes in the background. In line with the king's advocacy of monarchical divinity, therefore, Anna's motto could be seen to celebrate James as God's appointed ruler and "most high" on earth, or it could illustrate her threefold connection to royal power through her bloodlines, her marriage, and her success in bearing children. However, regardless of how the motto is interpreted, it is important within Anna's personal iconography as a self-confident gesture. In combination with the representational jewels, Anna's personal motto registers a decided move away from her earlier pendant portraits, where she appears as a subsidiary extension of her husband. Anna's decision to include visual links to her natal lineage, between 1612 and 1614, should be read as a response to court politicking and her attempt to distinguish herself from the king and his favoured Howard-Carr faction.

²¹³ Jenny Wormald, "James VI and I (1566–1625)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/14592> (accessed 4 February 2014).

²¹⁴ Jane Rickard, *Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 90-91.

Iconographic Developments: The Portraits by Paul van Somer

The discussion of the Woburn portrait indicates that Anna marshalled portraiture to express her distance from James. She achieved this by selecting different artists from her husband; by highlighting her distinct cultural interests; and by announcing her prestigious position as a member of the House of Oldenburg and the Pembroke-Southampton network, a Habsburg descendant, and heir to Elizabeth I's visual legacy. This visual persona is even more explicitly articulated in the full-length hunting portrait by Van Somer from 1617 (figure 1.60). Anna's choice of Van Somer, who has been labelled by Barroll as "the most advanced painter in England before the coming of Mytens and Van Dyck," can be seen to parallel her preference for the comparatively advanced, continental style of Oliver for her portrait in miniature.²¹⁵ In the last two years of Anna's life, Van Somer produced a number of portraits for her personal use (rather than for the king or for gifts), and he later worked for James as well. After Anna's death, Van Somer was paid the large sum of £170 on 4 February 1620 "for diverse pictures by him made for the late Queenes Majestie."²¹⁶ It is probable that the hunting portrait was included in this bill along with the other autograph full-length portrait of Anna by Van Somer, which features the queen in front of an architectural fantasy that was painted by another artist (figure 1.54).²¹⁷ I would contend that the same bill, from 1620,

²¹⁵ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 58.

²¹⁶ Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 48, citing TNA: PRO, E351/544, f.117v.

²¹⁷ Oliver Millar, *The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (London: Phaidon Press, 1963), 81-3, cat. nos.106, 110; Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 48. Millar and Wood posit that the version in the Royal Collection at Holyroodhouse (RCIN 401177) was painted after Van Somer, but it is unclear whether it was posthumous, while the version at Drumlanrig is thought by both scholars to have been painted after Anna's death (Collection of the Duke of Buccleuch). Other copies after the Van Somer type are found in the full-length version in the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts and the two bust length portraits in feigned ovals held in the collection of the National Portrait Gallery in London (NPG 127) and the National Trust (Warwick Shire Hall). The Photographic Reference Archive at the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh contains details of additional versions after the Van Somer type with full-length versions being held at Gripsholm, Sweden (Sph II 7-74), and at Euston Hall (Collection of the Duke of Grafton) (Sph II 7-71). One further version is recorded in the Photographic Reference Archive at the National Portrait Gallery, London, which was last documented in the collection of Hirschl and Adler, New York.

also likely included Van Somer's portrait of the queen's long-standing ally at court, the Earl of Pembroke, which is currently in the Royal Collection in London (figure 1.61).

Dated 1617, Van Somer's portrait was presumably commissioned to mark Pembroke's appointment as Lord Chamberlain on 23 December 1615, as he is shown holding the white staff and key of office.²¹⁸ Pembroke had been Anna's original candidate for the position following Northampton's death in July 1614, but James chose to settle the office on his favourite Robert Carr.²¹⁹ Following Carr's fall, Pembroke was awarded the coveted position. I would suggest that the Van Somer portrait was commissioned by Anna to mark her triumph over the Howard-Carr faction. Anna's connection to the portrait is further confirmed by the inventory of Oatlands Palace taken on 7 October 1617, which includes an entry for "The Lo: Chamberlaine Pembrookes picture" hanging in the gallery alongside Anna's own hunting portrait (figure 1.60).²²⁰ Furthermore, Pembroke's portrait does not feature in the inventory taken of Oatlands the previous October, which indicates that Anna acquired the portrait sometime in 1617. The close proximity of the two portraits and their presence in the gallery where they would have been seen by a large volume of people, shows that Anna was intentionally looking to draw a connection between herself and Pembroke. Rather than entering the Royal Collection through James, as it is supposed, I would argue that Van Somer's portrait of Pembroke descends from Anna.²²¹

²¹⁸ Slater, "Herbert, William, third Earl of Pembroke," *ODNB* (accessed 8 June 2013).

²¹⁹ *Ibid.* Somerset's appointment upset Anna, and Chamberlain remarked that "the Queen doth pretend a promise for the Earl of Pembroke," TNA: PRO, SP 14/77, fol.106: letter to Carleton, 30 June 1614; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 144.

²²⁰ ESRO Glynde MS 319, fol.8r.

²²¹ On the subsequent history of the portrait see Oliver Millar, "A Little Known Portrait by Paul van Somer," *BM* 92 (1950): 294, who notes that it was hanging at Oatlands in 1651 when the Parliamentary commissioners valued the work and sold it for £6 to Captain Stone. The painting was returned to the Crown at the Restoration, and it hung at Whitehall during the reign of Charles II (r.1660-1685).

As well as producing portraits for Anna in the late 1610s, Van Somer later provided James with a new image in 1618 (figure 1.62), and was paid £60 in the first week of May “for diverse pictures by him made for his Mat^y.”²²² I would suggest that James’s decision to commission a new portrait in 1618 was prompted by Van Somer’s hunting portrait of Anna that the king would have seen at Oatlands. Up until this point, the type that De Critz had established of James in c.1605, which broadcast generic notions of princely magnificence, had remained the king’s standard royal image (figures 1.19, 1.21-1.23). By 1618, as Kevin Sharpe suggests, James may have been under the influence of Anna’s “artistic tastes and knowledge,” which saw him decide to sit to Van Somer even though De Critz was still under his employ.²²³ Unlike the very idiosyncratic imaging of Anna, however, Van Somer produced a comparatively formulaic image of majesty for the king, which suggests that James’s position may have limited his mode of portrayal. On the other hand, in comparison to the earlier De Critz type, Van Somer’s portrait is infinitely more magisterial. James is shown standing in a characterless interior and resting his left hand on a table that bears the traditional symbols of majesty: crown, orb, and sceptre. Further prestige is accorded to the king through the insignia of the chivalrous Order of the Garter with the blue Garter riband, hanging Garter badge, and the jewelled Garter around his left leg. On the floor to his right lies a suit of Greenwich armour, which as Millar notes, bears James’s initials *IR*, while the king himself is shown wearing the gorget of this armour under his circular ruff.²²⁴ Further militaristic posturing is found in the sword slung around his waist, and in light of James’s ardent pacifism there is no doubt that this new and comparatively combatant image was intended for a public, and indeed, an international audience. Although this specific portrait

²²² Auerbach, *Tudor Artists*, 134, citing TNA: PRO, AO 1/390/55.

²²³ Sharpe, *Image Wars*, 61.

²²⁴ Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, vol. 1, 80, cat. no.103, plate 43. On this image type see also Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, vol. 1, 179, plate 352.

is known to have hung in the Bear Gallery at Whitehall during the reign of Charles I, the large number of existing copies and variants testify to the popularity of this image and its status as the new official image of the king.²²⁵ While Van Somer's portrait is a successful imaging of regal heroism and military might, it is nonetheless configured in the standardised, international language of court portraiture that was used earlier by De Critz. As such, it appears somewhat staid and formulaic in comparison to the very distinctive and allegorical portrait that Van Somer conceived for Anna.

In the same manner as the earlier Woburn portrait (figure 1.33), Anna's hunting portrait from 1617 (figure 1.60) includes references to her building projects and her horticultural patronage. In the present portrait, however, the link is much more explicit as the background opens onto a recognisable section of Anna's palace of Oatlands, complete with the new vineyard that she had planted on the south side of the privy gardens, and the classical stone gate that she commissioned from Jones.²²⁶ In this respect it has parallels with James's later portrait by Van Somer, where the Banqueting House that the king commissioned from Jones, is visible through the window (figure 1.56). In this, James may have been influenced by Anna's earlier hunting portrait. However, where Anna's portrait commemorates completed projects, James's portrait was completed before the Banqueting House. This points to James's enthusiasm to be depicted alongside his building endeavours, and his understanding of the magnificence that accompanied architectural patronage. Given that Van Somer's painting was a state portrait destined for reproduction and dissemination, James was clearly looking to promote not only his wealth and regal standing, but his cultural sophistication in bringing classicism to the physical heart of London. As a result of James's

²²⁵ Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, vol. 1, 80-81., cat. no.103.

²²⁶ Howard M. Colvin, *The History of the King's Works*, vol. IV (1485-1660) (London: H.M.S.O, 1982), 212.

eagerness though, there are some inconsistencies between the painted representation and the physical building. In both portraits the buildings are relegated to the background, although Anna believably occupies the same environment as her palace, which heightens the impression of her control and ownership.

That Anna held the hunting portrait in special regard is confirmed by the fact that it was her only life-size portrait known to have been displayed at Oatlands.²²⁷ The painting is recorded in the inventory of the palace that was compiled in 1617 as “Her maiesties owne picture with her horse by her done at large” and hanging “in y^e gallery next to y^e vineyard.”²²⁸ It is worth considering why Anna chose to hang such an important commission at Oatlands, which was around 48 kilometres from the centre of London, rather than at her principal palace of Denmark House. It is conceivable that showcasing such a confident portrait at a main residence would have been considered inappropriate due to the large number of English elites, courtiers, and foreign dignitaries who would have seen it. Thus, the mode of portrayal was possibly sanctioned in part by its display at a lesser residence.

In the hunting portrait, Anna is positioned as she was in the Woburn portrait, standing in the right-hand side of the canvas and orientated to the left. This eschews the potential for the portrait to be seen as a counterwork to an image of James. Dressed for the hunt, with her right arm authoritatively akimbo, and with running deer in the middle distance, Anna can be seen to embody Diana: virginal goddess of the hunt, powerful guardian of women, and lunar

²²⁷ Wood, “Portraits of Anne of Denmark,” 48. The vineyard and Jones’s gate are discussed in detail in Chapter Three below.

²²⁸ ESRO Glynde MS 317; also quoted in *ibid*, and in Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 31. It only hung in the gallery for less than a year, however, before being sent to Prince Charles at St James’s on 8 March 1618. A marginal notation in ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.7r, reads “Sent to the prinz in S^t: Jaymes 8 Mar 1618.” Also cited by Wood, “Portraits of Anne of Denmark,” 48.

deity. Knowles asserts that this association would have been made more apparent by the fact that it hung directly opposite the painting *Diana and her Nymphs*, by Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) and Frans Snyders (1579-1657), which remains in the Royal Collection (figure 1.63).²²⁹ This cannot be correct, however, for the paintings hung in different galleries. In the inventory of 1616, Rubens and Snyders's painting was hanging in the South or "Garden Stone" Gallery, but the inventory of the following year shows that it had been moved to the North Gallery while Anna's portrait was now listed in the South Gallery.²³⁰ Nevertheless, by aligning herself with Diana, Anna effectively joined a lineage of powerful women who identified with the goddess and employed Diana iconography.²³¹ This included Diane de Poitiers (1499-1566) and, more importantly, Elizabeth I, whose visual legacy, as noted above, served as a model of emulation for Anna.²³² The connection to Elizabeth would have been underscored by the fact that the hunting portrait was strategically placed next to a portrait of the deceased Tudor queen.²³³ In the following reign, the circle of elite women who identified with Diana was extended to include Henrietta Maria and the Countess of Arundel.²³⁴ Anna's decision to align herself with the chaste huntress casts her as a paradigm

²²⁹ Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 31.

²³⁰ ESRO Glynde MS 315 (inventory of 1616); ESRO Glynde MS 319, fols. 7r, 8r (inventory of 1617).

²³¹ Chew, "Countess of Arundel and Tart Hall," 301. I am indebted to Chew for this interpretation. While Chew makes no mention of Anna, her discussion of the possible meanings behind Aletheia Talbot's use of the Diana myth at Tart Hall has informed my reading of Anna's hunting portrait from 1617.

²³² *Ibid.*, 301, 313, note 74; Strong, *Gloriana*, 125-28. Barkan states that Elizabeth was "frequently mythologised as Diana," and provides the example of the inscription at the entrance to Whitehall Park, which explicitly referred to Elizabeth as Diana, while at Nonsuch, Elizabeth had "a fountain celebrating chastity" that bore a sculpted scene of Diana and Actaeon. He also reads Jonson's play *Cynthia's Revels* (1600) as a reconfiguration of the Diana and Actaeon myth in order to comment on contemporary politics, see Leonard Barkan, "Diana and Actaeon: The Myth as Synthesis," *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 332-35. Furthermore, the entertainment that Jonson penned on the occasion of Anna's progress to England in 1603 announced that Anna would "exceede, whom she succeeds, our late Diana," as quoted in Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 18. For an in-depth discussion of Diane de Poitiers's equivocation with Diana, and the ways in which such an ideology could be used against her, see Sheila Ffolliott, "Casting a Rival into the Shade: Catherine De' Medici and Diane De Poitiers," *Art Journal* 48 (1989).

²³³ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol. 7r. On the political significance of portrait arrangements see Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," 215-17.

²³⁴ For Lady Arundel's use of Diana iconography see Chew, "Countess of Arundel and Tart Hall," 301-303. On Henrietta Maria's use of Diana imagery see Sykes, "'house of delight,'" 335. For a discussion of the ways in

of female virtue. It also casts her as an autonomous, powerful woman, which is reinforced through the considered placement of the portrait, and her traditionally masculine pose.

Standing authoritatively beyond the walls of Oatlands, Anna is accompanied by a richly caparisoned horse and a liveried servant. The queen stands in an unusual pose with her right arm akimbo, which Joaneath Spicer states was “indicative of boldness or control.”²³⁵

This posture was almost exclusively reserved for male sitters and, according to Zirka Filipczak, it even functioned as an indicator of gender.²³⁶ Filipczak writes that when occasionally seen in female portraits, it was common for the other hand to counter its inherent masculinity by being overtly feminine, or for the sitter to be shown with female props and an affable expression.²³⁷ This is not the case in the hunting portrait, however, where accessories and pose reinforce rather than temper the manliness of Anna’s resolutely akimbo elbow. Anna is seen wearing a “masculine type of hat” while her left hand transgresses gender norms, just as casually as her right, since it is seen controlling five Italian greyhounds.²³⁸ This type of display is more typically associated with portraits of noble males, wherein the control of animals metaphorically implies that the sitter is in control of

which seventeenth-century women in France, England, and Italy incorporated and invoked the mythologised figures of Diana, Flora, and Venus in their visual and written imagery see Susan Shifrin, “‘A Copy of My Countenance’: Biography, Iconography, and Likeness in the Portraits of the Duchess Mazarin and Her Circle” (PhD diss., Bryn Mawr College, 1998), 176-224.

²³⁵ Joaneath Spicer, “The Renaissance Elbow,” in *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, ed. Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (London: Polity Press, 1991), 85.

²³⁶ Zirka Zaremba Filipczak, “Portraits of Women Who ‘Do Not Keep Strictly to the Masculine and Feminine Genders, as They Call Them’,” in *Pokerfaced: Flemish and Dutch Baroque Faces Unveiled*, ed. Katlijne Van der Stighelen, Hannelore Magnus and Bert Watteeuw (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2010), 231.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 233.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 231.

their own passions and, by extension, is fit to rule over others.²³⁹ In Van Somer's portrait, Anna pictorially claims these qualities for herself.

Anna's authoritative pretension may be accounted for by political context. The previous year had seen James officially change the name of Anna's main palace to Denmark House, thereby acknowledging her command over her own court. This explicitly evidences the polycentric structure of the Jacobean court where separate centres amicably co-existed. Perhaps more significantly, however, in the same year the hunting portrait was painted (1617), James embarked on his Scottish progress, leaving a six-person council to rule in his place, which included Anna.²⁴⁰ Writing to the Doge and Senate on 19 January 1617, the Venetian Secretary, Giovanni Battista Lionello, reports that "a council of six persons will be set up for the governance of England, comprising the queen, the prince, the archbishop of Canterbury [George Abbot], the lord Chancellor [Francis Bacon], the lord Treasurer [Thomas Howard, 1st Earl of Suffolk] and the earl of Worcester [Edward Somerset]." ²⁴¹

Interestingly though, precedent existed for queens consort to act as regent in the event of the king's absence from England. During Henry VIII's military campaigns in France, for example, he chose to appoint his wife Regent, leaving Katherine of Aragon in charge in 1513, and then according the same power to Catherine Parr (1512-1548) in 1544.²⁴² Charles

²³⁹ Raatschen makes a similar argument in relation to Van Dyck's hunting portrait of Henrietta Maria with her dwarf Jeffery Hudson from 1632, see "Merely Ornamental? Van Dyck's Portraits of Henrietta Maria," 159. Hallam also observes that "the black attendant in the Van Somer portrait can be seen as... a sign of the queen's rank and... the animals in the portrait are likewise bound to service," which leads her to deduce that "both human and animal... [are] tamed, i.e. under control, we must also acknowledge that they are in the control of the queen," see Hallam, "Re-Presenting Women," 299-300.

²⁴⁰ James arrived in Scotland on 13 May 1617. He left Scotland on 4 August 1617, arriving back in London on 15 September, see Nichols, *Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities*, vol. 3, 300, 390, 436.

²⁴¹ CSPV, vol. 14, 412, no. 602.

²⁴² McManus, "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court," 85.

I later followed Henry's example, assigning regency to Henrietta Maria during his Scottish progress in 1641.²⁴³ It is possible that Anna petitioned James to allow her sole authority over political matters in his absence in 1617. Indeed, Chamberlain's letter to Carleton, of 4 January 1617, includes the telling observation that "the Quene removed yesterday to Whitehall from Somerset House y^t beeing suspected that she dreames and aimes at a Regencie during the Kings absence in Scotland."²⁴⁴ James's decision to deny Anna regency could have been an attempt to curb her power and influence. It is perhaps significant that James chose to take Southampton with him to Scotland, thereby ensuring that Anna was without a leading member of her faction during his progress.²⁴⁵ Yet, had James been concerned about Anna's political power and aspirations, he would have been unlikely to assign her a ruling opinion in his absence, or to allow for the council to comprise any of her supporters. Surely, he would have been under no obligation to do so.

More logically, I would suggest that James's decision to appoint a ruling council rather than a regent aligns with his pacific approach to foreign, domestic – and within that, factional – politics. The composition of the council is telling in this regard, for it shows James judiciously crafting a balanced group. On the one hand, Suffolk had been one of James's most important and reliable privy councillors and he was a central member of the Howard faction, securing a dominant position at court with the marriage of his daughter Frances Howard, to the king's favourite Robert Carr. By the time of James's progress, however, Suffolk's position at court had started to weaken. Frances and Carr had been imprisoned in

²⁴³ Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Longman, 2005), 292-94.

²⁴⁴ Norman Egbert McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols., vol. 2, (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), 47, no. 256; also noted by McManus, "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court," 85.

²⁴⁵ Honan, "Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton," *ODNB* (accessed 30 August, 2014).

the Tower since May 1616 for their part in the Overbury scandal and Buckingham had begun to displace Carr in James's affections since around August 1615, with Fenton reporting in September that Suffolk was "not in such friendship with our great man [Buckingham] as he was, nor so much caressed by the his Majesty as I think he could wish."²⁴⁶ Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was in a better position with James. A trusted Attorney-General, by the time of the progress he was also a privy councillor, and was made Lord Keeper in March 1617 just weeks before James's departure. Bacon appears to have been originally aligned with Howards, or at the very least, was canny enough to support those in greatest favour with the king. Certainly, he was involved in Carr's wedding celebrations, sponsoring *The Masque of Flowers*, which was performed at Whitehall on Twelfth Night at a personal cost of £2000.²⁴⁷ Shortly thereafter though, Bacon, as Attorney-General, led the trial against Carr in the Star Chamber, and he concurrently became close to Villiers, attributing his coveted position as Lord Keeper to the favourite.²⁴⁸ On the other hand, Abbot was a known ally of Anna's and was distinctly anti-Howard.²⁴⁹ In August 1613 Fenton observed that he was "exceeding partial against the Chamberlain [Suffolk]", and Abbot played a role, along with Anna, in the plot to supplant Carr with Villiers.²⁵⁰ Worcester too had connections to Anna, having accompanied her to Bath in 1613, and his son Thomas Somerset (1579-1649) was

²⁴⁶ Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*, 139; Pauline Croft, "Howard, Thomas, 1st Earl of Suffolk (1561–1626)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/13942> (accessed 16 April 2015); Paton, ed., *Manuscripts of Mar and Kellie*, 80, letter from Thomas, Viscount Fenton to John, Earl of Mar: 18 September 1617.

²⁴⁷ Alison Scott, *Selfish Gifts: The Politics of Exchange and English Courtly Literature, 1580-1628* (Madison N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006), 175-76; Lisa Jardine and Alan Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune: The Troubled Life of Francis Bacon, 1561-1626* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1998), 335, 343-44; Jerzy Limon, *The Masque of Stuart Culture* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990), 157, 185-86.

²⁴⁸ Jardine and Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune*, 355, 359-61, 373, 386-87, 393.

²⁴⁹ Kenneth Fincham, "Abbot, George (1562–1633)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/4> (accessed 16 April 2015).

²⁵⁰ Paton, ed., *Manuscripts of Mar and Kellie*, 53, letter from Thomas, Viscount Fenton to John, Earl of Mar: 15 August 1613; see also Jardine and Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune*, 357.

Anna's Master of the Horse, a position he held since the beginning of the reign.²⁵¹

Moreover, contemporary correspondence indicates all of the meetings were held at Anna's residence of Greenwich Palace with Chamberlain reporting that

Most of the counsaile kepe there [Greenwich] about her [Anna], saving such as have necessarie attendance at the terme, and those come still on Saterdag night and tary Sondag. The rest are only absent on Star-chamber dayes, which have ben few or none this terme.²⁵²

This was not the first time that Anna presided over council meetings. Early in the reign, James had decreed that during his absences from London for "open air and exercise," the Privy Council was to assemble "once every weeke... in such places as our dearest wife shall keepe her Courte." Although Cecil was the main recipient for James's letters, Anna evidently played a role in keeping lines of communication open, for as well as the council meeting at her residence, the king added that the purpose of meeting at Anna's residence was to ensure that the councillors "Know some certaine place where they shall receive dispatch in all those things, w[hi]ch doe depend upon our owne directions to you."²⁵³

Although Anna did hold a position of political importance during James's absences from London, scholars have been too quick to see her role during James's 1617 progress as one of sovereignty and triumph. Roper, for example, concludes that "Anna had effective charge of the English government for much of 1617," when she "ruled in conjunction with Prince Charles... [and] her allies."²⁵⁴ Similarly, Hallam notes a connection between the date of Van

²⁵¹ Pauline Croft, "Somerset, Edward, 4th Earl of Worcester (c.1550–1628)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/26005> (accessed 16 April 2015); TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; TNA: PRO, JASI/1646; TNA: PRO SC6/JASI/1648; TNA: PRO SC6/JASI/1650; TNA: PRO SC6/JASI/1653; TNA: PRO SC6/JASI/1655.

²⁵² McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 2, 76, no.266: London, 24 May 1617; also quoted in McManus, "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court," 86.

²⁵³ TNA: PRO SP14/12, fols.19r-v (9 January 1605); Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*, 56-57.

²⁵⁴ Roper, "Unmasquing the Connections," 51. Roper incorrectly identifies the Lord Chancellor as being Sir Thomas Egerton, 1st Baron Ellesmere (1540-1617), who he states was connected to Pembroke, and therefore

Somer's commanding hunting portrait and James's progress, which she sees as evidence that Anna "sought assignment as Regent on his [James's] behalf" and that she "usurped male masculine prerogatives, including the government of others."²⁵⁵ It is important to remember that precedent existed for James to grant Anna regency, and his decision to place her on a ruling council indicates that she did not have sole authority during his absence. However, I would suggest that Anna exercised a level of control on the ruling council, for it contained a number of her associates, and all business was exclusively carried out at her residence.

In addition to Anna's decision to commission the assertive hunting portrait in 1617, further evidence of her authoritative posturing at this time, can be seen in Robert White's (*fl.*1617) courtly entertainment *Cupid's Banishment*, which was performed for the queen during James's absence, at Greenwich Palace on 4 May 1617. Analysing this performance, McManus highlights the fact that Anna appropriated James's physical position as the chief spectator and that, even more pointedly, this was the only time throughout the Jacobean reign that someone other than James was seen to occupy that privileged role.²⁵⁶

In consideration of the political context, Hallam looks to Anna's masculine pose and her declared control over man and animal in the hunting portrait and concludes that "Van Somer's portrait is testimony to a woman's successful sovereignty," claiming that "the Queen's court at Greenwich was not simply an inconsequential female alternative to the

to Anna. However, Ellesmere resigned from the post on 6 March 1617, and died on 15 March, and so cannot have been part of the council. On 7 March 1617, the Keepership was awarded to Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam and later Viscount St Alban, who held the post until 1621 and was part of the ruling council during James's progress. See Jardine and Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune*, 393.

²⁵⁵ Hallam, "Re-Presenting Women," 299-300.

²⁵⁶ McManus, "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court," 85.

court at Whitehall, but a secondary site of royal authority.”²⁵⁷ In my view, this is taking Anna’s articulation of independence a little too far. Anna was not queen regnant, and neither did she rule England in her husband’s absence. Rather, she remained firmly under James in the hierarchy of the Jacobean court. While she exhibited differences in opinion, factional alignment, and artistic patronage to James, I have found no evidence to suggest that she ever openly challenged the king, or that James viewed their differences as a point of contention. As I argue above, polycentrism was a central feature of Jacobean court culture, and the pair remained aligned on aspects of foreign policy such as the pursuit of an Anglo-Spanish marriage alliance.

Hallam’s overtly feminist reading of the hunting portrait seems to be based to some extent on Stephen Orgel’s interpretation of the painting, which he discusses in the context of James’s counsel to the London clergy in 1620.²⁵⁸ Writing to Carleton on 24 January 1620 that “the world is very far out of order,” Chamberlain reports that James had requested members of the London clergy to “inveigh vehemently and bitterly in theyre sermons” against women who wore “brode brimd hats, pointed doblets, theyre haire cut short or shorne.”²⁵⁹ Orgel expressly connects James’s admonition with Anna’s “broad-brimmed hat, short hair, pointed doublet and yellow ruffs” seen in her “roughly contemporary” hunting portrait and suggests that “the real object of King James’s outburst” was in fact Anna’s choice of fashion.²⁶⁰ This is a somewhat fanciful reading, however, considering the portrait was painted three years earlier and that Anna herself had passed away in March of the

²⁵⁷ Hallam, “Re-Presenting Women,” 300, citing *ibid.*, 84-89.

²⁵⁸ Stephen Orgel, *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge, England; New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 83-87, 94-96, 98-100.

²⁵⁹ Quoted in *ibid.*, 83-84, citing McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 2, 286-87, 294.

²⁶⁰ Orgel, *Impersonations*, 84.

previous year. Furthermore, in Van Somer's portrait, Anna's hair is not "short" but is set in a tight coiffure with a lovelock trailing over her left shoulder (figure 1.64). Tied with a small red bow, this style had repeatedly appeared in visual representations of the queen since around 1605 (figures 1.6-1.10, 1.41, 1.54, 1.58). Similarly, pointed bodices, like that worn by Anna in Van Somer's portrait, can be seen in portraits of the queen from as early as 1605 (figure 1.20). What is more, Anna's cuffs and wired collar are comprised of very fine white lace that cannot be misconstrued as yellow, especially when set against portraits of sitters who are most definitely wearing starched yellow lace, such as Van Somer's portrait of Elizabeth Countess of Kellie from around 1619 (figure 1.65).²⁶¹ In Van Somer's hunting portrait, it is clear that Anna cuts a bold and commanding figure. The extent of Anna's confident posturing has been exaggerated by literary scholars though, and it should be remembered that the portrait was relegated to the queen's lesser palace of Oatlands. Like the Woburn portrait before it, however, Anna is again expressing her difference from James. Here she is celebrated as an authoritative woman and an architectural patron with a proclivity for the Italianate.

The Italianate Element

In his nuanced discussion of Anna's personalised image of royalty, Knowles rightly discerns "an element of self-conscious internationalism" in her patronage that he further defines as

²⁶¹ Orgel's reference for this statement is Graham Reynolds, *Costume of the Western World: Elizabethan and Jacobean, 1558-1625*, ed. James Laver (London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1951), 21. Reynolds does state that "the lace of the ruff and the cuffs and round the yoke of the bodice is dyed with saffron," but as I have argued, the lace on Anna's dress is decidedly white. This is confirmed by the comparison noted above, and by the fact that the numerous copies after this portrait (see for example the versions in the Royal Collection, London RCIN #403253 and that at Lamport Hall, Collection of the Trustees), which are almost exact in terms of costume depict Anna with very white lace trimmings.

being a consistent “interest in Italian culture.”²⁶² Aside from Knowles though, this facet of Anna’s cultural activities has not been investigated or sufficiently recognised by scholars. In Van Somer’s portrait from 1617, it is visually implied by way of Jones’s classicising gateway, Anna’s five Italian greyhounds, and her personal motto *La mia grandezza dal eccelso* that is etched across the sky (figure 1.50).²⁶³ A preference for the Italianate also appears to have informed Anna’s decision to support certain poets, playwrights, designers, and artists, as well as encouraging her to add Italian to her repertoire of languages. In addition to choosing Italian for her motto, rather than the customary Latin, evidence suggests that Anna was conversant in the language. Following Giacomo Castelvetro (1546-1616), the Italian linguist John Florio (1553-1625), who was a Groom of the Privy Chamber, was hired as her Italian reader and tutor.²⁶⁴ He also supplied Anna with numerous Italian volumes, which are discussed in Chapter Three. Further evidence of Anna’s proficiency is found in an extant epistle to the Danish diplomat Jonas Charisius (1571-1619), which is executed in Italian, while Foscarini and Correr claim that in response to Christian IV’s gift of the “C4” jewel in June 1611, “the Queen replied in Italian, by her own hand, wishing him all success, declaring she desired nothing more than to see the increase of his glory and his State.”²⁶⁵

The Italianate aspect of Anna’s patronage serves to further distinguish her from James’s tastes and interests, which were coloured by theology, poetry, hunting, “learning and

²⁶² Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 27.

²⁶³ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 206., cat. no.139. The identification of the dogs as Italian Greyhounds was originally made by Oliver Millar in 1963, see Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, vol. 1, 81, cat. no.105. Jones’s classicising gateway that is commemorated in this portrait is discussed in Chapter Three below.

²⁶⁴ From 1604, Florio is listed as receiving an annual pension of £100, which was significantly higher than the seven other Grooms, who each received £60 per annum. Notably, another Groom, Daniel Bachelor, did receive an annual pension of £100 in addition to his wage. Florio appears regularly in Anna’s household accounts, continuing to receive his £100 annuity until 1618. See TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1650; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1653. On Florio’s position as Anna’s Italian tutor see also Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 27; Wade, “Queen’s Courts,” 56.

²⁶⁵ Wade, “Queen’s Courts,” 56; CSPV, vol. 12, 162, no.250.

debate.”²⁶⁶ Further, Anna’s knowledge of Italian also importantly contradicts the customary historic evaluation of the queen, which Roper summarises as a “feather-brained backer of expensive and frivolous court entertainments with no aptitude or understanding of court politics.”²⁶⁷ Although there is little concrete evidence concerning the nature of Anna’s education, her linguistic proficiency functions as a clear indicator of an intelligent and educated princess. Wade declares that by the time of her marriage, in 1589, Anna already knew Danish, German, and Latin.²⁶⁸ She had been learning French since March of that year, in order to have a common language with James and, following her remove to Edinburgh, she added English and Scots to her linguistic repertoire.²⁶⁹ Furthermore, during her time in England, as mentioned, Florio was enlisted to teach her Italian. Indeed, the Florentine diplomat Ottaviano Lotti (*d.*1634) states that Florio was “with the Queen all day long teaching her the Italian language and hearing her conversation on all subjects,” and that he was entrusted to write “all her most confidential letters.”²⁷⁰ Anna also appears to have had a genuine interest in literature, theatre, and poetry. In this, Anna again warrants comparison with Elizabeth I. The Tudor queen had the command of five languages and was an avid reader, who regularly received manuscripts and books as gifts. She wrote poems, treatises, and speeches, and was held in high regard by her tutors William Grindal (*d.*1548) and Roger Ascham (1515-1568).²⁷¹ Furthermore, Anna’s husband James is consistently celebrated as a literary great without rival, with Wormald summarising the king as “a remarkable phenomenon,” noting that he was a poet, a scholar, a translator, a politician, a

²⁶⁶ Jenny Wormald, “James VI and I: Two Kings or One?” *History* 68 (1983): 188, note 2; 205.

²⁶⁷ Roper, “Unmasquing the Connections,” 47.

²⁶⁸ Wade, “Queen’s Courts,” 56.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁰ Quoted in Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 27.

²⁷¹ Virginia Blain, Patricia Clements, and Isobel Grundy, eds., *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English: Women Writers from the Middle Ages to the Present* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1990), 335; Peter Beal and Grace Ioppolo, eds., *Elizabeth I and the Culture of Writing* (London: British Library, 2007), xiii.

political theorist, and a theologian.²⁷² It is perhaps testament to Anna's education and confidence that, despite having such an erudite husband, she was able to assert opinions, support factions, and patronise artisans that were not connected to James.

Anna's multilingualism and pronounced cultural interests were not unique at the Danish court. Anna's siblings were multi-linguists, important patrons of music, painting, and dance, and avid supporters of Northern European court festivals and the accompanying traditions of tournament pageants, allegorical fireworks, and mumming.²⁷³ Writing on the cultural significance of Anna's three sisters, Wade notes that once married, "these women presided over renowned courts which became celebrated for their patronage of the arts."²⁷⁴ Indeed, the decision to give royal women a sound humanist education seems to have been followed in the Northern European courts more generally. Certainly, Queen Christina of Sweden (1626-1689), was formidably educated and was renowned for her court academy, her extensive library, and her learned patronage. Like Anna, Christina was multilingual. She had 11 languages at her disposal, including the more uncommon Aramaic, Hebrew, and Arabic.²⁷⁵

²⁷² Wormald, "James VI and I," *ODNB*, accessed 4 February 2014.

²⁷³ On the education and cultural activities of Anna's siblings, see Mara Wade, *Triumphus Nuptialis Danicus. German Court Culture and Denmark: The Great Wedding of 1634* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996); "Queen's Courts"; ed. Pomp, *Power and Politics: Essays on German and Scandinavian Court Culture and Their Contexts* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004); "Duke Ulrik as Agent, Patron, Artist: Reframing Danish Court Culture in the International Perspective c.1600," in *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective*, ed. Michael Anderson, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen, and Hugo Johannsen (Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark, 2011). For Christian IV, see further Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, and various chapters in *Reframing the Danish Renaissance, passim*.

²⁷⁴ Wade, "Queen's Courts," 49. Wade concedes that "we do not know the course of study set out for the girls," but suggests that "the range and scope of his [Christian's] education can be used as an indicator for the type of education the other children must have received," *ibid.*, 54.

²⁷⁵ Susanna Akerman, *Queen Christina of Sweden and Her Circle: The Transformation of a Seventeenth-Century Philosophical Libertine* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 103-21.

It is significant that while Anna was fluent in a number of languages, it was Italian that captivated her attentions and coloured her patronage. As discussed above, she consistently favoured the Italian linguist Florio. She also patronised Samuel Daniel whose interest in neoclassical Italian literature was well known; this is likely to have been a factor in her decision to appoint him as “the Queen’s Poet,” and to commission pastoral plays from him.²⁷⁶ The Italianate element of her patronage also extends into the realm of theatre, for she chose to patronise the writer Thomas Campion (1567-1620) who, unlike Jonson (who was patronised by James), was heavily influenced by the Florentine *intermedi* and placed a greater emphasis on music and dance over poetry.²⁷⁷ As I discuss in Chapter Three, however, the Italianate does not appear to have informed Anna’s collection of paintings, which is marked by an interest in northern European works. The basis of Anna’s fondness for the Italianate is difficult to identify, but it may have been encouraged by her connection to the Earl of Southampton. Certainly, Southampton exhibited a passion for the language, having Florio in his “pay and patronage” as his Italian tutor since at least 1594.²⁷⁸ Park Honan also notes that together with Anna, the earl was one of the three dedicatees of Florio’s 1611 Italian-English dictionary entitled “Anna’s New World of Words.”²⁷⁹

Anna would also have been introduced to aspects of Italian culture during her childhood. The Danish court of her father, Frederik II, was frequently home to humanist drama, itinerant troupes, and elaborate celebrations featuring international dancers, musicians, and theatrical performers that included the renowned Italian dance master Matthias Zoega

²⁷⁶ Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 35; John Pitcher, ed., *Hymen’s Triumph*, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), x.

²⁷⁷ Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 35.

²⁷⁸ As quoted in Honan, “Wriothesley, Henry, third Earl of Southampton,” *ODNB*; A. L. Rowse, *Shakespeare’s Southampton: Patron of Virginia* (London: Macmillan, 1965), 134.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

(c.1545-c.1605).²⁸⁰ Anna's Danish childhood can certainly be credited with instilling in her a continued love for music, dance, theatre, and building.²⁸¹ Furthermore, it is likely that Anna's education, like her brother Christian's, was based on the system developed by the German humanist Johannes Sturm (1507-1589), which would have gone some way to familiarising her with the fundamentals of Italy's socio-cultural principles.²⁸² Christian himself seems to have been similarly captivated by Italian traditions and patronised composers, musicians, sculptors, and painters who had Italian training, or were knowledgeable about Italian courtly styles.²⁸³ In consideration of the Italian presence in Anna's wider patronage, the iconographic decision to include Italian greyhounds, her Italian motto, and classicising architectural detailing in the hunting portrait combine to make a pointed reference to Anna's individual cultural interests.

While Van Somer's portrait clearly highlights Anna's interest in the Italianate, it also symbolically attests to her being loyal, reliable, knowledgeable, and possessed of divinely ordained power (figure 1.60). Here, the viewer is immediately greeted with Anna's emphatically grandiose motto, which flutters across a darkened sky. Given significantly more prominence than preceding portraits, Anna announces that her power comes from her birth-right as a daughter of the House of Oldenburg, and is not solely derived through her husband. Illuminated by the sun burst, the oak tree bespeaks Anna's reliability and

²⁸⁰ Wade, *Triumphus Nupitalis Danicus*, 22-24, 34-35.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 22-24; "Queen's Courts," 55.

²⁸² Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 26-27.

²⁸³ Kristoffer Neville, "Christian IV's Italianates: Sculpture at the Danish Court," in *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective*, ed. Michael Anderson, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen, and Hugo Johannsen (Copenhagen: National Museum, 2011), 335-47; Metter Müller and Ole Kongsted, "Christian IV and Music," in Heiberg (ed.), *Christian IV and Europe*, 119-141. Some examples include the composers and musicians Vincentius Bertholusius (c.1550-1608), and Gregorius Trehou (c.1540-1619), the Kapellmeister Melchoir Borchgrevinck (c.1570-1632), the painter Gerrit van Honthorst (1592-1656), and the sculptors François Dieussart (c.1600-1661), and Adriaen de Vries (c.1556-1626).

constancy, while the perched owl, as the common attribute of Minerva, directly conflates queen with goddess and therefore, with the quality of wisdom.²⁸⁴ In addition to the owl, Anna's innate wisdom is seen in her virtue of self-rule and, by extension, her ability to rule over others. This is indicated by the obedient dogs, the tame caparisoned horse and the subsidiary male servant. Indeed, the presence of the Moorish figure heightens Anna's authority and regal stature: by gazing towards the queen with an air of servitude and adoration, he instructs the viewer to follow suit and pay deference to the queen consort of England.

Conclusion

In 1603, James and Anna were welcomed into England as the country's new king and queen consort. The first easel portraits of the new royal couple were commissioned from the king's Sergeant-Painter, John de Critz, around 1605 (figures 1.19, 1.20). In these full-length pendants, James and Anna are seen attired in sumptuous fabrics and jewels, and standing in an opulent interior, but without any identifying features, and few visual symbols of majesty. As pair portraits, they are expressly intended to be viewed together, and James occupies the privileged position on the dexter. Hanging side by side, De Critz's companion portraits work to announce that general qualities of material abundance and conjugality are the province of the new ruling family. Coming after the death of the single and childless Queen Elizabeth, these features would have been decisive in the success and popularity of the new reign.

In the much more private realm of miniature painting, however, Anna chose to independently patronise Isaac Oliver, while James opted to retain Elizabeth's limner

²⁸⁴ Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 31; Hearn, *Dynasties*, 206, cat. no.139.

Nicholas Hilliard. Oliver's Italo-Flemish style resulted in miniatures of the queen consort that appear comparatively modern in their use of softer modelling and shadowing (figures 1.4, 1.6-1.10, 1.29). This divergence in the choice of artists gradually spread to easel painting as well and, significantly, Anna moved away from the portraitist patronised by James. Over the course of the 1610s, Anna radically reconfigured her pictorial persona, and I argue that this decisive change was the result of her shifting position at court. The deaths of Robert Cecil and Prince Henry in 1612 deprived Anna of two key supporters, and cleared the way for the ascendancy of the Howard-Carr faction that was favoured by James. Subsequently, Anna aligned herself with the oppositional Pembroke-Southampton group and, over the course of the next two years, they worked to replace Robert Carr with George Villiers, and to fill court posts with their own clients. In addition, Anna opposed Northampton's application for the Keepership of Greenwich Park, hosted wedding celebrations to rival those of Carr and Frances Howard, and chose to patronise artists such as Marcus Gheeraerts and Paul van Somer, who were favoured by Southampton and Pembroke respectively, while Gheeraerts was also connected to Elizabeth.

Anna's altered position at court motivated her to craft a visual persona and a political stance that was distinct from that of James. Painted by Gheeraerts, rather than De Critz, the Woburn portrait from around 1614 (figure 1.33), provides the first example of Anna using portraiture to broadcast her difference from James. This is achieved in a number of significant ways. First, by standing in the right of the canvas and turned to the left, Anna occupies the side of greater power and prevents the portrait from being read as a pendant image to that of her husband. Second, jewelled ciphers of her mother Sofie, and her brother Christian IV underscore her position as a Danish princess and a member of the esteemed

Oldenburg dynasty. This familial connection is reinforced through the conspicuous red favour, which is similarly worn by Christian in his full-length portrait from the same year (figure 1.50), and which highlights their joint support for an Anglo-Spanish marriage match. Third, Anna's choice of Gheeraerts, who concurrently produced a similar portrait of the Earl of Southampton in terms of orientation and pose, announces her factional alignment with the oppositional group. Gheeraerts, however, was also favoured by Elizabeth, and Elizabethan elements of costume, pose, and surroundings are seen in the Woburn portrait. This works to align Anna with the visual iconography of England's former queen, thereby bequeathing her some of the cachet associated with Elizabeth. Lastly, the background details serve to commemorate her interests in architecture and garden design, which were not shared by James. By comparison, James's visual persona at this date (1614) continues to follow the standard type that De Critz had established for the king around 1605, which contains no references to his lineage, his royal status, or his interests (figures 1.19, 1.21-1.23). Executed in accordance with the traditional language of court portraiture, James is shown in generic interior settings, wearing rich clothing, lavish jewels, and Garter regalia. While he undoubtedly appears as a figure of high standing and great wealth, it is far removed from the highly personalised portrait of Anna at Woburn.

The concrete references to Anna's familial dynasty, learning, virtuosity, and cultural activities seen in the Woburn portrait are further consolidated in the last portrait that she commissioned: the full-length hunting portrait by Van Somer in 1617 (figure 1.60). Positioned on the hierarchic right with right arm akimbo, Anna appears dominant and authoritative. In the same manner as the Woburn portrait, this painting can be seen as a response to the specifics of Anna's socio-political milieu. Commissioned in the same year

that James completed his Scottish progress, the portrait commemorates the significant position that James granted Anna in his absence. Together with a council of five, Anna was to govern England while James was away. That she was able to hold a primary position in the council is supported by the fact that it comprised several of her allies, and that all meetings were held at her residence of Greenwich. Adding to Anna's strong position at the time of the portrait commission was James's recent decision to formally change the name of Anna's main London residence. Shifting from 'Somerset' to 'Denmark' House, the palace became immediately marked as the domain of the queen consort.

In the portrait of 1617, Van Somer depicts the queen consort in hunting attire, flanked by her caparisoned horse and liveried servant and surrounded by obedient dogs, while deer are clearly seen running in the middle distance. Consequently, Anna is positioned as Diana the virginal deity and common Elizabethan conceit, which casts Anna as the natural successor of Queen Elizabeth's powerful visual legacy. Positioned beneath her swirling Italian motto, with right arm resolutely akimbo, and her newly completed stone gateway and vineyard at Oatlands in the background, Van Somer's portrait offers a comprehensive summation of the English queen consort. It tells the viewer in no uncertain terms that Anna was possessed of an impeccable pedigree; that she was learned and wise; and crucially, that she was aesthetically and politically distinct from her husband King James. A year after Anna's hunting portrait was painted, James decided to reconfigure his visual image, and commissioned a full-length portrait from Van Somer (figure 1.62). Here, the viewer is greeted with explicit symbols of kingship in the golden orb, closed crown, and sceptre, and the work has a distinct element of militarism and chivalry through the presence of armour and Garter regalia. I suggest that Anna's innovative hunting portrait may have provided

impetus for James to update his own visual image at this time. Like the earlier portraits by De Critz, however, Van Somer's portrait of James, from 1618, is configured in line with the established visual language of court portraiture, and as such offers a very standardised image of kingship.

It is clearly apparent, therefore, that while the early English portraits of James and Anna by De Critz are united in their expression of the generic qualities of material wealth and elite status, the portraits completed of the royal couple throughout the 1610s are markedly different. Portraits of Anna completed during this decade testify to her natal lineage and cultural interests, while portraits of James remain comparatively conservative and formulaic. As I have argued, these differences are directly related to the changing socio-political climate of the Jacobean court, which motivated Anna to distance herself from the favourites, cultural interests, and policies advocated by James, and to craft a visual persona that expressed her alternative position. As I have maintained throughout this chapter, however, the available evidence does not suggest that James viewed this difference as a direct affront to the institution of the monarchy, or to himself personally. The royal couple continued to work together to achieve an Anglo-Spanish match, and James allowed Anna a noteworthy position in the English ruling council in 1617. There is also the likely possibility that Anna's alignment with the powerful anti-Howard network was politically beneficial to James, for it would have allowed him to maintain close ties to the competing factions. Further, James and Anna's divergent positions can be viewed as an example of the polycentricism that defined the Jacobean court.

Chapter Two: Dress and Jewellery

This chapter extends the exploration of Anna of Denmark's visual self-representation that was established in Chapter One by examining her personal adornment. Dress and jewellery are combined in this chapter, as they were a crucial and commonplace pairing in Jacobean England, where jewels were frequently incorporated into apparel, or were carefully chosen to complement and aggrandise the splendour of the wearer's clothing. As Smuts comments, "the medieval principle that power and prestige must always be expressed" continued in the Jacobean reign and was largely communicated by way of "precious metals, jewels and rich clothes."¹ Despite the inherent political facet of material magnificence, however, Anna's penchant for jewellery and dress has been repeatedly interpreted by scholars as evidence for concluding that she was "an extravagant consort" who merely "loved jewellery [and] fine clothes."² In this chapter though, I show that as a clear indicator of status and wealth, Anna's high level of adornment was decidedly strategic, and indeed, a necessity in matters of Jacobean diplomacy and ceremony. This chapter examines Anna's visual persona and contends that, like other areas of her agency, Anna's patronage of makers of luxury goods and her practice of gift-giving point to a queen consort who skilfully employed cultural avenues for political and aesthetic ends. I draw attention to Anna's use of physical adornment to express her position as a regal and illustrious member of the Stuart dynasty, while concurrently signalling her difference from James through her natal identity.

¹ Smuts, "Art and the Material Culture of Majesty," 90-91.

² Collins, *Jewels and Plate*, 167; Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 26.

As I argued in Chapter One, Anna's easel portraits attest to a queen consort whose adornment successfully communicated the power and prestige of her natal and marital courts. Trying to match the jewels and garments worn by Anna in her portraits to those listed in the documents, however, can be a frustrating task. Unlike paintings, there is a paucity of extant articles of jewellery and dress. The intrinsic value of precious metals and gemstones, in addition to the relative ease and speed with which jewels could be broken up, made into plate, refashioned, or sold, means that comparatively little survives from the Jacobean era, although the Cheapside Horde is an important exception.³ A similar fate has befallen royal garments from the period, for luxury fabrics were in themselves extremely costly, and were often woven from innately expensive materials such as gold or silver. Furthermore, clothing was frequently adorned with copious amounts of intricate and valuable embroidery and lace that was similarly made from precious metals as well as gold and/or silver buttons, tags, and aglets, meaning that garments were repeatedly reused and recycled.⁴ To this end, as far as female clothing was concerned, garments comprised a series of independent, detachable pieces so that pairs of hanging and wearing sleeves, bodices, skirts, foreparts, and kirtles could be easily removed and reassembled in order to quickly update ensembles in line with changing fashions.⁵ Fabrics were reused until they were worn out and it was often the case that, like jewellery, garments that were either new or worn were given away as a mark of personal favour.⁶

³ Collins, *Jewels and Plate*, 132; Forsyth, *Cheapside Horde*, 1-2.

⁴ Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: University Press, 2000), 25.

⁵ An example of this is found in the inventory of Anna's wardrobe goods from c.1608, where a "gowne the bodies of greene taff... The long Skirts of Silck grograne [silk grosgrain]" was accompanied by a note in the margin in a second hand that read "this gowne bodies ript to furnish other bodies of whyte sattine for ye same skirts," CUL MS Dd.I.26, fol.15r. See also *ibid.*, 24.

⁶ Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, 26.

Fortunately, in comparison to physical objects, a quantity of documentary evidence related to Anna's jewellery and dress survives. However, despite the fact that an inventory of Anna's jewels was compiled in 1606 and lists more than 400 pieces, for the most part it does not provide detailed descriptions of the pieces. Similarly, a decade of accounts kept by her principal jeweller, and numerous entries in the accounts of the Exchequer do not adequately describe the items Anna commissioned and paid for, which makes matching documented items with those seen in portraits little more than educated guesswork.⁷ This is similarly true of Anna's clothing, since although two inventories of Anna's wardrobe from c.1608 and 1611 remain, and additional information can be gleaned from her household accounts and those of the royal wardrobe, these entries lack the detail required for conclusive pairing with painted representations. It should also be noted that possible connections between documents and paintings are further obfuscated by the fact that portraits cannot be taken as decisive accounts of reality, as elements were often embellished, exaggerated, completely fabricated, or omitted. As a result, while this chapter does not aim to directly match written and visual evidence, it draws heavily on archival evidence and utilises portraits for illustrative purposes in order to create a more comprehensive and accessible picture of Anna's strategic appearance.

Princely Magnificence

Letters, dispatches, and diary entries of the Jacobean period consistently describe the material wealth and magnificence of the royal family and its courtiers. Generally, historians

⁷ The various methods of payment that Heriot received is discussed below. He was regularly paid by Sir Thomas Knyvett (1545/6-1622), and Sir George Carew (1555-1629), Anna's Surveyor-General, and her Receiver-General and Vice-Chamberlain respectively. However, privy seals were periodically issued by James to alleviate increasing debt.

have used these glowing eyewitness accounts, in conjunction with the enormous sums that the early Stuarts spent on clothing and jewellery, to compare the Jacobean era unfavourably to the perceived parsimony of its predecessor. To some extent, this is true. For example, in the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign, the wardrobe spent an annual average of around £13,000.⁸ By comparison, in the first six months of James's reign, Sir John Fortescue (c.1531-1607), in his capacity as Master of the Wardrobe, mounted a debt of £29,000, which by 1606 had reached £50,867.⁹ The total expenditure of the wardrobe during the first five years of James's reign was set at £83,900, which contrasts sharply with the £21,300 spent by the wardrobe in the last five years of Elizabeth's reign.¹⁰ James's expenditure, however, needs to be viewed in the context of his accession. As discussed in Chapter One, the question of the English succession was mired in uncertainty and anxiety and James was only one of several possible candidates for the crown.¹¹ Furthermore, as a foreigner and head of a new ruling dynasty, it would have been crucial for James to legitimise his right to rule, which could be partly achieved through material magnificence.

The sums spent by the Jewel House also rapidly mounted with the accession of the Stuarts. From 1598 to 1603, only £13,800 was outlaid on jewellery, while a staggering £44,000 was issued under James for the period 1603 to 1608.¹² However, as Frederick Dietz points out in

⁸ Frederick C. Dietz, *English Public Finances 1558-1641*, 2 ed., 2 vols (London: Frank Cass, 1964), vol. 2, 107.

⁹ In 1599, Fortescue was granted the post of Keeper of the Great Wardrobe for. On 1 June 1603, the post was granted to Sir George Hume, later Earl of Dunbar. On Fortescue's role and benefits under Elizabeth, see Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 163-65. For the rise in debt see Dietz, *English Public Finances*, vol. 2, 107. The figure does not include the costs associated with Elizabeth's funeral or James's coronation.

¹⁰ Dietz, *English Public Finances*, vol. 2, 111-12. The figure for James includes the additional £6,000 that was spent "For the Kings robes over and above the wardrobe." See also Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, 21-23, who discuss the "astronomic increases in expenditure" in the early years of James's reign, however, they only cite secondary sources and provide no possible reasons for the increase in expenditure.

¹¹ Doran, "James VI and the English Succession," 29-30; Mackie, "Secret Diplomacy," 267-8.

¹² Dietz, *English Public Finances*, vol. 2, 112.

his work on Tudor and Stuart finance, these comparisons are not very equitable. They fail to take into consideration the change in prices that occurred throughout the period, and the economies that James enforced in other departments.¹³ This is most apparent for the military and naval services, which by 1607 had yielded a net savings of £386,920.¹⁴ I would also add that the comparison with Elizabeth is somewhat misguided, since the rise in the expenditure of the Jewel House and the Royal Wardrobe during James's reign has to be partly accounted for by the fact that James was required to outfit not only himself, but his queen consort, his heir, and his two other children in a manner befitting the status and prestige of English royalty.¹⁵ Furthermore, while the Tudors had been amassing royal goods for more than a century, the Stuarts did not arrive from Scotland with the level of majesty befitting English royalty.

Large sums were spent during James's English reign for the adornment of the royal family, their courtiers, and for quantities of gifts. It should be remembered, however, that for members of royalty, beneficence, personal opulence, and the amassing of vast collections of gems and goldsmiths' work was a traditional princely role and duty.¹⁶ As conspicuous signs of wealth, standing, and in the case of inherited or symbolic pieces, dynastic pride, jewels and apparel fulfilled an inherently political purpose. For royalty, jewels and a richness of dress readily communicated the wealth and cachet of the individual, their family and, by extension, their kingdom. For this reason, as Smuts points out, "when contemporaries

¹³ Ibid., 108, 111.

¹⁴ Ibid., 111.

¹⁵ Chambers also recognises that James had to provide for his family, although in keeping with the traditional view of history, he states that part of James's financial difficulties stemmed from "the personal inclination of Anna of Denmark for ostentatious prodigality," Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 6.

¹⁶ Cocks, "Status and Making of Jewellery," 4.

described a stately scene, they often did so largely in terms of the clothes worn.”¹⁷ In addition, jewels and clothing served an important role in the highly politicised world of gift exchange, marriage negotiations, and movement between courts.

Magnificent articles of jewellery and apparel, along with opulent fabrics, trimmings and interior furnishings, comprised the lavish bridal trousseaus that accompanied princesses in their highly-charged political crossing from their natal to marital court.¹⁸ When Anna set sail for Scotland in September 1590, to take up her position as the wife and queen of James VI of Scotland, Danish clothing, hangings, and jewellery would have formed a central component of her trousseau. These goods would have demonstrated the magnificence of her family, her country, and the virtuosity of Danish goldsmiths, jewellers, and tailors.¹⁹ While inventories of Anna’s bridal trousseau do not appear to be extant, tantalising references to the material wealth and extravagance of her bridal journey can be gleaned from eye-witness accounts and letters.²⁰ On 6 July 1589, Thomas Fowler reported that

¹⁷ Smuts, “Art and the Material Culture of Majesty,” 92.

¹⁸ Cocks, “Status and Making of Jewellery,” 5. Cocks provides the example of Princess Anna (1532-1585), who bought 15 important jewels along with “her brocades, damasks and velvets” from Denmark when she married Augustus, Elector of Saxony (1526-1586) in 1548. Using Henrietta Maria as an example, Hibbard has written on the cultural and political transfer of princesses from their natal to marital courts, see Hibbard, “Henrietta Maria in the 1630s,” 94-95; Hibbard, “Queen’s Patronage of Artists and Artisans,” 117-19.

¹⁹ A number of Danes are included in the extensive list of members of the queen’s household that has been compiled by Juhala based on various archival and printed primary sources, see Amy L. Juhala, “The Household and Court of King James VI of Scotland, 1567–1603” (PhD diss., The University of Edinburgh, 2000), 327-33. On Anna’s journey to Scotland see Riis, *Should Auld Acquaintance Be Forgot*, 264-65.

²⁰ Maureen Meikle confirmed to the author that no details of Anna’s trousseau have been located in the Danish or Scottish archives to date. Email communication, 1 December 2012. However, it would have been customary for inventories of Anna’s trousseau to have been drawn up in Denmark and then again in Scotland. This was certainly the practice carried out for Anna’s daughter, Princess Elizabeth. The warrant issued to the Great Wardrobe on the occasion of her marriage in February 1613 has been published in *Archaeologia* 26 (1836): 380-94. For a discussion of Elizabeth Stuart’s trousseau see Valerie Cumming, “The Trousseau of Princess Elizabeth Stuart,” in *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies in London Archaeology and History Presented to Ralph Merrifield*, ed. Joanna Bird, Hugh Chapman, and John Clark (London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1978). The inventory of Henrietta Maria’s vast and sumptuous bridal trousseau remains in the British Library (BL Kings MS 136, fols. 430-61), for transcripts see Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

great provision is made for the young lady's coming; 12 ships fully furnished, three of them most princely apparelled, besides [four] for horses and stuff – 16 ships in all. They tell of rich provision of apparel, jewels, furnishing for horses, coaches and women; more than 500 tailors and embroiderers have been at work upon it for three months. The Queen-mother has bought many jewels for her, especially pearls.²¹

Fowler wrote a second letter that same month to William Ashby, the English Ambassador in Scotland, wherein he reports that “all things are ready for her coming away: her guard, horses, ships, plate, jewells, apparel... all so costly it is strange to hear; one of her coaches has no iron in it but all silver.”²² The visual riches of Anna's journey from Denmark to Scotland effectively broadcast the prestige and wealth of her family and the Danish court. Anna's material potency as a Danish princess conveyed her worthiness to take up her position as the queen of Scotland. As the new queen, Anna was also the recipient of many pieces of jewellery and dress, receiving a jewel bearing her cipher from the burgh of Edinburgh, and a gold chain and a diamond-encrusted cloak from Queen Elizabeth.²³

For her second highly-charged political journey from Scotland to England in 1603, following James's ascension to the English throne, Anna was again at the head of an exceptionally lavish cavalcade. James was at pains to ensure that she would be arrayed in jewels and dress befitting her status as the new queen of England. He wrote to the Privy Council requesting that they deliver “such jewels and other furniture which did appertain to the late Queen as you think meet for her estate.”²⁴ He later ordered that

Jewells to be sent for our Wyfe... you send some of the Ladyes...to meet her as farre as they can at her entry into the Realme, or soone after; for that we hold needfull for

²¹ *CSP Scots*, vol. 10, 115, no. 141.

²² *Ibid.*, 124-25, no. 160.

²³ Meikle, “Anna of Denmark's Coronation,” 290, 293. Additional gifts from Elizabeth to the new Queen included a clock covered with jewels, a pearl-inlaid chest, and a tablet. Juhala notes that due to the instability of the Scottish currency, French crowns were usually used for jewellery, “Household and Court of King James,” 159.

²⁴ Quoted in Scarisbrick, “Anne of Denmark's Jewellery,” 228.

her honor: and... for Horses, Lytters, Coaches, Saddles and other things of that nature.²⁵

In the event, James must have been satisfied that Anna's progress displayed the splendour and glory that was appropriate to her new status since it cost the English crown over £2,000.²⁶ Writing to the Doge and Senate on 10 July 1603, Scaramelli, the Venetian secretary in England, reports that Anna reached Windsor accompanied by "two hundred and fifty carriages, and upwards of five thousand horses."²⁷ The previous week, on 4 July 1603, Carleton wrote to Chamberlain to affirm that Anna arrived with "a court of ladies and many very fair and goodly ones which were never before seen *in rerum natura*."²⁸ Such accounts were of course highly exaggerated, but they served an inherently political purpose by maintaining the essential mythology of Anna's magnificence.

Having been "accustomed to wearing expensive baubles since her childhood in Denmark," it is unsurprising that during her time in Scotland Anna continued to add to the princely collection of jewels and dress that she had brought out with her from Denmark.²⁹ The Scottish goldsmith Heriot, mentioned above, began working for Anna in an unofficial capacity in May 1593. He was appointed her goldsmith for life in 1597, and accompanied the Stuarts to England in 1603.³⁰ While Heriot worked mostly for Anna, he did receive commissions from James and Prince Henry in Scotland and later in England.³¹ An example of the types of jewels that Anna ordered from Heriot in Scotland can be found in his accounts

²⁵ Ellis, *Original Letters*, 70-71, no.CCXLI: James I to the Lord Keeper and other Ministers.

²⁶ Meikle, "'Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule'," 110.

²⁷ *CSPV*, vol. 10, 60, no.87.

²⁸ Lee, *Jacobean Letters*, 34.

²⁹ Meikle, "'Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule'," 107.

³⁰ Meikle, "Meddlesome Princess," 107. Heriot appears in the household accounts of 1603, receiving an annuity of £50, TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9, which is discussed further below.

³¹ Juhala, "Household and Court of King James," 158-59.

for May 1593, when he delivered the queen jewels to the value of 493 French crowns (£123 sterling). This included “*twa hingeris [earrings]*” set with 84 rubies, together with a cipher jewel and two rings that were all adorned with diamonds and rubies.³² Heriot also supplied Anna with richly adorned clothing. Between April and July 1600, he delivered three stomachers that were embroidered with gold and silver, as well as three farthingales, two embroidered girdles, and three velvet bonnets.³³ Anna’s annual expenditure on clothing in Scotland began relatively modestly with just over £1,000 Scots (£83 sterling) being outlaid in 1591. By 1599, however, expenditure had risen sharply to £10,000 Scots (£833 sterling), and the years 1601-03 saw Anna spend more than £12,000 Scots (£1,000 sterling) per year.³⁴ It is likely this steep incline in expenses was partly due to Anna’s trousseau, which would have adequately clothed her in the first years of her Scottish period, but would definitely have required modifications and additions after 10 years in Scotland. Thomas Riis states that during the Stuarts’ Scottish period, the yearly clothing allowances provided to James and his consort by the Treasury of the Exchequer indicate that Anna spent much more on dress than James, whose outlay was between 71% and 83% of his wife’s.³⁵ However, James did have a

³² Meikle, “*“Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule’*,” 107. John Hayward incorrectly states that Heriot’s accounts indicate “in 1597, the first year of his appointment to her as Queen of Scotland... he delivered twelve rings and seventeen jewels, several of which, described in the accounts as pairs of pendants, were probably ear-rings.” Hayward bases this conjecture on a printed nineteenth-century source, which is actually a random selection of jewels that Heriot supplied to Anna between 1605 and 1615, taken from his accounts that are preserved in The National Archives in London. I discuss Heriot’s English accounts throughout this chapter. See John Hayward, “The Arnold Lulls Book of Jewels and the Court Jewellers of Anne of Denmark,” *Archaeologia (Second Series)*, 108 (1986): 227, citing W. Hone, *The Every Day Book* (London, 1830), 750. For Heriot’s work for James and Anna while in Scotland see Juhala, “Household and Court of King James,” 155-73, citing Jewellery Accounts of George Heriot, vol. III, GD 421/1/3, fol.5.

³³ Juhala, “Household and Court of King James,” 172, citing Heriot Accounts, fol.14. Juhala notes that Anna was expected to pay for her own jewels and dress from the revenue gathered from her land rents, but that James had to regularly supplement her income. This was also the case in England where Anna paid for some of Heriot’s accounts herself, but also had privy seals issued to relieve her mounting debts. I discuss this in more detail below.

³⁴ Riis, *Should Auld Acquaintance Be Forgot*, 274. The exact figures were £1,234.10s. in 1591; £10,000 in 1599 and 1600; £12,001.13s.4d. in 1602 and £12,505.14s.11d. in 1603. As noted in the Introduction, in 1603, the exchange ratio of the pound Scots to the pound Sterling was fixed at 12:1.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 276.

partiality for costly gems and lavish dress, and he regularly commissioned pieces from Heriot, while also furnishing the jeweller with his own apartment in Holyrood House from which he could do business.³⁶ Some of the jewels that James bought from Heriot were intended as gifts for his wife. In 1602, for example, James gave Anna a quantity of jewels to the value of £1,163.6s.8d. Scots (£97.5s.6d. sterling) and the following year they collectively spent £7,577.6s.8d. Scots (£631.5s.6d. sterling) on jewellery.³⁷

The royal spending on jewels and apparel in Scotland was not only for personal use. When Anna's entourage returned to Denmark, they left with a quantity of gifts that included gold chains to the value of 4,500 French crowns (£1,125 sterling), as well as rings set with great table diamonds and rubies for Anna's mother Sofie, and her brother Christian IV.³⁸

Nonetheless, expenditure on clothing and jewellery in Scotland was little compared to the riches that James and Anna purchased in England. While the Venetian secretary, in his preservation of the queen's largesse, boasted that "on leaving Edinburgh" she "generously distributed among the ladies who remained behind, all her jewels, dresses, hangings of her rooms, everything she had, without exception," Anna would undoubtedly have taken articles of dress and jewellery with her to England.³⁹ One piece that definitely travelled with the queen was the Imperial Crown she had worn at her Scottish coronation on 17 May 1590, which was later inventoried as part of her collection in London around 1606.⁴⁰

³⁶ Meikle, "Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule," 108.

³⁷ Riis, *Should Auld Acquaintance Be Forgot*, 274-75.

³⁸ Meikle, "Anna of Denmark's Coronation," 291.

³⁹ *CSPV*, vol. 10, 58-72, no.91.

⁴⁰ The crown was included in the inventory drawn up of Anna's jewellery in England, see Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 207, no.153.

The Tudor Wardrobe

According to the Venetian secretary, Anna's beneficence on leaving Scotland was due to that fact that

in the late Queen's (Elizabeth's) wardrobe she will find six thousand dresses, and though she declared that she would never wear cast (worn) clothes, still it was found that art could not devise anything more costly and gorgeous, and so the Court dressmakers are at work altering these old robes, for nothing new could surpass them.⁴¹

Again, this was clearly an exaggeration, although English courtiers were not far behind in their assertions that Anna was to inherit Elizabeth's "rich wardrobe," which contained "more than two thousand gowns."⁴² It has never been definitively established whether Anna left most of her possessions behind in readiness for inheriting Elizabeth's riches. Janet Arnold suggests that Anna is likely to have taken and adapted some of Elizabeth's more fashionable or costly items, and may well have gifted other pieces to some of the gentlewomen and ladies of her household, and to her relatives in Denmark.⁴³ It is evident from Anna's portraits (discussed in Chapter One) and her household accounts that, to some extent, Anna did model her appearance on that of the Tudor queen. She continued to wear voluminous drum-shaped farthingales in the manner of Elizabeth, despite the fact that they were considered outmoded.⁴⁴ This was not merely an exercise in frugality. While Anna presumably wore the farthingales that she inherited from Elizabeth, she also continued to

⁴¹ CSPV, vol. 10, 63-64, no.91.

⁴² Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. 2, 3: Chamberlain to Carleton, 30 March 1603. By comparison, Arnold notes that Elizabeth's wardrobe goods, as inventoried in 1600, amounted to just over 1,900 items, which includes all separate pieces of clothing and lengths of fabric. See Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 174.

⁴³ Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 175. This is in keeping with Anna's pattern of gift-giving later in the reign, which is discussed below.

⁴⁴ Vincent, *Dressing the Elite*, 35; Reynolds, *In Fine Style*, 42.

purchase new farthingales from a specialist based in London.⁴⁵ As I argue in Chapter One, this should be seen as a tactical visual emulation of the deceased queen.

By wearing Elizabeth's clothing, Anna was able to directly absorb some of the cachet associated with the deceased queen. Discussing the important role of clothing in gift-exchange during the seventeenth century, Susan Vincent has persuasively argued that a worn piece of apparel not only cemented a relationship with the original wearer but also conferred part of their identity.⁴⁶ Importantly, when the original wearer was a member of royalty, this became even more acute. Pointing to the therapeutic power of the royal touch, as evidenced by the continued ritual of touching for the King's Evil (scrofula), Vincent suggests that not only did royal raiment hold some residue of the original wearer's identity, but was also possessed with some of their thaumaturgic abilities.⁴⁷ Thus, in consciously choosing to wear some of Elizabeth's (now) unfashionable clothing, Anna gained some of the Tudor queen's regal prestige and power. This would have been visually apparent, for as mentioned in Chapter One, Elizabethan modes of dress – particularly the drum farthingale – came to operate as shorthand for the Tudor queen during the Jacobean period.⁴⁸ Pointedly, it was a style of dress that Anna continued to favour throughout James's reign. For example,

⁴⁵ TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9 includes payment of £16.16s.6d., to Robert Hughes "for making of divers ffarthingales for her Majesties use," as per three separate bills covering the 20 July 1603 through to 20 March 1604. See also TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646 (accounts for 1605), where "Robert Hughes of London ffarthingalemaker," is paid £34.15s.4d., as part payment of his bill of £51.9s.10d. Anna consistently purchased farthingales from Hughes, and by 1617 he is noted as "the Queenes Ma:^{ts} vardingallmaker maker." For payments to Hughes see various entries in TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1653; TNA, PRO: SC6/JASI/1655.

⁴⁶ Susan Vincent, "To Fashion a Self: Dressing in Seventeenth-Century England," *Fashion Theory* 3 (1999): 209.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 210-11. The practice dated back to the eleventh century and the reign of Edward the Confessor, and continued to be performed by successive monarchs, as a means of demonstrating divine favour and powers, until the reign of Charles II (1630-1685), see Elizabeth Furdell, *The Royal Doctors, 1485-1714: Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2001), 52-53, 159-60, 200-201.

⁴⁸ Dobson and Watson, *England's Elizabeth*, 50, 57.

writing of an audience with Anna on 22 December 1617, Horatio Busino recalls that “Her Majesty’s costume was pink and gold with so expansive a farthingale that I do not exaggerate when I say it was four feet wide in the hips.”⁴⁹ In 1603 though, by minimising the visual transition between the two reigns, Anna was able to assist in the smooth accession of the Stuarts.

Artificers of the Royal Wardrobe

Farthingales were only one of a myriad of items that came together to create a complete outfit for the queen. Due to the wide variety of fabrics, processes, embellishments, and pieces of dress in the early modern period, there were a large number of specialists required to oversee royal apparel and many were paid wages or fees for serving the queen in “ordinary.” Anna’s household accounts from 1605 to 1607, for example, show she kept a master tailor, James Duncan, an embroiderer, James Freeland, a perfumer, Francis Blondew, an upholsterer, Henry Walker, a silk-woman, Hester le Telier, a laundress, Susanna Greene, a coffer-maker, George Davies, and a cobbler, Francis Baker.⁵⁰ In addition to their annual wage, these artificers were paid for specific services rendered, while particular tasks or jobs could be delegated to craftsmen outside the household. In 1607, for example, a second upholsterer, John Baker, was paid £10 in “Extraordinaire... for the dressing of her Ma.^{ts} Cabinet.”⁵¹ An extensive list of bills from London artificers was regularly included in Anna’s annual household accounts, although the particulars are not given. In the accounts for 1605, for example, the list includes: two linen drapers, Thomas Midleton and Edward Ferrers; a

⁴⁹ CSPV, vol.15, 80, no.131: Busino to the Signori Giorgio, Francesco and Zaccaria Contarini.

⁵⁰ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648.

⁵¹ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646.

girdler, Richard Burneby; a pinner, William Phillips; two milliners, Thomas Cooke and Richard Crashawe; a mercer, Christopher Weaver; two seamsters, Elizabeth Price and Francis Britane; a goldsmith, William Glanville; two haberdashers, George Enslowe and Richard French; a hosier, Hugh Griffeth; a trunk-maker, John Greene; a cabinet-maker, Edward Cordwell; a feather-maker, Jane Gascard; and an apothecary, George Shires.⁵² The accounts further include an additional perfumer, Thomas Sheppard; an embroiderer, Christopher Shawe; a silk-woman, Dorothy Speckard; a draper, George Wyn; and a cobbler, Thomas Willson.⁵³ The wide range of artificers in Anna's household and used by her London, testifies to the wide range of luxury goods that were necessary to her position as queen consort. In this, Anna draws comparison with her successor, Henrietta Maria, who also cultivated a high level of material splendour, which was appropriate to her position.⁵⁴ While some payments were made from Anna's Privy Purse, as was expected, a quantity of bills had to be settled by the crown on her behalf. A surviving debenture book in the British Library indicates that between Michaelmas 1610 and 12 November 1611, Anna's debts to "dyvse Creditors and Artificers of London," had risen to a staggering £16,526.19s.4d., which was to be paid through the Exchequer.⁵⁵ This extremely costly set of bills included accounts with 10 different mercers and four embroiderers, as well as a silk-man, a silk-woman, a tailor, an upholsterer, a draper, a haberdasher, a hosier, a saddler, and a linen draper.⁵⁶ The biggest

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ See Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

⁵⁵ BL Lansdowne 165/31, fols.162r-163r.

⁵⁶ Ibid. The mercers were: Sir Baptist Hickeys, Edward Barnes, Alice Woodrow, Robert Pory, John Dames, Thomas Woodward, John Browne, Richard Fishbourne, John Hull, and John Willett. The embroiderers were: Christopher Shawe, Stephen Cottgrove, Monsieur Seinemoure, and James Freeland who by this time had died and his bill for £870.14s.03d. was to be collected by "Thomas Williams Administrator." The silk-man was Thomas Henshawe and the silk-woman was Dorothy Speckard. The tailor was James Duncan who was the Master Tailor in Anna's household as noted above. The upholsterer was John Baker, the draper was John Harrison, the haberdasher was George Enslowe, the hosier was Thomas Alport, the saddler was John Bingham, and the linen draper was William Ferrers.

expense was to the silk-man, whose five bills amounting to an enormous £4,882.5*d.*, which was more than the bills of the four embroiderers combined.⁵⁷

The Wardrobe Inventories⁵⁸

Additional information regarding Anna's dress can be found in two inventories of her wardrobe goods that were taken in 1608 and 1611. On 12 April 1611, an inventory was drawn up "of all the warderoabe Stuffe... furniture, and other things" that were removed from Zachary Bethell's care and delivered to Thomas Marvin.⁵⁹ I am not aware of any scholarly analysis that has been carried out on this inventory, and I would suggest that Anna ordered an inventory to be taken at this time due to the change in Keeper, which seems to have been a customary practice. For example, when the Keepership of the Jewels was transferred from Mary Ratcliffe (c.1550-1617/18) (who held this position under Elizabeth) to Katherine Howard, Countess of Suffolk (c.1564-1638), on 26 August 1603, an inventory was drawn up alongside a discharge to Ratcliffe, while a second discharge was concurrently issued to Katherine for jewels that were taken out for members of the royal family and "sondry others."⁶⁰ Although a specific location is not given for the inventory of 1611, I would suggest that at least part of it pertains to items housed at Denmark House. By 1615, Thomas Marvin was receiving an annual wage of £50 for his role as Keeper of the Standing Wardrobe and Privy Lodgings at Denmark House, which was staffed by an additional two

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, fol.162v.

⁵⁸ The percentages given in the following analyses have all been rounded to the nearest whole number.

⁵⁹ TNA: PRO, LR2/121. Bethell occurs in the accounts for 1615 as "Surveyor of her Ma^{ty} Warerobe of Robes," which earned him £20 per annum. The only other references to Marvin that I have been able to trace is in his capacity as Keeper of the Privy Lodgings at Westminster (Whitehall) in 1604, which he held jointly with Laurence Whitfield, *CSPD*, vol. 8, 174, and in June 1611, Marvin was serving as a page of Anna's Bedchamber and was regularly called upon as a witness to the payments of Heriot's bills by Sir Thomas Knyvett, see TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fols.49r, 50r-v. For a transcription of a section of this inventory, see Appendix I.

⁶⁰ Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 60-61, citing *CSPD*, vol. 8, 35; TNA: PRO, SP14/6/7.

men.⁶¹ Furthermore, the inventory commences with the heading “Robes for the Order of St George,” which is quickly followed by a section, “Apparel for Men” that includes three kirtles, four hoods, two mantles (one of which is for the Order of St Michael), one robe, eight gowns, three capes, two cloaks, 15 coats, four cassocks, five doublets, and a pair of short hose – with a total of 49 pieces.⁶² We know from an inventory of goods in Denmark House drawn up after Anna’s death in March 1619, that the St Michael Robes belonging to Henry VIII were indeed housed there and, moreover, it seems likely those garments had been stored at the palace since the reign of Elizabeth.⁶³

The descriptions of clothing in the inventory of 1611 tell of a material magnificence appropriate to matters of state ceremony. The vast majority of garments are fashioned in shades of red, and the associated shades of purple and tawny (69%).⁶⁴ The high proportion of purple (35%), with its imperial associations, and the extravagantly expensive deep crimson red (30%) would have combined to produce a sumptuous visual display. As Maria Hayward outlines, crimson was one of the most expensive colours of the period, for it was made using the dye extracted from the *kermes ilicis* or Scarlet Grain insect, and it would

⁶¹ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1655. Marvin also received an additional £6.13s. for his livery and £10 for his “meal and coales” per annum.

⁶² TNA: PRO, LR2/121, fols.3r-5r. One item is simply listed as “one garment.” Kirtles could be worn by both men and women. The *OED* states that around c.893 a kirtle referred to “a man’s tunic or coat, originally a garment reaching to the knees or lower, sometimes forming the only body-garment, but more usually worn with a shirt beneath and a cloak or mantle.”

http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/search?searchType=dictionary&q=kirtle&_searchBtn=Search

⁶³ Payne, “Inventory,” 25. As Payne points out, Arnold observes that Henry VIII’s garments documented in the Commonwealth Sale of 1649, are absent from the inventories made of Elizabeth’s wardrobe goods. These inventories were made in 1600 and included all goods held in the Tower, at Blackfriars, and Whitehall. Payne logically suggests that the garments might have been precluded from Elizabeth’s inventories because they were already being stored at Denmark House.

⁶⁴ According to Linthicum, “tawny, a yellowish tan” was “composed of deep red and much yellow,” see Marie Channing Linthicum, *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1972), 46. In the inventory, tawny is used interchangeably with rose, indicating that it was perhaps pinkish in hue.

have been immediately understood as such by onlookers.⁶⁵ Additional sumptuousness came in the form of embroidery, which adorns 32 out of the total of 49 pieces, and is mainly executed in gold thread (72%). Further decoration is found in an array of gold buttons, aglets, and loops that were sewn onto the garments, although many of these are noted to have been removed “for her Ma^{ts} use.”⁶⁶ Considering their age, it is perhaps unsurprising that not all garments were well preserved, and one fur-trimmed crimson velvet coat was described as “the furr being old and rotten not worthy to be charged.”⁶⁷ As the preface to the inventory implies, along with State Regalia it features a diverse array of more than 380 items including articles of female and male apparel, soft furnishings, suites of furniture, lengths of fabric and lace, coffers, cabinets, and several ornaments. It would seem that some of these items were inherited, as many are noted as being “very old” or “very much worne,” while one length of diaper was noted as being “eaten wth rats.”⁶⁸ It is likely that these items were kept and recorded for their ancestral links.

In total, of the 383 entries in the inventory, only 122 entries (32%) pertain to pieces of female dress. While the entries are rather brief, they nevertheless indicate exceptionally lavish fabrics and a high degree of decoration with embroidery in gold, silver, and coloured silks, as well as a quantity of items that were set with pearls, gold aglets, buttons, and

⁶⁵ Hayward, “Crimson, Scarlet, Murrey,” 137-38. Hayward cautions that “even the most sumptuous red shades... might not be the result of dyeing with pure kermes.” She also asserts that shades of purple and red were the most significant colours in the Tudor wardrobe of Henry VIII, comprising his coronation robes, the robes that he wore on the high days of the liturgical calendar, and sparingly as part of his everyday wear. As Hayward points out, by the 1580s and throughout the Jacobean reign, the very costly and symbolic colours of red and purple became “state colours,” and were used to great effect in matters of ceremony, such as coronations and the opening of parliaments, see *ibid.*, 147.

⁶⁶ See for example, a murrey velvet cassock noted as having “eleven round buttons of gold, and x loopes, being of little flagons chaines of gold,” that were removed in April 1611 and given to the jeweller, Spilman, for the queen’s use, TNA: PRO, LR2/121, fol.4v. I discuss this practice in more detail below.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, fols.8v, 13v, 16v.

precious stones. Certainly, while jewels were purchased to be worn singly, pearls, gems, and precious metals were also in consistent demand to be woven or set into clothing, resulting in sumptuous garments. Examples are a pair of crimson velvet sleeves that were “embroidered wth venice gold, and trayles of pearle and Small blewe stones set in collets of Silver and guilt” and a purple velvet partlet that was “garnished with xxij [23] rubies or garnetts and seven diamonds in buttons of gold...with divers Small pearle.”⁶⁹ On occasion, Anna’s principal jeweller, Heriot, seems to have filled this requirement for pearls. In March 1611, for example, Heriot delivered 15 ounces of pearls “to y^e Seamster,” while his account for May and June of 1611 includes a charge of £84 for having provided “y^t imbrotherer” with “xxvij [28] ounces of pearle.”⁷⁰ Heriot reappears in the accounts for September 1611, having delivered “to the atire maker” 700 pearls and “Seaven hundred Smaller pearles.”⁷¹

It might be expected that this high degree of adornment would have translated into Anna’s body of portraits. Almost without exception, however, the jewels and precious stones in her personal images are not actually sewn onto her clothes, but are pieces of additional jewellery. There are only two portrait types where Anna wears apparel embellished with pearls or gemstones: the half-length portrait attributed to De Critz and dated to c.1604 (figure 2.1) and the full-length portrait by Gheeraerts from c.1614 (figure 1.30). In the earlier of the two, Anna is shown wearing a murrey-coloured bodice and sleeves, and a white stomacher, all set with what are likely to be rubies and black-enamelled diamonds.⁷² In the

⁶⁹ TNA: PRO, LR2/121, fol.7v, 9v.

⁷⁰ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fols.37r, 34r. The first order cost £45.6s., while in the second order, the pearls were charged at £3 the ounce.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, fol.34v. These were charged at 3*d.* ½ each, making a total cost of £10.12s.6*d.* The only other entry in Heriot’s accounts for supplying jewels of this kind was on 29 March 1612 when he “delivered to the Seamster iij ounces of pearle at £4 the ounce,” which cost £16 in total, see *ibid.*, fol.41r.

⁷² Murrey was a purplish-red. For an explanation of the various shades of red see Hayward, “Crimson, Scarlet, Murrey,” 136-37.

later portrait by Gheeraerts, she is shown wearing a boned bodice supporting a magnificent collection of pearls that trace the neckline of her bodice and extend down over her flounce in a similar shape to a stomacher. The majority of Anna's jewelled resplendence in this portrait, however, derives from the copious strings of pearls in her bracelets, necklaces, earrings, head attire, and around her red favour, in addition to the hanging diamond jewels on her collar and the jewelled miniature case and fan handle.

A second undated inventory of wardrobe goods belonging to the queen remains in the Cambridge University Library.⁷³ The only scholar who I am aware of having worked on this inventory is Helen Payne. However, Payne only discusses aspects of the inventory that pertain to members of Anna's household.⁷⁴ As yet, there has been no scholarly work carried out on the contents of this inventory as they relate to the appearance and magnificence of the owner and wearer: Anna of Denmark. Annotated in a second hand between 1608 and 1611, this inventory notes the movement of garments between residences, which presumably followed the movement of the queen herself. It also notes those garments that were gifted to Anna, and those the queen gave away.⁷⁵ As well as documenting the mobility of clothing in the royal wardrobe, the inventory's importance lies in its very detailed description of the queen's garments. With a total of 473 entries, the inventory includes gowns (over-dresses), mantles, waistcoats, jerkins, petticoats, and bodies (bodices). It confirms a high degree of ornamentation and is very evocative in its account of the types,

⁷³ CUL MS Dd.I.26. For a transcription of a section of this inventory, see Appendix II; Payne states that this inventory was drawn up by "one of the queen's Gentlemen Ushers" who "was appointed by warrant to draw up an inventory of the queen's robes, to keep account and 'have a provident care of them'," see "Aristocratic Women," 65, citing *HMC Salisbury*, part 20, 92.

⁷⁴ Payne, *ibid.*, 18, 87, 139.

⁷⁵ CUL MS Dd.I.26, see especially fols.15v-17r, which show a wide array of garments received at Denmark House, Greenwich, Theobalds, Holdenby, Woodstock and Hampton Court.

colours, and cuts of fabric, the various sorts of lace, the figurative or emblematic nature of embroidery, and the colours of thread. The pieces required for a full suite of dress such as the hanging and wearing sleeves, bodies, long skirts, short skirts, doublets, and safeguards are all separately noted. Taking all individual articles of apparel into consideration, the inventory comprises 569 pieces.⁷⁶ Of this number, the most common colour of dress was white, which accounts for 211 pieces or 37% of the collection. Red garments were the next most numerous, with 87 pieces of raiment (15%) recorded in this shade, including a wide variety of hues such as incarnadine, carnation, gingerline, crimson, rose, and the related shades of flame-coloured, tawny (or rose), orange, purple, pink, and peach.⁷⁷ In addition to garments made from one solid base colour, there are 10 articles of dress (2%) comprising “mingled colours,” such as “one gown of greene yellow and ash-colour mingled taffeta.”⁷⁸ There are also 18 garments (3%) made from two or more colours, as in “one saveguard of willowe colour and white damaske.”⁷⁹ As well as noting the colour of garments, the inventory includes the colour of the lining of 376 garments. Almost half are in shades of red (46%).⁸⁰ The next most popular single colour is white, which lines 46 garments (12%). More popular than white is the use of two or three colours together, which lines 56 garments (15%). As far as fabrics are concerned, the most common is satin, which was used in 303 of the total wardrobe goods, or just over half (53%). Significantly, this accords with the majority of Anna’s portraits, for the queen is generally depicted wearing garments of white satin (figures 1.7, 1.10, 1.18, 1.20, 1.24-1.26, 1.30, 1.35, 1.36, 1.50).

⁷⁶ This number does not include 13 entries listed under the heading “Coronacon Roabes.”

⁷⁷ Of the various shades of red, carnation is the most common and accounted for 30 of the 71 articles of dress, or 43%.

⁷⁸ CUL MS Dd.I.26, fol. 19v, no.326.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, fol.5r, no.85. The remaining items include one jerkin of Spanish leather, four gowns, two pairs of bodies, one nightgown, and one pair of long skirts of unspecified colours.

⁸⁰ Under the umbrella shade of “red,” which includes 174 articles of dress, the overwhelmingly most popular shade was carnation, which lines 117 garments (67%).

As well as isolating the sumptuous types and colours of the fabrics in Anna's wardrobe, the inventory isolates 263 garments that are embroidered or brocaded.⁸¹ It notes if the decoration is figurative and often records whether it is carried out in gold, silver, single, or multi-coloured threads of silk, or satin, or works of velvet.⁸² Of these, 124 pieces (47%) are embroidered with coloured thread, but the pattern or design is not specified.⁸³ Most commonly, embroidery is carried out with a single coloured thread, or with two colours. Less often, three different coloured silk threads are used, and in a few instances the embroidery is completed with four or more colours.⁸⁴ In addition, 83 garments (32%) are listed with figurative embroidery in gold, silver, and coloured silk threads and the devices include, amongst others, stars, suns, clouds, flies, birds, half-moons and feathers, fountains, esses, flowers, and butterflies.⁸⁵ One gown is noted to be embroidered with "flames like fire, and a hand and a hammer."⁸⁶ An example of this type of figurative embroidery can be

⁸¹ Brocade, as distinguished from embroidery, is made of solid or multi-coloured silk threads and is usually in a design or pattern that covers the entire garment. The thick, heavy nature of brocade means that it is often raised above the cloth. In the inventory under discussion, it is more commonly referred to as "flowered." Brocade is defined in the *OED* as being "a textile fabric woven with a pattern of raised figures, originally in gold or silver; in later use, any kind of stuff richly wrought or "flowered" with a raised pattern," while embroidery is described as "the art of ornamenting cloth and other fabrics with figures of needlework." See "brocade"; "embroidery," *OED Online*, March 2013, Oxford University Press (accessed 15 April 2013).

⁸² The 263 cases come from a total of 460 entries (57%) which does not include the 13 entries pertaining to coronation robes. When analysing the colours and types of fabric in this inventory, I have broken down the entries into their individual pieces of apparel in order to give a more precise picture of the contents of Anna's wardrobe. This is due to the fact that the majority of entries in the inventory include individual articles of dress (such as hanging sleeves, wearing sleeves, bodies, skirts) that were made from different fabrics or in different colours. With embroidery or brocade, however, there is usually only one description per entry, i.e. for the entire suite of dress.

⁸³ This number includes 74 garments that were described as being "striped" and quite often as "striped down right." This refers to vertical lines of embroidery that ran the length of the garment, but it is not specified whether these lines included figurative details such as flowers, stars, birds, knots, or branches.

⁸⁴ Single coloured embroidery accounts for 55 of the total 124 garments, or 44%. This includes 26 instances where the work is completed in gold thread, and five cases where the thread is silver. Embroidery that is executed in two colours comprises 37 entries (30%). The use of three different coloured silk threads makes up 17 entries (14%), and of those, eight include gold and/or silver thread.

⁸⁵ "esses" refer to the letter "S," which was embroidered on clothing and was used in figurative jewellery as a reference to "sovereign." See Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 364. As I argue below, Anna is likely to have used the letter "S" in reference to her mother Sofie.

⁸⁶ CUL MS Dd.I.26, fol.1r. This curious pairing is an emblem reminding the viewer that they must suffer the continual blows of fortune and "evil fame" before being considered "precious" in God's eyes. It was used to

seen in a portrait of Catherine Howard, Countess of Nottingham (c.1547-1603) by Robert Peake the Elder (c.1551-1619) (figure 2.2). In this portrait, the Countess wears a white silk doublet extensively decorated with flowers and fruit, and a white satin skirt that is embroidered all over in vines, leaves, and spires. An extant piece of an English-made satin petticoat from c.1600 in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum testifies to this intricate level of embroidered detail, and features a collection of highly suggestive motifs including an armillary sphere, shooting arrows, jagged thunderbolts, a lion, two storks, an obelisk, and a winged cherub's head surmounted by a flaming heart (figure 2.3). In relation to Anna's body of portraits, though, it is notable that the queen is consistently depicted wearing garments that are embroidered with simple patterns rather than any elaborative figurative designs that could have had a symbolic significance (figures 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.18, 1.20, 1.24, 1.25, 1.34, 1.35, 1.54, 2.1). The one exception to this is Anna's Woburn portrait from around 1614, for as Hearn points out, Anna's dress is embroidered with "twigs and peacock feathers."⁸⁷ Hearn adds that these would have been "appropriate symbols" for Anna since the "bird was sacred to Juno, wife of the King of the Roman gods, Jupiter."⁸⁸ I would add, too, that Juno offered an important parallel to Anna, for they were both the daughters, sisters, wives, and mothers of gods/kings.

While Anna's inventoried clothing is often beautifully embellished, her most sumptuously embroidered garments are the petticoats. These are frequently adorned in a very rich manner with flowers, fruits, insects, fish, animals, trees, and birds. This decoration was

illustrate mottoes such as "Till God hath wrought us to his Will / The Hammer we shall Suffer Still," and "True Vertue, firme, will alwayes bide / By whatsoever suffrings tride," see George Wither, *A Collection of Emblemes*, 1635, English Emblem Books, No 12 (Menston: Scolar, 1968), 17, 171.

⁸⁷ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192, cat. no.130.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

intended to be seen and petticoats are often visible in portraits of the period. For example, a gold brocade petticoat is evident between the open skirts of Elizabeth Vernon, Countess of Southampton (1572-1655) in her portrait of 1622 (figure 2.4), and Anna's carnation-coloured fringed petticoat can be seen below her closed skirts in her portrait by De Critz from c.1605 (figure 1.20). While several of the petticoats owned by Anna are embroidered with only a couple of figurative elements such as "oranges, pansies, Jelliflowres (gillyflowers) and paramidize," or with "paunsies, thistle, Caterpillars & other devises," some are exceptionally decorative, with one petticoat described as:

Imbroydred alov^r butt moste ffayrest in a border 3 quarters deepe wth riminge workes of venice gold and purle wth 12 broad squares of the fforeSayd gold wth severall Devices in eache square Intermixte wth Dyvers Sorts of fruits ffowells & fyshes: wth a gard one eache Syde y^e border wth Imagerie worke & fowles.⁸⁹

Many of the more decorative petticoats were given to Anna as gifts and are discussed in further detail below.

While 207 garments are garnished with needlework or embroidery, another 56 garments are described as being brocaded or "flowered." The majority of these (31 garments or 55%) are brocaded in unspecified designs while others (25, or 45%) are brocaded with figurative works that include branches, 'slippes' (twigs), flowers, esses, diamonds, and feathers. An example of brocade work is seen in a half-length portrait of Anna from 1614, where the queen is shown wearing a white satin gown brocaded all over in gold (gilt-silver) thread, and green and red silk thread in flowers and botanical flourishes (figure 1.34). The latter are

⁸⁹ CUL MS Dd.I.26, fol.9r-v, 24r. The inventory includes 52 petticoats but embroidery details are only given for 15 of them.

most likely those referred to in the inventory as “flowers and branches,” since branches could also mean patterns.⁹⁰

In addition to costly embroidery or brocade, Anna’s clothes are adorned with a staggering quantity of various types of lace. The compilers of the inventory took considerable care in noting the type, colour, and location of lace on the queen’s apparel, amounting to 878 entries. This exactitude is related to the high cost of lace, and it would have been important to have a record of the type and quantity belonging to the queen. The most frequently cited type of lace is bone (bobbin) lace which adorns 146 pieces of dress or 17% of the total entries. Bone lace is made using weights or bobbins to hold the individual threads being crossed or woven, and the threads are worked in pairs to create a form of weaving where the weft and warp are worked up at an even rate.⁹¹ In the early seventeenth century, strips of bone lace were often used as trimmings to edge garments, or were laid across fabric as seen in the half-length portrait of Anna from 1614 (figure 1.34). Here, gold (silver-gilt) bobbin lace is apparent over the shoulder wings, “striped down right” the sides of her bodice, and along the edges of the button fastenings that extend down the arms and the front of the bodice. In addition to painted representations, there are surviving examples of bone lace trimmings from the Jacobean period. The collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum contains a jacket that was made in 1610 and a pair of gloves from c.1603-1625,

⁹⁰ Arnold, *Unlock’d*, 152. The words “flowers” and “branches” are relatively common in the inventory and have at least two meanings each. “Flowers” can be used to designate the literal appearance of flowers, or to refer to brocade, while “branches” is used to describe naturalistic branches but also to designate designs or patterns. For example, one ash-coloured gown is noted to be “Imbroyered alovr wth bla: and orange Coler Silkes in braunches or fflowers Lyke esses” while a silver gown is described as being “Stripte wth orange col^r, and flowerd wth wachett and Car: Silkes,” and a petticoat was embroidered with “wyldbeastes byrds fflowers and fruits,” CUL MS Dd.I.26, fols.19v, 20r, 21r.

⁹¹ Anne Kraatz, *Lace: History and Fashion* (New York: Rizzoli, 1989), 12, 187. Arnold adds that bone lace “was made by twisting bobbins holding gold, silver, silk, and linen threads above a pattern marked with pins. The bobbins were originally made of bone, hence bone lace,” see Arnold, *Unlock’d*, 361.

both of which feature trimmings of silver-gilt bobbin lace hung with spangles (figures 2.5-2.8).

Following bone lace in terms of quantity is purle lace, which features on 126 garments in the inventory (14% of the total).⁹² Arnold identifies purle lace as “braid with a row of minute loops or twists on the edge,” while purles in and of themselves were “individual twists of silver or gold wire.”⁹³ Due to their small size, purles are difficult to identify in portraits but are visible in the aforementioned pair of gloves held in the Victoria and Albert Museum (figures 2.7, 2.8). In addition to bone and purle lace, spangle lace is noted on 69 garments (8%), while in a further 80 instances, lace of various types is described as being “spangled.”⁹⁴ Spangles were small, circular pieces of metal of gold, silver, or brass, and were sewn or “hung” onto stretches of lace, ribbons, or fabric creating a rich, glittering effect.⁹⁵ Evidence of “spangles” can often be seen on shoe rosettes in full-length portraits from the Jacobean period as in Gheeraerts’s portrait of Anna from c.1614 (figure 1.33). They are also seen decorating the skirt and bodice worn by Lady Bowes in her portrait of 1630 (figure 2.9), and the jacket worn by Margaret Layton (c.1590-1641) in her portrait by Gheeraerts from c.1620 (figure 2.10). Lady Layton’s portrait commemorates the sitter wearing the abovementioned

⁹² Further lace types listed in the inventory, but appearing on only 5% or less of the total, include passement, galloon, binding, parchment, cloud, diamond, bias, heart, open, worm, compass, laying, and chain lace. On various types of lace see, Kraatz, *Lace*, 186; M. Jourdain, “Laces as Worn in England until the Accession of James I,” *BMC* 10 (1906): 167-8; Santina M. Levey, *Lace: A History* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2001), 120; Arnold, *Unlock’d*, 360, 367-69.

⁹³ Arnold, *Unlock’d*, 370.

⁹⁴ Lace that was noted to be “spangled” includes a variety of types such as bone, fringe, diamond, open, plate, and compass.

⁹⁵ According to the *OED*, a spangle was a “small round thin piece of glittering metal (usually brass) with a hold in the centre to pass a thread through, used for the decoration of textile fabrics.” See “spangle,” *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press (accessed 15 April 2013).

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/185557?rskey=5UMG23&result=3&isAdvanced=false>

jacket that survives in the Victoria and Albert Museum (figure 2.5).⁹⁶ While sections of lace are often enhanced with spangles, purles, plate, or bugles, there are also 54 garments in the inventory that do not have lace, but are nevertheless garnished with twists, plate, purles, owes, bugles, or spangles, or in various combinations of the six.⁹⁷ Comprised of costly fabrics, coloured with costly dyes, and adorned in a large quantity of precious metals and lace, Anna's inventoried garments together with the staggering bills that she incurred with various artificers indicates that the queen's wardrobe was appropriately magnificent for her royal standing.

One other type of adornment noted in the inventory is buttons. These form both a decorative and functional element, and can be found on the wings, down the wearing and hanging sleeves, on the breasts of gowns, and "about" the skirts. Despite the number of locations where they could be sewn, however, buttons are surprisingly uncommon and only appear in 53 articles of raiment or 9% of the total inventory.⁹⁸ Even more unexpected is that out of the 569 pieces of clothing that are listed, not one piece of apparel is embellished with gems or aglets, and only three pieces feature borders of seed pearls.⁹⁹ This is consistent with the majority of Anna's painted portraits, which in contrast to portraits of Elizabeth, do

⁹⁶ The jacket originally belonged to Margaret Layton, wife of the Yeoman of the Jewel House, Francis Layton (1577-1661). When the jacket was altered in c.1620, the spangled gilt-silver bone lace trimming was added to the collar, hem, cuffs, shoulder wings, and fastening.

⁹⁷ Purles are defined above. Bugles were small glass beads of a tube-shape that were usually black, see "bugle," *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press (accessed April 15, 2013). <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/24389?rskey=wUMdvm&result=3&isAdvanced=false> Arnold states that owes (or oes) were "circular spangles of gold (i.e. silver-gilt) and silver, stitched onto garments in decorative patterns, or powdered over the whole surface," and twists were "presumably two or more threads twisted to make a cord," while plate was braided threads of gold or silver, see Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 368-69, 375.

⁹⁸ Of those 53 instances, buttons were most commonly made of silver and coloured silk, which adorns 14 garments (26%), closely followed by plain silver buttons, which appear on 13 articles of dress (25%).

⁹⁹ The three articles of apparel embellished with seed pearls include one pair of bodies and the long skirts of one gown, and one other gown, see CUL MS Dd.I.26, fols.7r, 18v.

not show the queen consort attired in fabrics that have been sewn with gemstones or pearls.¹⁰⁰

This detailed inventory contains marked differences to the selection of clothing listed in the previously cited inventory taken by Anna's Receiver-General and Vice-Chamberlain, Sir George Carew, on 13 April 1611, and held in the National Archives. Of the 204 garments listed in that inventory, 16 pieces of apparel (8%) are decorated with seed and large pearls, a further nine articles of dress (4%) are embellished with pearls and sundry sorts of precious stones, while four pairs of sleeves are noted to have been adorned with gold aglets.¹⁰¹

Although this is not a large percentage of the inventoried clothing overall, it is a much larger proportion than that found in the Cambridge inventory. The discrepancy between the two inventories suggests, perhaps, that the dress recorded in the latter inventory was for everyday wear, while the richer articles of dress inventoried by Carew belonged to a reserve wardrobe that would have been available to Anna for more formal occasions. Overall, the vast quantity of decorative ornaments and the abundance of various laces confirm that Anna would have been regularly outfitted in a staggering array of material magnificence signalling her personal honour and prestige, along with that of the House of Stuart.

¹⁰⁰ Arnold states that Elizabeth's gowns "were often... decorated with jewels," see Janet Arnold, "Lost from Her Majesties Back," *Costume Society* 7 (1980): 9.

¹⁰¹ TNA: PRO, LR2/121, fols.6v, 7r-v, 8r-v, 9r-v.

Fabrics and Types of 'Fashion'

As well as pointing to a high degree of embellishment, the wardrobe inventories testify that, like her predecessor Elizabeth, some of Anna's garments were made from imported cloth and she was interested in the new styles and trends evolving in Italy, France, and Spain. Thus, an orange-coloured satin gown is noted as being "cutt & drawne out wth white Spanish taffeta."¹⁰² Anna also owned three gowns made from "Italian stuff," one of which is described as "an Italian gown."¹⁰³ The most common imported fabric appears to be green satin from France, which is listed as being used for a number of elaborate garments including a pair of skirts, four gowns, and a fifth gown of carnation-coloured silk grosgrain that was "Checkard wth ffrenche greene."¹⁰⁴ This gown is further described as having hanging sleeves "of y^e Spanishe ffaccon," which Arnold states were large, round sleeves that enclosed the upper arms and had a narrow wrist.¹⁰⁵ An example of these sleeves is seen in Larkin's portrait of Susan Villiers, Lady Fielding (1583-1652) (figure 2.11). This type of sleeve may also be seen in Anna's hunting portrait by Van Somer (figures 1.60, 2.12). The right sleeve has been unbuttoned and hangs loosely behind the queen; it has a narrow lace band at the base that would have cinched the sleeve at the wrist. While this is not overtly clear, the portrait definitely shows Anna wearing a Spanish farthingale. This is characterised by a conical shape that reached the widest point at the base with the use of padded hip rolls.¹⁰⁶ The majority of Anna's portraits, however, show her wearing the "French vardingale" or wheel farthingale (figures 1.20, 1.25, 1.33-1.35, 1.41, 1.43, 1.54). Using a whalebone

¹⁰² CUL MS Dd.I.26. fol.1r.

¹⁰³ Ibid., fol.7v; TNA: PRO, LR 2/121, fol.6v.

¹⁰⁴ CUL MS Dd.I.26. fols.6r-v, 25v.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., fol.25v. Anna owned nine gowns that featured Spanish sleeves see, fols.24v, 25r-v. For Spanish sleeves, see Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 116.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 195; F. M. Kelly, "Shakespearian Dress Notes - Farthingales," *BMC* 29 (1916): 357; Vincent, *Dressing the Elite*, 23.

structure or bolster, the widest point of this type of farthingale was around the hips, and from here the skirts fell vertically to the ground.¹⁰⁷ A quantity of French farthingales are listed in Anna's inventory.¹⁰⁸

In addition to Spanish sleeves, the two inventories show that Anna owned six pairs of French sleeves. These are characterised by a fullness of shape at the top of the sleeve, which is achieved by padding and high sleeveheads.¹⁰⁹ An example of this style can be seen in De Critz's portrait of Anna from c.1605 (figure 1.20), and Gheeraerts's portrait of Lady Croke from c.1605-10 (figure 2.16). A more pronounced example is found in Hilliard's 'Phoenix portrait' of Elizabeth from c.1575 (figure 2.13), which suggests that they were becoming increasingly outmoded.¹¹⁰ Articles of French dress in Anna's wardrobe extend to a black velvet French hood, a specific style of headdress that is closely fitted to the head. It is usually adorned with gold or jewelled billiments and a veil that extends down the back. The hood was commonly set over a coif, or caul, which was tied under the chin or at the back of the head.¹¹¹ That Anna owned only one of these may indicate they were no longer in fashion. Indeed, they had been worn since the time of Mary Tudor, and examples can be seen in her portrait by Antonis Mor (1516-1576) from 1554 (figure 2.14) and in her medal

¹⁰⁷ Kelly, *ibid.*, 357-58.

¹⁰⁸ CUL MS Dd.I.26. fol. 28r. Appended to the back of the wardrobe inventory is a list dated 23 March 1607, and comprising 28 farthingales that are "all past hir ma.^{ties} wearing."

¹⁰⁹ TNA: PRO, LR2/121 fols.8r, 9r.

¹¹⁰ Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 152.

¹¹¹ TNA: PRO, LR2/121 fol.10r; Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 202-203, 205. According to the *OED*, a coif was "a close-fitting cap covering the top, back, and sides of the head. In early use a cap of this kind, tied like a night-cap under the chin, worn out of doors by both sexes," see "coif," *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press (accessed 24 April 2013). This is distinct from a caul that is defined as: "A kind of close-fitting cap, worn by women: a net for the hair; a netted cap or head-dress, often richly ornamented," see "caul," *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press (accessed 24 April 2013).

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/35964?rskey=V5Fd7R&result=1&isAdvanced=false>
<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/29083?rskey=N9qniZ&result=1&isAdvanced=false>

from c.1555 (figure 2.15).¹¹² Almost without exception, Anna's portraits in large and miniature show her favouring high, padded hair studded with bodkins and aigrettes, which would not accord with a tightly fitted French hood (figures 1.2, 1.4, 1.6-1.10, 1.18, 1.20, 1.24-1.26, 1.33-1.35, 1.40-1.45, 1.54, 1.58, 2.1). Further French-influenced apparel is found in garments decorated in line with French fashions. This includes two petticoats and a deer-coloured satin gown described as being "pinckt all over wth a great French pinck."¹¹³ It was perhaps this use of imported French fabrics and use of French decorative cutting techniques that led Georg von Schwartzstät, Baron of Offenbach, to summarise during his tour of England in 1609, that English "attire is almost like the French."¹¹⁴

The Royal Jewellers and the Inventory of 1606

Dispatches and reports provide glowing accounts of Anna's resplendence. However, more concrete and detailed information regarding Anna's jewellery collection and expenditure is found in the accounts of the Exchequer and the Signet Office, in an inventory of her jewellery, and Heriot's accounts and vouchers. As mentioned above, Heriot worked for Anna in Scotland, and he travelled with the Stuarts to England in 1603. From this point onwards, he is listed in Anna's establishment lists as "her Ma.^{ty} Jeweller."¹¹⁵ This position brought him an annual retainer of £50, which was in addition to the goods and services he provided to

¹¹² Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 202. Arnold does not discuss French hoods, but she does provide an illustrated example.

¹¹³ CUL MS Dd.I.26. fols.14r, 16v. Deer-colour was presumably the same as fawn-coloured (pale brown). Arnold defines "pinked" as "small cuts on the surface of a fabric giving a decorative pattern," so that pinking in the French fashion presumably meant making larger or "great" cuts in the fabric. For the definition of "pinked" see *ibid.*, 369.

¹¹⁴ G. P. V. Akrigg, "England in 1609," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 14 (1950): 77.

¹¹⁵ Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 228. He first appears in the household accounts of 1603, see TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9.

the queen, and those he supplied to James.¹¹⁶ Heriot's accounts for 1605-15 are housed in the National Archives in London and are an invaluable source for scholars of early modern jewellery, although to my knowledge they have only been consulted by Scarisbrick.¹¹⁷ These records indicate that his position in England was highly profitable and, by 20 February 1615, he had earned more than £42,000 for his services to the queen – an astonishingly high sum.¹¹⁸ However, as was the case with many artisans who served the court, his payments were continually in arrears and, by 10 February 1615, he was owed an astounding £10,948.14s.3d. in unpaid bills.¹¹⁹

Heriot's accounts pertain to items that would have been in Anna's everyday use, as well as pieces that were expressly commissioned as gifts, or items that required repair. Rather than following the expected quarter dates, Heriot's itemised accounts of jewels cover variable periods of time, from short accounts that span only two or four months, through to more extensive bills that often cover more than a year.¹²⁰ Within the time period of any one account, specific dates are rarely given and the descriptions of the jewels are not as detailed as the entries found in the inventory of Anna's jewellery from 1606. The real value of Heriot's accounts lies in their ability to provide a powerful sense of the personal tastes and spending patterns of the queen. It appears Heriot received regular part payment of his bills

¹¹⁶ TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9. Heriot continued to receive his annual wage until Anna's death see TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1653; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1655.

¹¹⁷ Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery"; "Jewellery Inventory."

¹¹⁸ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fols.50r-v, 70r. This includes a list of money paid to Heriot on Anna's behalf and signified by various members of her Bedchamber, together with the eight privy seals "Granted by the King for The Queen's Jewels from His Accession to 20 February 1615," but it does not include the various payments to Heriot that are scattered throughout the accounts.¹¹⁹ Ibid., fol.2r.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., fol.2r.

¹²⁰ See, for example, *ibid.*, fol.42r, which covers "Februarie and March 1614," while fol.29r covers "the xxjth of July 1609 to the xxth of November next followinge." For longer accounts see, for example, fol.33v, which covers "the first of Janeuarie 1610 to the xvij of Maye 1611," or fol.41r, which spans "the ij of March 1612 to the last of November 1613."

with “ready money” from Anna’s Surveyor-General, Thomas Knyvett, and in several cases he was also paid by Margaret Hartside, one of Anna’s Scottish chamberers.¹²¹ It is unclear why Margaret fulfilled this duty instead of Knyvett, although she was evidently highly trusted by the queen, and was frequently placed in charge of money and precious goods. Payne notes that early in the reign Margaret had “responsibility for the queen’s plate,” and assisted Lady Walsingham in her capacity as Mistress of the Robes.¹²² Together with the Scottish First Lady and Groom of the Stool, Jane Drummond, Margaret was occasionally accountable for the delivery of Anna’s Privy Purse, signing for £1,700 that Anna requested on 20 March 1604.¹²³

In addition to the money that Heriot received from Knyvett and Margaret Hartside, eight privy seals were issued over the 10-year period covered by the accounts, which provided large sums of money to alleviate Anna’s mounting debts to the jeweller.¹²⁴ Moreover, privy seals issued by James to pay warrants to other artificers are recorded in Heriot’s accounts, thereby highlighting the close working relationships between jewellers and apparel makers

¹²¹ Knyvett was listed in Anna’s household accounts for 1615 as “Surveyor of her Mats Renewes,” for which he received £30 per annum (TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1650). In 1613, for example, Knyvett made part payments to Heriot on three separate occasions (TNA: PRO, LR 2/122, fols.38r-v). Knyvett also settled some of Heriot’s accounts in their entirety such as the payment he made on 13 July 1612 of £271.10s. (TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.64v). In Anna’s household accounts, Margaret Hartside is listed as chamberer from 1603-1607, for which she received £15 per annum (TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646). Heriot’s bill for the period 10 April 1607 to 10 February 1608 includes a charge of £30 for a ring that was “delivered to Margaret Hertsid... which she gave me to understand was by her ma^{ts} Direction” (TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.24r). It is noted that Heriot’s bill to the Crown for “Jewells and other things” from 31 December 1605 through to 20 September 1606 was offset by £500 that was paid to Heriot by “Mistris hartsyde” (TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.19r). From this evidence, it is clear that Margaret’s duties included ordering and paying for jewels from Heriot.

¹²² TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 64-65, 68, citing TNA: PRO, E351/1956, mem.4; TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; TNA: PRO, SP14/3/89.

¹²³ TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9. Drummond signed “Sixe Severall warrants,” which gave Anna £800, while Hartside signed one warrant for a further £1,700, giving Anna a total of £2,500. This is also noted by Payne *ibid.*, 58-59, although she misreads the monetary amounts.

¹²⁴ For example, the summary of Heriot’s accounts from the period 30 January 1611 through to 10 February 1615, includes not only a breakdown of the money that was still owed to Heriot, but also the money that he had received during that period which is listed as having been “payed vnto him by her Majestie,” TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.11r. For the eight privy seals see TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.70r and note 118 above.

in the Jacobean period. The accounts include payments to the jeweller Gilbert Nasmith of £1,333.6s.8d., and £550 to Anna's silk-woman, Hester le Telier, for "sondrie things w^{ch} have beene sevallie had of them both for the vse of o^r Said deerest wife the Queene."¹²⁵ Further, Sir William Stone, a London-based mercer, was paid £5,639.14s.6d. and the silk-man Thomas Henshaw received £5278.6s.11d., while Elias le Telier (Hester's husband), a linen draper based in London, was issued £1556.7s.6d by the crown.¹²⁶ These payments indicate that, on occasion, jewellers and tailors collaborated on garments, since pieces of jewellery and dress were considered to be the tandem prerequisites of a complete outfit. Jewels were often directly incorporated into clothes, or were consciously selected to complement and augment the wearer's raiment.

Comparison of the Accounts and the Inventory

A comparison of the jewels listed in Heriot's accounts with those recorded in the inventory of 1606 reveals very different items. The inventory of Anna's jewellery has been transcribed and published by Scarisbrick. This copy was kept at the Secret Jewel House in the Tower of London, and was annotated in three different hands until 1612. Scarisbrick suggests that it relates to Anna's "reserve" selection of jewels rather than pieces that were in daily use, such as those items listed in Heriot's accounts.¹²⁷ Unlike the jewels kept in the Tower, some of

¹²⁵ Ibid., fols.71r-v.

¹²⁶ Ibid., fols.73r-v. These payments cover the period from the Feast of the Annunciation in 1604, through to the Feast of St Michael in 1605. These artificers supplied Anna with goods on more than one occasion as they also appear, alongside Heriot, in the list of "Extraordinary payments...for necessaries belonging to her hignes Roabes and other ornaments" in Anna's 1605 household accounts. Stone was paid £1,000 in part payment of his total bill of £6,108.12s.4d., Henshawe similarly received £1,000 in part payment of his total bill of £2,644.15s.3d., and Elias le Telier is recorded as having been paid £550 that was owed to his wife, Hester le Telier, see TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646.

¹²⁷ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 194. Chambers states that during Elizabeth's reign, the First Lady of the Privy Chamber, who was also Mistress of the Robes "took charge of the jewels actually in use by the Queen and accounted for them to the Jewel-house," along with another of the chamberers. He lists the First Lady as

the pieces that formed part of Anna's daily *toilette* would have been stored in her rooms. Unsurprisingly, there are very few references to jewels in the surviving inventories of Denmark House and Oatlands Palace, as the jewels would have been inventoried separately. There is one entry in the inventory of Denmark House, taken in 1619, that attests to Anna having kept some of her jewellery in a cabinet, which is described as containing "Sixteene paire beades Chaines and bracelets in a small Coffe garnished wth silver."¹²⁸ A number of Anna's female attendants shared the responsibility for keeping the queen's jewels, including Margaret Hartside and Jane Drummond mentioned above. The Keepership of the Jewels was originally held by Katherine Howard, Countess of Suffolk, from 1603 to 1608, and she received an annuity of £26.13s.4d., which was equal to that of the Mistress of the Robes and the Keeper of the Sweet Coffers.¹²⁹ By 1608, the Keepership of the Jewels was held by Bridget Marrow, a Gentlewoman of the Privy Chamber.¹³⁰ In addition to the Keeper, Anna had a Clerk of the Jewel Coffers, William Bell, who received an annual wage of £13.6s.8d.¹³¹ By 1615, the position had passed to Brian Tashe, who was still named in the post in 1618, by which time the annual fee had risen to £20.¹³²

Figurative pendants occur in both the inventory and Heriot's accounts, and although many types are shared across the two groups, the reserve jewels contain a greater diversity of

being Katherine Astley from 1562-72; Katharine Howard from 1572-87; Dorothy Stafford in 1587, as well as Mary Ratcliffe who was in charge of Elizabeth's jewels from July 1587 to the end of her reign. See Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 44-45, note 1.

¹²⁸ Payne, "Inventory," 39.

¹²⁹ TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648. See also Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 60-61, citing TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; BL Add MS 27,404, fol.37.

¹³⁰ Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 61, citing TNA: PRO, LS13/168, fol.63v; TNA: PRO, SP14/40/50; TNA: PRO, SO3/2.

¹³¹ For the list of women who held the position of Keepership of the Queen's Jewels under Anna, see Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 60-62, 280. For Bell, see TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648.

¹³² TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1650; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1655.

design.¹³³ The reserve group abounds with pearls, chains, pendants, bodkins, aglets, pomanders, and fans. Comparatively, pearls rarely occur in Heriot's accounts, which feature an overwhelming number of diamonds and, unlike the inventory, the most common articles are rings, earrings, and miniature cases, which were presumably for everyday use. Other gems such as rubies, sapphires, and emeralds occur in both collections, as do crystal pendants, coral beads, and opals. Collectively, they elucidate the nature of Anna's spending and her taste, and importantly, these documents importantly indicate that contrary to popular historiography, Anna rarely dispensed with jewels in her possession. With the exception of three jewels that she gave to her Scottish chamberer Anna Livingstone, the queen generally chose to have jewels made anew for gifts. Her high volume of purchases from Heriot underscores her participation in the politicised world of gift-exchange. Further, Anna often had old pieces repaired by Heriot, rather than having them reconfigured or defaced, indicating that they perhaps held some personal or state significance. That said, Anna did do away with a number of inherited pieces and her approach to her jewellery collection seems to have been governed by changing tastes, which is considered below. As discussed in Chapter One, Anna is likely to have given jewelled miniatures featuring her cipher to favourites, family members, and loyal servants, for a number of them are commemorated in their portraits (figures 1.11-1.15).

¹³³ In addition to the various heart configurations and floral types found in the accounts, the inventory also lists jewels in the form of swans, sailing ships, fish, suns, keys, birds, bells, spiders and moons among other figurative designs, see Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 195-237.

The Crown Jewels and Issues of Ownership

In the second year of his English reign, James established a collection of more than sixty jewels that were “to be indyvidually and inseparably for ever hereafter annexed to the Kingdome of this Realme.”¹³⁴ Housed in the Secret Jewel House in the Tower of London, these prized pieces of jewellery were added to the collection of ceremonial objects, plate, and ornaments that had been housed there during the time of Queen Elizabeth and were the responsibility of the Master of the Jewels.¹³⁵ For the majority of James’s reign, this post was jointly held by Sir Edward Carey (*d.*1618) and his son Sir Henry Carey (*c.*1575-1633), passing to Sir Henry Mildmay (*c.*1593-1664) on 19 November 1618.¹³⁶ Among the jewels that James decided to make the hereditary property of the crown were several famous pieces including the Feather, the Mirror of Great Britain, the Portugal Diamond, the Cobham Pearl, the Mirror of France, and the Three Brothers (the Brethren), along with two imperial crowns, four pieces of unicorn horn, and a double handled gilt sword that had belonged to Henry VIII.¹³⁷

In reality, however, the jewels “united and annexed to the Crowne,” were not an inalienable collection, for James gave several pieces away. Sir Francis Gofton, Auditor of the Imprest, was required to draw up an additional schedule of twenty-six jewels that James removed

¹³⁴ The list of jewels is printed in J. Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*, 4 vols., vol.2 (London: J. B. Nichols, 1828), 45, and in Sir Francis Palgrave, *Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of the Exchequer*, 2 vols., vol. 2 (London, 1836), 299-309. The schedule was drawn up on 22 March 1605. James was not the first royal figure to establish a collection of Crown Jewels, and Cocks has traced the tradition back to Francis I of France (1494-1547) on 15 June 1530. See Cocks, “Status and Making of Jewellery,” 3.

¹³⁵ Collins, *Jewels and Plate*, 9.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, Appendix II, 257.

¹³⁷ Nichols, *Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities*, vol.2, 45-47.

from the national safe-house and gifted to Anna.¹³⁸ However, while Anna evidently had access to a sizeable collection of jewellery, it would seem that the jewellery James gave to Anna from the Crown Jewels, as well as many of the pieces listed in the inventory of Anna's jewellery collection in 1606, returned to the king's possession after her death. This is evidenced by an "H" jewel that had likely belonged to Henry VIII. First listed in the collection of the Crown Jewels, James gifted it to Anna sometime before 1606 when it was listed in the inventory of the queen's jewels.¹³⁹ It was clearly returned to James after Anna's death, for in 1623 the king gave the "H" jewel to Frances Stuart (née Howard), Duchess of Richmond and Lennox (1578-1639).¹⁴⁰ Similarly, James took possession of the jewels listed in Anna's collection as inventoried in 1606. For example, in 1622, James gave Katherine MacDonnell (née Manners), Duchess of Buckingham and Marchioness of Antrim (1603?-1649), a long gold chain set with diamonds and "great round pearls" that had been listed in the inventory of Anna's jewels.¹⁴¹ Later, in 1623, while Charles was in Spain, James sent him a host of jewels previously listed in Anna's collection.¹⁴²

Nevertheless, Anna clearly enjoyed some degree of control over the inventoried jewels, as she was able to have pieces reworked, annex them for plate, and even give them away. For example, a pearl pendant was removed from a "chayne of faire round pearles" and "put to a

¹³⁸ Palgrave, *Antient Kalendars*, vol.2, 306-309; TNA: PRO, SP 14/63, fols.116r-118r.

¹³⁹ Palgrave, *ibid.*, 307, no.2; Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 208, no.164. Scarisbrick traces the jewel to the inventory of Henry VIII's jewellery collection taken in 1550, and then to the inventory taken of Elizabeth's jewellery in 1587. See *ibid.*, 209, citing Henry VIII 1550 inventory, *Society of Antiquaries of London*: MS 129, fol.178 and BL Royal MS App. 68, fol.6b.

¹⁴⁰ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 208-209, no.164, citing R. Lemon, "Warrant of Indemnity and Discharge to Lionel Earl of Middlesex, Lord High Treasurer... Dated July 7, 1623," *Archaeologia*, vol. XXI (1827): 153-54, for evidence that James gave the jewel to the Duchess of Lennox, but the original warrant is preserved in TNA: PRO, SP14/139, fol.114, 11 March 1623.

¹⁴¹ Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 233, citing Lemon, "Warrant of Indemnity and Discharge," 153.

¹⁴² See for example Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 196, no.10; 197, no.24; 208, nos.157, 162; 209, no.171; 211, nos.182, 183; 223, no.306.

fayre pednant of a longe diamonde,” and on 5 September 1609, Nicasius Russell was ordered to make a “feather of gold in forme of a bird of Paradise” into a gold bowl.¹⁴³ Anna’s oversight of the jewels is further illustrated by the fate of the impressive 33-carat Portugal Diamond. Originally listed among the Crown Jewels, it must have been given to Anna before 1606, since it appears in her jewellery inventory of that year, where it is described as “a faire and great table Diamond being the Diamond of Portingale.”¹⁴⁴ On 6 February 1606, Anna ordered Sir John Spilman to make the Portugal Diamond into a bodkin.¹⁴⁵ The following year, when Anna Livingstone went to Scotland, the queen gave her a jewel from her 1606 collection and, on the occasion of Livingstone’s marriage in 1612, gave her an additional three jewels.¹⁴⁶

The issue of Anna’s control over the jewels is complicated by the fact that she did not make a will. Writing to Puckering on 16 March 1619, Lorkin recounts that

The queen, at her death, bequeathed all she had, by a verbal testament to the prince (a legacy of little less value than £600,000), if he might be suffered to enjoy it. But the king is impatient to hear of the notion, and means to seize upon all for himself.¹⁴⁷

This was confirmed by Chamberlain who asserts that “as for the speech of a will y^t is like to prove nothing, and perhaps y^t fell out for the best, for y^t is verely thought she meant to have made the King of Denmarke her executor.”¹⁴⁸ While he later reports that the

quenes trunckes and cabinets wth jiwalls [jewels] were brought thether from Denmark house in fowre carts, and delivered by inventorie by Sr Edward Cooke and

¹⁴³ Ibid., 197, no.23; 206, no.149.

¹⁴⁴ Nichols, *Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities*, vol.2, 46, no.30: “a jewell of Gould, being the great diamond of Portugale.” Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 223, no.306.

¹⁴⁵ Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 223, no.306.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 200, no.64; 212, no.196; 213, no.200. The gifts to Lady Livingstone are discussed in greater detail below. The inventory does not provide values for any of the listed pieces.

¹⁴⁷ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. 2, 146.

¹⁴⁸ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 2, 224-25: 27 March 1619.

auditor Gofton: the king pursued them all and bestowed some reasonable portion on the L of Buckingham, besides he hath the keping of Denmark house.¹⁴⁹

If Chamberlain was correct, it seems unusual that Anna wished her brother to execute her estate, and it may point to a growing rift between the king and queen. Further evidence of James's dispersal of Anna's goods is found in Chamberlain's declaration that "the King hath bestowed on the Prince... [Anna's] late graunt of clothes" while Lorkin attests that "His majesty hath... granted my Lord of Buckingham twelve hundred pounds a-year of land, that was the queen's."¹⁵⁰ Therefore, it can be adduced that while Anna exercised a level of control over a quantity of the Crown Jewels during her lifetime that she was able to wear, refashion, and give away, when she died on 2 March 1619, the jewellery she presided over, her properties, and her monopolies, were returned to James's possession.¹⁵¹

Divine Right Monarchy

As I have outlined, an opulent, bejewelled appearance in the early modern period was an intrinsic aspect of princely magnificence. It served to communicate not only the wealth and glory of the wearer but also that of their dynasty and, in the case of royalty, their kingdom.¹⁵² In Jacobean England, such jewelled splendour displayed by the king and his consort could also be seen as an illustration of James's personal belief in Divine Right Monarchy. In a speech delivered to Parliament in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, in 1605, James outlined his theory of the Divine Right of Kings, which included his assertion

¹⁴⁹ TNA: PRO, SP14/109, fol.75, Chamberlain to Carleton: 24 May 1619.

¹⁵⁰ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. 2, 158-59, letter to Sir Thomas Puckering: 5 May 1619.

¹⁵¹ James definitely took over Anna's Surrey palace of Oatlands after her death, which I discuss in Chapter Three below.

¹⁵² Cocks, "Status and Making of Jewellery," 4. Cocks makes this point in relation to collections of jewellery and "*objets de vertu*" housed in palaces, but it is similarly true for the individual wearer.

that the monarchy as God's "Vice-gerents [regents] on earth, and so adorned and furnished with some sparkles of the Divinitie."¹⁵³ As far as James was concerned, lavish adornment was not a matter of vanity, but a matter of majesty. This was similarly understood by the English Privy Council. In a series of letters exchanged between King and Council in 1604, James was expressly advised to pay for Anna's next Christmas masque in order to ensure an appropriate level of greatness.¹⁵⁴ Cancelling the masque to save money, the Council cautioned, "would be more pernicious than the expense of ten times the value" and "the judgement that will follow will be neither safe nor honourable."¹⁵⁵ In other words, the Council believed that perceived parsimony would cast aspersions on the king's own person and could signal a financial weakness that might encourage aggressive international policy on the continent.¹⁵⁶ This exchange clearly highlights the political importance of august displays of wealth, a key site for which was the royal body.

Given the political weight of material magnificence, it is unsurprising that Anna deployed jewels and clothing from the Tower during the masquing season. For Anna's first court masque, Daniel's *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, performed by the queen and her ladies at Hampton Court on 8 January 1604, warrants were issued to the Countess of Suffolk (Keeper of the Jewels) and Lady Walsingham (Mistress of the Robes), to take garments belonging to Queen Elizabeth from the wardrobe in the Tower of London.¹⁵⁷ This is not to say, however, that masquers were routinely outfitted from the wardrobe storehouse. Under

¹⁵³ Charles Howard McIlwain, ed. *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1918), 281; Godfrey Davies, *The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), 8; Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 229.

¹⁵⁴ Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 209-12.

¹⁵⁵ Quoted in Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 100, citing *Salisbury MSS*, 16:388.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 210.

the heading of “Payments made upon Severall Bills of Artificers” in Anna’s household accounts of 1605, the mercer Sir William Stone was paid the extremely large sum of £854.6s.6d. for “stuffes and wares delivered the second of Januarie 1603 for her Ma.^{ts} Maske,” while the silk-man Thomas Henshawe received £185.3s. “for divers parcels of stuffs delivered for Her Ma.^{ts} Maske” on 29 December 1603.¹⁵⁸ This enormous expenditure can be accounted for by date. As the first masque staged at the Jacobean court, it would have been to stage an appropriately magnificent performance, which would have signalled the strength and majesty of the new ruling dynasty.

Unfortunately, the specifics of the expenditure is not given, although according to Chambers, James paid for all six of Anna’s masques with the exception of the apparel of the chief masquers, who were expected to provide their own dress.¹⁵⁹ If this was the system, it is likely the cost of the queen’s costume would be charged to her personal account, although the sum disbursed to the mercer is sufficiently high to suggest that, on this occasion at least, Anna paid for some of the masquing costumes of her ladies.¹⁶⁰ Certainly, judging from the £106.11s. that was outlaid by Lady Rutland for her apparel as a chief masquer in *Hymenaei*, the amount Anna paid to Stone and Henshawe in 1603/4 could have easily outfitted several masquers.¹⁶¹ Significantly, there are only two references to masquing costumes in Anna’s wardrobe inventories, perhaps suggesting that performance

¹⁵⁸ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646.

¹⁵⁹ Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 209-10. Chambers notes that this was not a fixed arrangement, however, and the lace used for the costumes of the 14 main masquers in *Tethys’ Festival*, was paid for by the Exchequer. This contribution might have been due to the fact that the masque, which was performed on 5 June 1610, was a part of the larger celebrations surrounding Prince Henry’s investiture as Prince of Wales.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 209. Chambers states “I have no evidence that Anna’s personal account was ever charged with any part of the cost of the Queen’s masks,” which fails to take into consideration the bills submitted by Stone and Henshawe cited above.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 211-12. This masque was performed on 5 January 1606, as part of the celebrations for the wedding of Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex (1591-1646) and Frances Howard (1590-1632).

apparel was generally housed in the Tower. Evidently, the political significance of the masque ensured Anna was granted access to textiles inherited from the Tudors, and also meant she was prepared to invest large sums of money on the material magnificence of herself and her fellow masquers.

Goods from the Tower were again in use for Anna's *Masque of Beauty* in 1608. This time, as I discussed in Chapter One, a collar comprising 18 pieces of gold set with diamonds and the ciphers of Philip II of Spain and Mary Tudor (P and M) was brought out from the collection of Crown Jewels in the Tower for the queen's employ.¹⁶² This was not a matter of vanity, however, but one of calculated politicking. As noted, it is likely that Anna wore the collar to illustrate her support for the Anglo-Spanish marriage that was currently being negotiated. It also would have served to remind Spain of their previous union with England, underscoring that such a match was highly possible, for it had precedent. Notably, rather than returning to the Tower after the masque, the P and M collar appears to have remained in Anna's possession, for it is listed in a schedule of jewels deriving from "the Secrete Jewellhouse in the Tower of London [but] remayninge wth the Quene," which was drawn up in 1611.¹⁶³ The collar is also present in the inventory of Anna's jewellery. It appears as the last entry, in the second hand, described as having been "bought out of the Tower by his Majesties direction and geven to her Majestie, agaynst the maske at twelfnyght 1607."¹⁶⁴ I would suggest that this piece stayed with Anna for purposes of ready access, allowing her to repeatedly advertise her support and favour of the Spanish. For Anna's next masque, Jonson's *Masque*

¹⁶² The jewel was recorded in Gofton's original 1606 list of the Crown Jewels, see Palgrave, *Antient Kalendars and Inventories*, vol. 2, 301. no.9.

¹⁶³ TNA: PRO, SP14/63, fol.116r, no.2.

¹⁶⁴ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 237, no.406.

of Queens, which was performed at Whitehall on 2 February 1609, two elaborate gold collars were removed from the Tower for her use on 23 December 1608, and stayed in her custody after the masque.¹⁶⁵ As these examples make clear, Anna's adornment was of central importance to the crown. James repeatedly sanctioned heirlooms for Anna's use and possession in order that she could be arrayed in jewellery and clothing befitting her status as queen consort.

Writing on the various uses and public appearances of the Tudor jewellery, regalia, and plate housed in the Tower, Collins acerbically states that following the ascendancy of James, these precious items were merely used "for amateur theatricals."¹⁶⁶ This observation fails to consider the implicit correlation between an image of affluent majesty and political power.¹⁶⁷ The appearance of the English queen consort was frequently mentioned in ambassadorial dispatches, where she was conflated with the magnificence and splendour of the English Crown. Had James and the Council been privy to the account written by the Venetian ambassador to the Doge and Senate on 24 January 1608, they would undoubtedly have been very pleased by the political account of Anna's appearance. Describing the "splendour of the spectacle" of the *Masque of Beauty*, the ambassador stated that it

was a miracle... but what beggared all else, and possibly exceeded the public expectation was the wealth of pearls and jewels that adorned the Queen and her

¹⁶⁵ These two collars are listed in TNA: PRO, SP14/63, fol.166r: "Note of Jewels of the Secret Jewel House in the tower remaininge wth the Queen," that was compiled on 8 May 1611, and lists jewels removed from the Tower between 1607 and 1609. For the connection to the masque see Collins, *Jewels and Plate*, 15.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁶⁷ Elias, *Court Society*, 52-53. Elias makes this point in his discussion of the innate correlation between the "size and splendour" of a house and the "rank and status" of the owner. Even though Elias is discussing property, the principle of his argument relates to appearance more generally, thereby reaffirming James's opinion on material majesty discussed above. Thus, Anna's opulent appearance was crucial, as it not only signified the wealth of the Jacobean kingdom, but more importantly, it had a direct bearing on the perceived rank and status of the Stuart dynasty.

ladies, so abundant and splendid that in everybody's opinion no other court could have displayed such riches.¹⁶⁸

While Anna, according to Foscarini, was consistently "most richly and extraordinarily arrayed," the appearance of the king, as expected, was also of prime interest and descriptions of James's jewels and clothing frequently pepper diplomatic dispatches.¹⁶⁹ Recounting a dinner to the Doge and Senate, the Venetian ambassadors, Francesco Contarini and Marc' Antonio Correr, were evidently very pleased with the magnificence of James's apparel, which they describe as comprising "a [hat] jewel made of five diamonds of extraordinary size, and also a chain of diamonds from which hung the George, that is the Order of the Garter." On account of the sumptuousness of James's dress, in conjunction with "the great number of silver-gilt vases upon the side-board, piled up to the ceiling, and for a service of flagons holding goblets of precious stone studded with gems," the ambassadors were able to define the evening as having been particularly "royal."¹⁷⁰

Later, on the occasion of Princess Elizabeth's marriage to Frederick V on 14 February 1613, both James and Anna wore jewel-encrusted garments offset by magnificent jewels that attracted comment. The Venetian ambassador relayed that

the King's cloak, breeches and jacket were all sewn with diamonds, a rope and jewel of diamonds also in his hat, of inestimable value. The Queen had in her hair a great number of pear-shaped pearls, the largest and most beautiful there are in the world; and there were diamonds all over her person, so that she was ablaze.¹⁷¹

As Smuts outlines, these displays of splendour and affluence served to reinforce social hierarchies, convey political power, and were a central part of the inherited visual culture of

¹⁶⁸ CSPV, vol. 11, 86, no.154. Giustinian's report is often quoted and can be found in Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 229; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 25.

¹⁶⁹ CSPV, vol. 14, 96, no.139.

¹⁷⁰ CSPV, vol. 12, 430-32, no.801.

¹⁷¹ CSPV, vol. 13, 498-99, no.775.

the court.¹⁷² Further, while some scholars have pointed to Anna's sumptuous appearance as evidence of her personal love of sparkling gems, and her profligate and shallow nature, it is apparent from these eye-witness reports that her opulent presence was a requisite sign of the majesty, wealth, and material abundance of the English crown and her royal husband. This was instrumental in matters of foreign policy, and is clearly illustrated by Anna's strategic decision to wear certain colours and certain jewels to communicate political position and favour.

Repairing and Reconfiguring Jewels

While Anna has been maligned for her "unlimited extravagance," the inventory of Anna's jewellery, drawn up in 1606, shows that she retained jewels originally belonging to Henry VIII, Mary Tudor, and Elizabeth. Furthermore, Heriot's accounts indicate that Anna continued to pay for the maintenance of some of her jewels.¹⁷³ Sometime during 1606, for example, Heriot charged Anna for the material and labour required to make a new clasp for "the froge Jewell."¹⁷⁴ This may well be the same "frog jewel" that is listed in Anna's jewellery inventory as "a vine Leafe of gold enameled greene, hauing three pendants of rock Rubies in clawes without foile, and a frogge vpon the leafe garnished with Diamonds," which she had inherited from Elizabeth.¹⁷⁵ If it is the same jewel, this indicates that Anna continued to repair some of her old jewels rather than having them reconfigured or broken

¹⁷² Smuts, "Art and the Material Culture of Majesty," 90-93.

¹⁷³ Dietz, *English Public Finances*, 104. Dietz does, however, weigh Anna's expenditure against that of James and concedes that Anna was not "a lone participant in the extravagance which she fostered," 102. Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 193; "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 230.

¹⁷⁴ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol. 20v.

¹⁷⁵ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 210, no.174. Scarisbrick includes the jewel's entry from Elizabeth's 1587 Inventory, fol. 33 as "one leaf of gold enameled with a frogge of gold thereon garnished with sparckes of diamondes."

down into plate. Furthermore, Heriot's accounts show he repeatedly billed Anna for the repair of old or "broken worke," such as his account from 25 July 1612, which includes a charge of £10 "for mending Certaine braslits, a Coller of great Saphires and dyvers uther mendings."¹⁷⁶

Although Anna preserved and maintained a number of old pieces of jewellery, she did have some of her jewels reconfigured. These were sometimes in poor condition such as the "broken gold of iij Jewells defaced, whereof one of them... hath one table Ruby & one Emerald remaining, with other small peeces broken," which was made into gold aglets.¹⁷⁷

But more often, the original piece was in perfect order, as in the case of a great and fair pearl that was taken from a "pendant of good forme, with a small stalke of plain gold" and was "put to a pendant of a long fayre diamond of many cut sett in gold without foyle."¹⁷⁸

Another example is found in the "Brooche of a round circle of gold with two interlaced triangles, garnished with sparkes of Diamonds and Rubies," which was made into gold aglets by Nicasius Russell on 14 November 1609.¹⁷⁹ The decision to have jewels made into aglets at this time may have been related to prevailing tastes. Certainly, throughout the later 1610s and 1620s, the practical use of points (laces) to tie garments together was superseded by hook-and-eye closures, so aglets became valued primarily for their decorative function.

Laces and bows with aglets made of precious metals, glass, crystal, or studded with gems hung off the bottom of men's and women's garments well into the 1640s (figures 2.16-

¹⁷⁶ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.41r. Other examples include Heriot's account from 1 December 1605 to 20 September 1606, which includes a charge of £3 for mending jewels, as does his account from the next year dating from 10 April 1607 to 10 February 1608. Heriot's bill for 1608/1609 also includes £5 worth of repairs, see *ibid.*, fols.20r, 24r, 26r.

¹⁷⁷ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 217, no.258.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 198, no.33.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 210, no.179.

2.18).¹⁸⁰ Despite the fact that Anna often had old jewels mended rather than earmarking them for plate and did not dispense with a large volume of her jewellery overall, she did, on occasion, have items that were in perfectly good order reconfigured into other jewels or made into aglets. The motivating factor seems to have been changing fashions, for the majority of the pieces relinquished by Anna were jewels that featured complicated figurative settings favoured during the Elizabethan period.

In addition to having pieces reconfigured, the indefatigable royal need for plate (bowls, ewers, salts, basins) that was requisite in matters of state ceremony, gift-giving, and reward meant that some pieces from Anna's reserve collection were broken down.¹⁸¹ However, over the six-year period during which the inventory, compiled in 1606, was annotated, a mere 54 of the 453 pieces (12%) listed were broken down into plate, indicating that Anna did not regularly sacrifice pieces of her jewellery.¹⁸² Rather than forfeit her jewellery, another source of materials that Anna used for plate was the precious metal buttons and tags that adorned her clothing. Between January 1609 and April 1610, Anna relinquished five sets of buttons from her collection of jewels for the making of plate.¹⁸³ The following

¹⁸⁰ Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 94, 96; Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 359. Ribeiro refers to stays and stay laces, which in effect are bodices and the laces or cords that were used to draw them together, although according to the *OED*, the term "stay laces" did not come into use until 1720, and certainly in Anna's wardrobe inventories, bodices or stays are consistently referred to as "bodies." See "staylace," *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press (accessed 22 April 2013).

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/189423?rskey=DEIbVU&result=1&isAdvanced=false>

¹⁸¹ Further information regarding the traditional uses of plate in ceremonial and gift giving as well as other examples of jewellery and apparel being defaced for plate is provided below.

¹⁸² The printed inventory is numbered and lists 406 items. On seven occasions however, a collection of items are grouped under one entry, but they are all individual pieces. As such, the larger total number of items (453) that I have listed includes each individual sub-entry in order to provide a more accurate idea of the proportion of jewels that were made into plate (54), and the proportion of that number, which were either figurative in design (41) or defaced (19). These numbers only account for jewels specifically designated to be made into plate. It excludes the 20 pieces that were reconfigured into aglets, bodkins, or other jewels. Among those 20 pieces were a set of buttons, a loose diamond, a miniature case, an elaborate black velvet purse, and five pearl pendants that were interchanged between jewels.

¹⁸³ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 205, no.142; 206, no.144; 230, no.353; 234, nos.381, 382.

year, on 10 April 1611, 10 buttons and 28 pairs of gold aglets were removed from a purple satin gown, which had perhaps belonged to Henry VIII, and given to Spilman to be made into plate. Later that month, Spilman was provided with an additional 11 gold buttons and 10 gold loops from a cassock of murrey velvet that were presumably destined for plate.¹⁸⁴ As this evidence makes clear, Anna did not mark large quantities of jewellery for plate, and often looked to melt down accessories such as buttons and aglets instead. Of course, she did on occasion reconfigure or break down jewels, but this was not on the large scale that historians have traditionally asserted.¹⁸⁵

Regarding the instances that Anna did have jewels broken down into plate, Scarisbrick has stated that they were chosen due to poor condition, rather than as the consequence of changing styles.¹⁸⁶ Yet, of the 54 items in Anna's inventory that were earmarked for plate, more than three quarters were figurative in design, while only 35% were noted to be "defaced," which indicates that jewels were more readily chosen on the basis of design.¹⁸⁷ While some damaged jewels were indeed given over to plate, the majority of the jewels were representational, and were in perfect condition. This suggests that Anna was responding to the latest styles and the move towards jewellery that emphasised gemstones over setting.¹⁸⁸ Moreover, Anna's collection, as inventoried in 1606, includes a quantity of defaced pieces such as a gold cross with loose pearls and "the gold being broken," a "long

¹⁸⁴ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.4r, 5v. These items are both listed under a sub-heading of "Apparell for men," indicating that they may have been part of those garments originally belonging to Henry VIII that were stored at Denmark House during Anna's lifetime. See above, 139-143, and Payne, "Inventory," 25, 32-3, 35.

¹⁸⁵ Collins, *Jewels and Plate*, 167; Scarisbrick, *Jewellery in Britain*, 69.

¹⁸⁶ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 193.

¹⁸⁷ There were a total of 54 earmarked for plate, of which 41 pieces (76%) were figurative and only 19 pieces (35%) were noted as being in poor condition.

¹⁸⁸ Richard Edgcumbe, "'O, Those Jewels! The Pride and Glory of This Kingdom!'" in *Tudors, Stuarts and the Russian Tsars*, ed. Olga Dmitrieva and Tessa Murdoch (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2013), 153.

chain of many small links” that was noted as having “one small Emerald wanting xiiij [13] Pearles wanting,” and a chain of gold knots interspersed with pomanders that had “some netting broken and Pearles wanting.”¹⁸⁹ If what Scarisbrick supposes is true, then the poor condition of these pieces should have warranted their selection for plate over the figurative items. In addition, a significant number of jewels and buttons were described as being of “very ould fashion” or “ould worke” or “ancient worke,” which Anna chose to retain. By contrast, many of the pieces that she ordered to be broken down were comparatively new, having been recently acquired by Elizabeth.¹⁹⁰

Jewels that had been gifted to Elizabeth in the 1580s and 1590s, which Anna had made into plate or refashioned into aglets included: a jewelled swan; a jewel in the form of “a half Circle with a candlestick and a candle burning, two flies about the light”; a jewel that featured Bacchus seated on a tun [cask] with Pegasus flying overhead; and a gold collar with a pendant of a bear and ragged staff.¹⁹¹ Anna also had a jewelled pelican, which had been in the collection of Elizabeth, made into a gold bowl on 27 September 1610, but it is unknown whether Elizabeth had inherited, bought, or been gifted this piece.¹⁹² Consequently, it seems Anna rarely sacrificed pieces from her collection for plate. When she did, she often

¹⁸⁹ Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 210, no.176; 213, no.197; 214, no.216.

¹⁹⁰ See for example *ibid.*, 210, no. 177; 220-21, no.283; 230, no.350; 233, no.366. It should be noted that two of these jewels (nos.177 and 283) were in poor condition.

¹⁹¹ The swan jewel was delivered to Spilman to be made into plate on 26 July 1609, and had been given as a New Year’s gift to Elizabeth by Baroness Burghley in 1586; the jewel featuring a candlestick and flies was “defased and deliuered to Mr Nicasius Russell, Jeweller, the 27 September 1610 by her Majesties direction, for the making of a Gold Boll,” and Scarisbrick notes that it was originally given to Elizabeth as a New Year’s gift in 1586 by Lord and Lady Talbot. The jewel featuring Bacchus was listed as “wanting one Emeralde,” and was delivered to Russell on 26 July 1609, to be made into a basin and ewer, having been originally given to Elizabeth in 1584 as a New Year’s Gift by Thomas Woodhouse. The pendant of the bear and staff was broken down to make aglets in January 1606, and Scarisbrick suggests that it must have been given to Elizabeth by Ambrose (Dudley) Earl of Warwick (c.1561-90) since it was the badge of the Earls of Warwick. See *ibid.*, 210, 211-12, 220-21, 230, nos.177, 189, 283, 350.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 233, no.368. It is unknown when this jewel entered Elizabeth’s collection. For the description of the jewel in Elizabeth’s inventory see BL Stowe MS 557, f.100v.

chose highly complex figurative jewels that held no real personal or state importance, particularly late personalised gifts to Elizabeth. These jewels were chosen over those that were *à jour*, or plain set, or those which perhaps held some value of inheritance, even if they were now in poor condition. It is worth pointing out that Anna did not dispense with any of Elizabeth's jewels immediately, but waited until 1609/10 when she had already been queen consort for a number of years. As I have shown, Elizabeth's visual legacy was extremely important to Anna, and in the early years of the English reign she continued to stress continuity with the Tudor queen through shared clothing, furnishings, and aspects of her self-representation.

This is not to say that Anna no longer favoured representational jewels. She did continue to purchase a quantity of figurative jewels and rings from Heriot, buying "a paire of Lizard pendants" and "a Starre pendant" in 1614 that were both set with diamonds.¹⁹³ However, these were much simpler than the complicated jewels favoured by Elizabeth, which Scarisbrick describes as "mannerist."¹⁹⁴ Heriot's accounts reveal a large quantity of representational rings, which commonly feature hearts and flowers. Specific flowers are mentioned, with the rose being the most frequent, although Anna also bought a number of rings in the shape of pansies, daisies, and leaves. Heart imagery occurs in a number of highly symbolic variations including pierced hearts, hands holding hearts, burning hearts, hearts with serpents, and one ring featuring a pierced eye together with a pierced heart. According to emblemata of the period, a burning heart and hand could be seen as symbolic of true love or friendship. The device of a lone burning, or pierced, heart signalled contriteness,

¹⁹³ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol. 46r.

¹⁹⁴ Scarisbrick, *Jewellery in Britain*, 87.

which was thought to be valued by God above all other sacrifices or pious works, and a heart together with an eye referred to a mind that was fixed upon “celestial matters” as opposed to corrupt “fleshy thoughts.”¹⁹⁵ While I have been unable to trace any surviving jewels with such iconography, a quantity of highly symbolic Renaissance jewellery does survive (figures 2.19-2.21). In addition to heart imagery, Anna bought a large number of emblematic diamond rings that included darts, trophies, and lizards, and she also bought two rings that opened: one in the shape of a frog, and one in the shape of a scallop shell.¹⁹⁶ Irrespective of whether they were figurative or plain set, however, the large volume of diamond rings that Anna purchased from Heriot indicates many of them must have been intended as gifts.

The intrinsic value of jewellery meant that in addition to being broken down into plate, it was subject to being pawned during financial difficulties. Using jewellery as collateral for loans was a long-standing tradition and one that continued under the Stuarts.¹⁹⁷ Like many jewellers of the early modern period, Heriot was also a moneylender and a banker. Yet again, contrary to the traditional view of Anna as “an extravagant consort” who “sought relief from pressing difficulties by pawning jewels,” she only pawned jewels to Heriot on two

¹⁹⁵ Wither, *Collection of Emblemes*, 84, 99, 230, 237, 77, 43. On the religious symbolism of pierced hearts, see an essay by Michael Neill who writes that “the heart was symbolic of love and piety; when pierced, it stood for ‘contrition and devotion under... extreme trial’.” He further notes that the pierced heart could be used as “a symbol of the Sorrows of the Virgin.” See Michael Neill, “‘What Strange Riddle’s This?’: Deciphering ‘Tis Pity She’s a Whore,’” in *John Ford: Critical Re-Visions*, ed. Michael Neill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 161-62, 177, n.25.

¹⁹⁶ Elizabeth similarly owned “one Jewell of golde like an Irish darte garnished with fower small diamonds,” see Arnold, *Unlock’d*, 331, transcribed from BL Stowe 557, fol.98r, no.61. I have been unable to trace any of these devices in Geoffrey Whitney, *A Choice of Emblemes, and Other Deuises...* Early English Books (Leyden, 1586), or Wither, *Collection of Emblemes*.

¹⁹⁷ Cocks, “Status and Making of Jewellery,” 5. Cocks provides the example of Rudolph II (1552-1612) who in 1578 placed 308 items of jewellery and plate in pawn to Queen Elizabeth I. Jones and Stallybrass discuss the frequency with which jewels and clothing were pawned for money in early modern England, and note that pawning goods crossed all levels of society, see Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, 26-32.

occasions.¹⁹⁸ On 1 May 1609, Anna pawned a gold ring “with a large thik table diamond and set round about with Small table Diamonds,” “A rosse Jewell opening for a picture set of both the sydes with Diamonds” and “a Crosse of gold set with Seaven Diamonds and two rocke rubyes” to Heriot.¹⁹⁹ The three jewels collectively yielded Anna £1,305.15s. of ready money, but over the course of the following six years and 10 months, they cost her £1,248 in interest.²⁰⁰ A second instance of Anna pawning jewels to Heriot occurs on 24 April 1613 when she placed “a jewell infashione of a rosse set on the one syde with diamonds” in pawn for £700. This action cost her £222.10s. in interest by 24 February 1615, and by this time, she needed £3,498.15s. to redeem the four jewels.²⁰¹ Anna later used jewels as security for a loan from the jeweller Spilman. Writing to him in February 1615, Anna states that she has “some necessary occasions to take up money att interest” for which she is “contented to Ingage, some of oʒ Jewells,” which yielded her £3,400.²⁰² As well as using jewels as security against loans, Anna pawned a jewel to Heriot in exchange for another jewel, rather than for money. In November 1609, she placed “a Jewell infashione of a baye leaf openinge for a picture and set with Diamonds” in pawn to Heriot for £150, “which was for the pryce of a tablett set with Diamonds opening with her Ma:^{ties} [Anna’s] picture in it.”²⁰³ This is perhaps one instance that is indicative of the slow move away from the complex emblematic designs that had dominated the Elizabethan period towards plain settings that were intended to be secondary to the stone.²⁰⁴ As noted above though, Anna did continue to order figurative

¹⁹⁸ Collins, *Jewels and Plate*, 167.

¹⁹⁹ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.15r.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² TNA: PRO, SP14/80, fol.58, February 1615; TNA: PRO, SP14/80, fol.90, 26 March? 1615. Collins uses this instance of Anna pawning jewels to Spilman along with that found in BL Stowe MS 560, fols.40-3, for his rather exaggerated conclusion that Anna was “an extravagant consort” who “sought relief...by pawning jewels,” *Jewels and Plate*, 167, note 3.

²⁰³ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.15v.

²⁰⁴ Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 193.

jewels from Heriot throughout her time in England, but they were never as elaborate as those owned by Elizabeth.²⁰⁵ The documents clearly show that Anna very rarely put jewels in pawn. In the 15-year period that is covered by Heriot's accounts, there are only three instances of Anna pawning jewels, and I have only come across one additional documented case, when she placed some jewels in pawn to Spilman in 1615. The evidence does not support the traditional characterisation of Anna as a foolish woman who was always in financial difficulties, and who had no regard for the value of commissioned or inherited jewellery.

Personalised Jewels

Anna's bejewelled appearance illustrates the general magnificence of the Jacobean monarchy. Yet Anna used representational jewellery for a more specific purpose: to strategically signal her dynastic cachet and to underscore her difference from James. As well as the cipher jewel that Christian IV gifted Anna in June 1611, which was discussed in Chapter One, the queen commissioned a number of jewelled pieces from Heriot that contained Christian's letters, or combined them with her own. Confirmation that Anna wore jewellery with reference to Christian is indicated by the numerous charges for their repair. The purchases and repairs generally date between the end of 1607 and the middle of 1611, and I suggest they should be contextualised within the eagerly sought, but confessionally problematic Spanish marriage.

²⁰⁵ One jewel belonging to Elizabeth is described as: "one Fearne braunche of golde having therin a Lyzarde a Ladye Cowe and a Snaile," as cited in Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 328.

As outlined in Chapter One, for reasons of status, power, and wealth, Anna strongly supported the plan to arrange a Spanish bride for her eldest son, Prince Henry. During the lengthy negotiations in pursuit of the match, Anna is known to have verbally championed the prestige and strength of her familial links. It is also likely that she sought to visually advertise her connections among the international diplomatic community at court, and jewelled ciphers would have adequately fulfilled this aim. On 4 October 1607, Anna purchased “a litle pendant informe of a C contayning xix Diamonds,” and on 10 February 1608, she received one of the most expensive pieces that she ever bought from Heriot: a jewel “wth an A and two CC Sett wth Diamonds,” for an impressive £300.²⁰⁶ While there are no reports of Anna wearing these ciphers, there is clear evidence that she did wear jewelled letters to assist her political ambitions at this time. As noted above, Anna pointedly chose to wear the illustrious bejewelled collar with the letters P and M, at the performance of the *Masque of Beauty* on 10 January 1608. Given by Philip II to Mary Tudor, the collar was testimony to the previous Anglo-Spanish marriage, and it signalled Anna’s support for the current match that was under negotiation.²⁰⁷

In January 1610, when Anna purchased a pendant that was “Set with diamonds informe of this L^{re} C,” the Anglo-Spanish match was being hotly discussed at court.²⁰⁸ On 2 March 1610, for example, it was eagerly reported that “there was a close understanding... between England and Spain, thanks to the Queen... the Prince of Wales would presently be sent to

²⁰⁶ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.24r. The account runs from 10 April 1607 to 10 February 1608. At the bottom of the page, however, are entries for 1 January 1607, which is followed by the diamond jewel on 10 February. It is unclear whether it relates to 1607 or 1608.

²⁰⁷ Ungerer, “Circulation of Gifts,” 156-57.

²⁰⁸ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.32r.

Spain and the Queen was anxious that he should marry the Infanta.”²⁰⁹ The Spanish match was again at the forefront of Stuart diplomacy in the middle of 1611, with Foscarini reporting to Venice on 21 July 1611 that “her Majesty inclines to the Spanish Infanta, of whom she thinks very well.”²¹⁰ Following his audience with Anna the next week, he stated that she “talked mostly about her mother, her brother, the greatness of her house.”²¹¹ Coinciding with this dispatch was the need for one of Christian’s tablets to be mended, for Anna owned at least three miniatures of her brother.²¹² Whether Anna wore a miniature during Foscarini’s audience is unknown, but the repair charges indicate that she did wear Christian’s picture during this time. Her wearing of the miniatures is further illustrated by the fact that one of the cases needed repairs the following year, and a new crystal and “a fillet of gold” was issued for it on 1 April 1612.²¹³ Throughout the protracted marriage negotiations for Henry, cipher jewellery would have enabled Anna to silently showcase her position, and to potently remind foreign officials of her dynastic cachet in order to strengthen the English attempt to secure an Anglo-Spanish marriage.

As well as visually showcasing her natal connections at this time, Anna sought to use her rumoured Catholicism to assist with the realisation of a match with Spain. Writing to King Philip III on 27 September 1611, the Spanish Ambassador, Alonso de Velasco (*d.*1620), claimed that a Scottish priest was being concealed at Anna’s court under the pretence of being a “servant” of her Catholic first lady Jane Drummond (*c.*1585-1643), adding that the

²⁰⁹ CSPV, vol. 11, 436, no.811.

²¹⁰ CSPV, vol. 12, 182, no.280.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 184-86, no.284.

²¹² TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.34r. The tablet was mended in May 1611. In addition to the case made by Heriot, two highly valuable miniatures were kept in the Tower. See Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 220, no.78; 233, no.369. One of these may have been that gifted by Christian in 1606, and cited below.

²¹³ TNA: PRO, LR 2/122, fols.41r.

priest said Mass, but did not administer the sacrament to the queen.²¹⁴ It is unclear whether Velasco had seen the priest or whether he had been informed by Anna or Jane, but either way the report should be contextualised within the diplomatic negotiations surrounding the much-desired, but confessionally problematic Spanish marriage.

As noted in Chapter One, the Stuarts pursued a Spanish match for both sons. In both cases, the conditions outlined by the Spanish during the preliminary negotiations were strongly focussed on the issue of religion. While James was primarily concerned about the dowry, Philip III and subsequently Philip IV (1605-1665), were adamant that, in addition to the Infanta being given confessional freedom, the bridegroom was to convert to Catholicism and toleration was to be granted to English Catholics. The religious demands of the Spanish underscore the importance that rested on the Catholic question in England and it is logical that Anna would seek to remind Spanish officials of her Catholicism in order to add weight to the likelihood that some of the Spanish terms for religion could be fulfilled. Anna certainly tried such an approach when the Stuarts were looking to a marital alliance with Tuscany in 1612. Attempting to smooth over some of the religious demands for the marriage, Anna personally wrote to Pope Paul V. She professed her Catholic faith, requested his consent to the marriage and signed the letter as "*obedientissima filia*" (obedient daughter).²¹⁵ However, Paul V was not convinced of Anna's Catholicism. Although rarely

²¹⁴ Loomie, "Catholic Consort," 308, citing Seccion de Estado, Archivo General de Simancas, E 2588, fol.66, Velasco to Philip III, 27 September 1611. Loomie suggests that Anna did not take the sacrament as she still attended Protestant services with James, but that "she permitted Catholics to use her chapel," *ibid.*, 312. Conversely, Meikle and Payne interpret these reports to mean the priests punished Anna for her outward conformity by withholding the sacrament and confession, Meikle and Payne, "Lutheranism to Catholicism," 62. See also Payne, "Aristocratic Women and the Jacobean Court," 241-43, 245, 247-69.

²¹⁵ I have been unable to trace the original letter. The first reference to the letter is found in Riguccio Galluzzi, *Istoria del Granducato di Toscana sotto il governo della casa Medici*, vol. III (Florence, 1781): 323. Galluzzi's account of the Anglo-Tuscan marriage negotiations carried out at the Grand Ducal court in 1611-12 is apparently drawn from material in the Medici archives although he provides no specific references. The

cited by scholars, Paul's letter to the Nuncio at Paris includes concerns about "the queen's frequent changes in religion." The Pope adds that he does not believe in Anna's most recent shift to Catholicism, or in her declarations of her faith, which he refers to as her "good words."²¹⁶

Clearly, Rome understood Anna's Catholicism to be in word only, and without conviction or action, which highlights the difficult position that Anna was in as she strove to uphold a reputation of outward conformity. Accordingly, despite Anna's efforts to reassure Paul V of her Catholicism in order to secure the Florentine-English marriage, the pope dismissed the match between Henry and Caterina de' Medici (1593-1629). The pope's rejection of the alliance underscores the importance that was placed on the question of religion and the possible benefits of Anna's Catholicism. If Anna could assure Catholic officials that she was a genuine coreligionist, then England would be more likely to broker a cross-confessional marriage alliance, for the queen would be able to protect the religious rights of a Catholic bride. Indeed, a comment made by the Spanish Ambassador in 1614, neatly summarises the value that was placed on Anna's suspected Catholicism as he states that Anna was

a Catholic and her Lady of the Bedchamber [Jane Drummond] most Catholic, and it is in the company of these two persons that the Princess [Maria Anna] will have to be, which will greatly lessen the inconvenience of the attraction of the wife and children to the husband [Charles].²¹⁷

passage in question reads: "*Assieurava del desiderio e delle istanze di tutti i buoni Cattolici di quel Regno perchè ciò avesse effetto, e finalmente con una lettera tutta di suo pugno indirizzata a Sua Santità di cui si dichiarava obbedientissima figlia lo pregava a credere a quel di più che il Lotti gli averebbe manifestato in suo nome.*" The letter is subsequently referred to by Bellesheim, *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland*, vol.III, 350, note 2; Leopold Ranke, "The Popes of Rome, their Church and State during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," vols. 2 and 3, Berlin, 1836, as reprinted in *The Quarterly Review*, vol. LVIII, no. CXVI, London, 1837, 371-406, 397; Mackie, "Secret Diplomacy," 282, all of whom cite Galluzzi.

²¹⁶ Letter of Paul V to the Nuncio at Paris, 15 August 1612, as cited in Bliss, "Religious Belief of Anne of Denmark," 110. Bliss states that the letter is among the Roman transcripts at The National Archives but does not provide a complete reference. My thanks to Erika Carminati for the translation from the Italian.

²¹⁷ Gardiner, *Narrative of the Spanish Marriage*, 121, note a; Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 250.

Given the weight of Anna's religious identity, it is perhaps unsurprising that she would try a similar tactic in 1617. At this time, negotiations for the Spanish marriage were again intensifying with Giovanni Battista Lionello, the Venetian Secretary to the Doge and Senate observing on 7 April that James was "very anxious to make an alliance with Spain, the queen is inclined the same way and the prince also."²¹⁸ In August of that year John Digby, Earl of Bristol (1580-1653), was dispatched to Madrid to begin formal talks.²¹⁹ Two months later, on 22 October 1617, Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, reported to Philip III that Anna maintained a chaplain and a priest at Oatlands, but added that Anna "is not a very good Catholic... there are many days when she doesn't take the Sacrament and doesn't confess because they don't want to absolve her... and [she] favours some puritans to the scandal of good nobles [i.e. Catholics]."²²⁰ As she had done with Velasco several years earlier, Anna was trying to persuade Gondomar that she was a coreligionist. In doing so, Anna was looking to reassure the Spanish that their religious terms could be met and an Anglo-Spanish match could be made.

As Gondomar's letter makes clear, however, many elite Catholics were not convinced of the sincerity of her devotion. A further example of this hesitancy is found in a letter from Pedro de Zúñiga, Marquis of Floresdavila (1580-1622) to Philip III. Writing on 2 August 1612, the Marquis reported that during his recent audience with Anna, she had told him that "she was quite Catholic." Like Gondomar, however, the Marquis held distinct reservations about

²¹⁸ CSPV, vol.14, 484, no.718: 6 April 1617.

²¹⁹ David L. Smith, "Digby, John, first Earl of Bristol (1580–1653)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/7628>, accessed 8 May 2015.

²²⁰ *Documentos Ineditos para la Historia de Espana: correspondencia oficial de Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, conde de Gondomar* (Madrid, 1936): 109, Gondomar to Philip III, 22 October 1617. My thanks to Nick Stanley for translating letters in this volume from the Spanish. The dispatch is also cited by Loomie, "Catholic Consort," 312; Meikle and Payne, "Lutheranism to Catholicism," 62. Neither publication makes mention of Gondomar's doubts over the genuine nature of Anna's Catholicism.

Anna's Catholicism, and he went on to remind Philip that "she is no more [Catholic] than I told in another letter," which was to say, very little.²²¹ The following year, Cardinal Guido Bentivoglio provided an assessment of Anna's religion and temperament, asserting that she had "a changeable character." He concludes that any idea that Anna was Catholic "could not have been founded on anything but uncertain conjecture."²²² Later, the Venetian Ambassador in England, Pietro Contarini, also expressed uncertainty over Anna's religion. In his summary of the state of England at the close of 1618, Contarini notes that "some consider her [Anna] a Catholic... but really her religion is not known."²²³ The observations of Zúñiga, Bentivoglio and Contarini have been rarely cited by scholars, indicating that there has not been a balanced view of the complexities of Anna's confessional identity. Interestingly, Anna's dealings with these Catholic officials reveal the difficulty of her position as she endeavoured to satisfy them that she was a genuine Catholic, while concurrently preserving her public Protestantism.

While it is likely that Anna used her suspected Catholicism and her family lineage to support England's quest for a Spanish bride, Anna's decision to wear Christian's cipher and miniature would have been partly spurred by personal motivations. In 1605, Anna sent Christian her own miniature, writing to say that she hoped he would wear it just as she wore his on her

²²¹ Zúñiga to Philip III, 2 August 1612, translated and published in Albert Joseph Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics, 1603-12*, vol. I (Catholic Record Society, 1973), 204., letter no.65, citing Seccion de Estado, Archivo General de Simancas, E 2589/62. The previous letter to which Zúñiga refers, was written to Philip III on 5 March 1609 and is translated and published in *ibid.*, 127, letter no.38, from original decipher Seccion de Estado, Archivo General de Simancas, E 2587/16.

²²² As transcribed and published in "Catholic Consort," 303, citing *Relazioni fatte dall'... Cardinal Bentivoglio in tempo delle sue nunziature di Fiandra e di Francia* (Antwerp, 1629): 174-5.

²²³ Relation of England of Pietro Contarini, Venetian Ambassador, 1618, *CSPV*, vol.15, p.420, no.679 and also quoted in Barroll, *Anna of Denmark: Cultural Biography*, 172.

dress “with the devoted memory of a sister.”²²⁴ It is possible that a charge for mending the “tablet of the kinge of denmarkes picture” in May 1606 was in relation to the royal birthing rituals.²²⁵ Princess Sophia was born the following month, and Anna may have taken comfort in the miniature during her lying-in, or perhaps she intended to wear the jewel at her Churching.²²⁶ Given the close relationship between Anna and Christian, it is likely that she found solace in his portrait and it perhaps notable that when Christian visited England in August that year, he chose to gift Anna another of his “picture, richly set with jewels.”²²⁷

Later purchases and mending of familial jewels occur in 1614/15, and should be seen as part of Anna’s highly strategic move to distance herself from the networks and aesthetics supported at James’s court. On 8 May 1615, Heriot charged the queen for mending the “Kinge of denmarkes Cipher,” and on 5 August 1615, the jeweller delivered Anna a miniature case that referenced Christian, having “a Cipher of A and C set on the one Syde with diamonds,” as well as an “S” ring set with 8 table diamonds.²²⁸ Sometime in 1614, and again on 1 January 1615, Heriot had supplied Anna with two other “S” rings set with diamonds.²²⁹ These “S” rings are likely to have been a reference to her mother Sofie, in the same manner that the diamond-crowned “S” pendant seen frequently in her portraits, was a visual allusion to the Danish queen.

²²⁴ Scarisbrick, “Anne of Denmark’s Jewellery,” 234, citing *Jewellery in Danish Collections* (Copenhagen: Museum of Decorative Arts, 1960), 25-26.

²²⁵ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.20v.

²²⁶ The rituals associated with Anna’s two English births are discussed in Chapter Three below.

²²⁷ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. 1, 67.

²²⁸ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fols.43r-v.

²²⁹ The top of the manuscript is damaged and the exact date is obscured, but the ring cost £4.10s. The other ring bought in January 1615, cost £9, *ibid.*, fols.44r, 46v.

As I discuss in Chapters One and Three, the years 1614 to 1615 saw Anna actively express her alignment with the Pembroke-Southampton network and her continued aversion to the Howard-Carr faction that dominated James's favour. In December 1613, Anna directly challenged Northampton, one of the leaders of the Howard-Carr faction, for the Keepership of Greenwich Park; around 1614, she commissioned the strongly independent Woburn portrait; in February 1614, Anna staged the Drummond-Roxburghe wedding entertainments at Denmark House in competition with the Howard-Carr marriage hosted by James at Whitehall; in August 1614, she was involved in the plan to replace Carr with Villiers; and in December 1615, she was finally successful in having her long-standing ally the Earl of Pembroke made Lord Chamberlain – a post that had previously been held by Carr, despite Anna's protestations. Throughout 1614 and 1615 then, it is clear that Anna sought to challenge the favourites, policies, and appointments associated with the Howard-Carr network. The display of jewelled symbols of her genealogy at this time would have underscored her deviation from James's position, identifying her first and foremost as a daughter of Denmark.

On the other hand, or perhaps simultaneously, there is a distinct possibility that Anna's use of familial jewellery in 1614/15 was related to her quest to secure a Habsburg princess for a Stuart bride. In 1614, there was a period of high activity over the second proposed Anglo-Spanish match between Prince Charles and the Infanta Maria Anna. As I outlined in Chapter One, in March and August 1614 ambassadors reported that Anna was in favour of the marriage, and the negotiations may even have been the reason for Christian's impromptu

visit to England in July 1614.²³⁰ Like Anna, Christian was a supporter of the Spanish matrimonial union and, as I have already argued, there is a distinct possibility that Gheeraerts's two full-length portraits of the siblings from around 1614 were intended to announce their shared backing of an Anglo-Spanish marriage. Contextually then, it is likely Anna would have worn jewels that advertised her genealogy in order to remind onlookers of her natal prestige, and the fact that the House of Stuart-Oldenburg was worthy of a Habsburg bride. Distancing herself from James's factional policies and buttressing the English bid for a Spanish princess, however, are not mutually exclusive possibilities. Anna could have used jewellery to realise both aims, in yet another example of her ability to negotiate delicate political aspirations and positions. In either case, the purchases and repairs of these jewels indicate that Anna employed jewelled references to her natal lineage at specific times, and likely for political purpose. In doing so, she tactically announced her distance from James, while concurrently highlighting the prestige and power of her familial networks.

Earlier purchases of "S" jewels in Scotland held a similar political potency, with Anna buying three ruby "S" rings from Heriot on 4 January 1601.²³¹ At this time, the question of the English accession was foremost on the Stuarts' mind, and they both went to considerable lengths to ensure that James would be the successful heir. Anna's decision to buy, and presumably wear, symbols of her natal lineage at this time is likely to have been an attempt to remind Elizabeth - and the wider courtly community - of the Stuarts' illustrious Danish

²³⁰ Reports of Gondomar and Foscarini as noted in Chapter One; see also Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 234-35; *CSPV*, vol. 13, 171-72, no.356.

²³¹ Juhala, "Household and Court of King James," 162, citing Heriot Accounts, fol.16. Juhala does not make a connection between the cipher jewels and Anna's mother.

connection that could benefit England with shipping and trade concessions through the Baltic, Protestant support, and broad European networks. While the association to her mother would seem fitting, it should also be noted that the letter “S” appeared in beads and buttons worn by Henry VIII’s queens, and Elizabeth I also wore jewels and gowns that were decorated with “esses,” which Arnold suggests was likely to be a reference to “Soverayne.”²³² However, while the Tudor women wore articles of clothing and jewels that bore a number of “esses,” the wording of Heriot’s accounts makes clear that the jewels delivered to Anna were decorated with a single “S.” Considering the consistent visual and verbal references that Anna made to her natal lineage, I would suggest the “S” rings she bought were consciously symbolic of her mother and her dynastic cachet.

Religious Devotion: The Jewelled Evidence

In addition to the body of jewellery that specifically recalled members of her family, Anna owned a quantity of specifically devotional jewellery, which Meikle and Payne have unequivocally labelled as “Catholic paraphernalia” and confirmation of her “covert Catholicism.”²³³ Anna did own a quantity of religious jewellery, but only a few pieces could be classified as “Catholic paraphernalia.” Heriot’s accounts and the inventory from 1606, attest to Anna having a number of jewelled crosses and cipher jewels, and the inventory also includes IHS ciphers and devotional jewels that are figurative in nature. The inventory lists two figurative jewels featuring the Virgin Mary: a diamond and ruby Annunciation, which Anna later gave away, and a jewel of the crowned Christ and Virgin under a cloud,

²³² Arnold, *Unlock’d*, 70. Conversely, Scarisbrick suggests that the ‘S’ was “for Souveigneur of remembrance,” see *Jewellery in Britain*, 149.

²³³ Meikle and Payne, “Lutheranism to Catholicism,” 67.

which included a diamond “Romane A” as a personal reference to the queen.²³⁴ The inventory further shows Anna owning two jewelled IHS ciphers, and 11 crosses, which included two Jerusalem crosses, a St Andrew cross, and two double crosses in the form of pendants and rings.²³⁵ The magnificent diamond-encrusted Lorraine cross worn by Anna in the Woburn portrait (figure 1.33) cannot be identified with either of the double crosses in the inventory.²³⁶ One sported two large “rock Rubyes” while the other entry describes “a verie faire double Crosse of the order of Jherusalem, garnished on both sides with diamonds, the one side some faire pointed and table diamonds with other sorts.”²³⁷ Even allowing for the author to have mistaken the Lorraine Cross for a Jerusalem cross, this description is not specific enough to allow a connection with the portrait. Sporting two transverse bars, the Cross of Lorraine is an heraldic cross that was sometimes called the Jerusalem Cross, or the Patriarchal Cross, and is thought to have been used by the Knights Templars during the Crusades.²³⁸ The name confusion stems from the fact that it was taken up by Godfrey de Bouillon, Duke of Lorraine (c.1060-1100), who was chosen by the Crusaders as the first King of Jerusalem.²³⁹ As such, it is unlikely to have incited fear at the English Protestant court, for it would have been indicative of broad Christianity.

²³⁴ Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 221, no.87; 226, no.321. Anna gave The Annunciation jewel to Anna Livingstone, which is discussed below.

²³⁵ Ibid., nos., 81, 151-61, 176, 183, 267, 311; “Anne of Denmark’s Jewellery,” 235.

²³⁶ Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 205, no.157; 224, no.311. Writing on the appearance of religious jewellery in portraits of the Jacobean period, Scarisbrick declares that “two spectacular designs belonged to Queen Anna,” which included “the huge Lorraine cross entirely composed of diamonds” that is seen in her portrait by Gheeraerts, “and the other, studded with emeralds and worn from an emerald collar, listed in the 1607 inventory,” see *Tudor and Jacobean Jewellery*, 45. I have been unable to trace this last cross in the inventory. Hallam misinterprets this passage from Scarisbrick and claims that the Lorraine cross illustrated in Anna’s portrait was listed in her inventory, Hallam, “Re-Presenting Women,” 282.

²³⁷ For the first cross with “rock Rubyes,” see Scarisbrick, “Jewellery Inventory,” 208, no.157; Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192, cat. no.130, also suggests that in the Woburn portrait, “Anna here wears a large double cross, which might be that described in her 1606 inventory.” The cross she is referring to is the diamond studded double cross that was also set with rubies, which is clearly not that shown in the portrait.

²³⁸ Reverend William Wood Seymour, *The Cross in Tradition, History, and Art* (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1898), 364-65.

²³⁹ Ibid., 356, 367.

In comparison to Anna's collection that was inventoried in 1606, devotional jewels that are figurative in design do not occur in Heriot's accounts. This may indicate that Anna inherited the Marian jewels, although they are pointedly absent from the inventory of Elizabeth's jewellery collection. Heriot did, however, supply Anna with 27 bejewelled crosses and 19 cross-shaped diamond rings. Among the rings, two are specifically noted as being the Saint Andrew's Cross and the Jerusalem Cross, while another diamond ring opened to reveal a cross inside, which was evidently lavish since it cost £150.²⁴⁰ The first of these were purchased from Heriot in October 1607, and the majority were bought between 1610 and 1613, then in 1615. While most of these purchases were relatively inexpensive, some pieces were clearly sumptuous, such as the "Crosse Sett with 13 large diamonds," that Anna bought in May 1611, for the very princely sum of £240.²⁴¹ It is notable that Anna did not begin to purchase jewelled crosses from Heriot until 1607 – a full two years after the start of his accounts. Importantly, as discussed above, it was also in 1607 that Anna began to buy familial cipher jewels. Furthermore, Anna's acquisition of the costly cross in May 1611, cited above, coincides with Heriot's charge for the mending of Christian's cipher, and with Foscari's audience with the queen. It is possible that some of Anna's purchases of devotional jewellery were connected to her wish for a Spanish match. Wearing such jewellery would no doubt have endeared her to the Spanish and, on a diplomatic level, it would have helped maintain a certain ambiguity about her confessional identity, for crosses were generic enough to be worn by both Protestants and Catholics. Some of the crosses Anna bought appear to have been for devotional rather than political purposes. For her visits to Bath in April and August of 1613, Anna bought 10 cross-shaped jewels. In 1615,

²⁴⁰ TNA: PRO, LR 2/122, fol.42v.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, fols.24r, 37r.

Anna again sought cures at the spas in Bath and at Greenwich, and Heriot again supplied her with a quantity of nine jewelled crosses. As journeys undertaken to cure ill-health, Anna's purchases are perhaps evidence of the strength of her Christian faith in adversity. The volume of crosses that Anna purchased, though, suggests that many of them must have been intended as gifts.

Of the specific crosses that Anna owned, the Saint Andrew's Cross is representative of Christian-Imperialism, and holds a specific connection to Scotland. As the patron saint of Scotland, Andrew's "saltire", or diagonal cross, featured in a political and religious context in Scotland since the medieval period. It was used on seals, worn by soldiers on the battlefield as a form of identification, and it first appears on a flag in an illuminated manuscript dating to c.1503.²⁴² Similarly, the Jerusalem Cross is more commonly associated with heraldry than with a specific Christian denomination. Consisting of one large cross potent with four small Greek crosslets in each quadrant, it was used as an emblem during the Crusades, earning the name of the "Crusader's Cross." The five crosses that make up the Jerusalem Cross are generally held to represent the five wounds that Jesus sustained during the Passion or, alternatively, the four small crosses are seen to symbolise the four books of the Gospel.²⁴³

By comparison, the devotional jewels featuring the Virgin would seem to hold a particularly Catholic resonance. Interestingly, as discussed above, Anna of Denmark gave the Annunciation jewel to one of her chamberers Anna Livingstone, on the occasion of her

²⁴² Graham Bartram, *British Flags and Emblems* (Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press, 2004), 10; Bartram, "The Story of Scotland's Flags," *Proceedings of the XIX International Congress of Vexillology* (York, 2001), 168.

²⁴³ Seymour, *Cross in Tradition, History, and Art*, 356, 364; Carl Liungman, *Symbols: Encyclopaedia of Western Signs and Ideograms* (Stockholm: Ionfox AB, 2004), 98.

marriage on 22 June 1612. I have been unable to ascertain whether Lady Livingstone was Catholic, but her husband, Alexander Montgomery, Earl of Eglinton (1588-1661) was a staunch Presbyterian.²⁴⁴ On the other hand, Anna's father Alexander Livingstone, Earl of Linlithgow (*d.*1621), was nominally Protestant, but her mother, Helen Livingstone, Countess of Linlithgow (*d.*1627) was a noted Catholic, and was close to Anna of Denmark during the queen's time in Scotland.²⁴⁵ It is possible Anna Livingstone was Catholic, and that she was one of the chamberers who is thought to have assisted the queen with her private devotions in England. If Anna of Denmark was indeed a covert Catholic, then she may have gifted the Annunciation jewel to Lady Livingstone in a nod to their shared faith, and a sign of gratitude for her religious guidance. On the other hand, the queen may have viewed the jewel as a contentious item that could comprise her efforts to maintain a confessionally ambiguous position. This may have encouraged Anna to part with the Marian jewel over other pieces in her collection. Certainly though, the queen would have been aware of Lady Livingstone's confessional identity, and the subject of the Annunciation with the associated Immaculate Conception would have been appropriate in the context of marriage with the accompanying hope for children. Indeed, the couple were blessed with a son in March of the following year with the arrival of Hugh Montgomery, seventh earl of Eglinton (1613-1669).

Further information on the devotional nature of Anna's jewellery can be found by comparing it to the extant inventory of the jewels belonging Princess Mary Tudor. Published

²⁴⁴ Edward Furgol, "Montgomery, Alexander, sixth Earl of Eglinton (1588-1661)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/19053>, accessed 10 July 2014.

²⁴⁵ Julian Goodare, "Livingstone, Alexander, first Earl of Linlithgow (*d.*1621)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/16801>, accessed 10 July 2014.

by Frederic Madden, the document provides insight into the jewelled possessions of a royal English Catholic.²⁴⁶ Compiled between 1542 and 1546, it comprises 114 entries and, unsurprisingly, many of these pertain to devotional jewels. In comparison to Anna's vast quantities of crosses, however, Mary only owned five crosses, and she only had two IHS ciphers.²⁴⁷ Far more common for the Catholic princess were elaborately figurative pieces from the Old Testament, and prayer beads made from precious materials. Mary possessed nine pairs of prayer beads that ranged in material and included agate, coral, garnet, and lapis lazuli, most of which were gilded.²⁴⁸ She also owned 17 representational pieces noted as "tablets" or "broaches" that featured the Trinity, Passion imagery, a picture of Saint John the Evangelist etched out in mother-of-pearl, and "thistory" of Old Testament figures such as Abraham, Solomon, King David, Moses, Susanna, Isaac, Noah, Jacob, and "how Christ healed the man of the palsey."²⁴⁹ Evidently, rather than common crosses or IHS jewels, Mary was much more interested in having jewellery that could act as a devotional aid, and thus she chose to own and wear biblical narratives over signs or symbols. It is possible Anna used her Marian jewel in a comparable manner, although it is noteworthy that she only owned one such piece. Further, the large volume of crosses and the two Jesus ciphers that Anna owned cannot be taken as evidence of Catholic leanings, for the very Protestant Elizabeth owned similar pieces. An inventory taken of Elizabeth's possessions, in July 1587, lists five jewelled crosses and "a Jhesus contayninge xxxij diamonds three emerodes and a Rubie with three pearls pendant."²⁵⁰ Further, Scarisbrick states that the jewellery configured

²⁴⁶ Madden, *Privy Purse Expenses*, 175-201, fols.136-149v.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 175-76, 183-84, 186-88.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 179, 180, 182, 189.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 177, 178, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188.

²⁵⁰ BL Royal Appendix 68, fol.6r.

in the Sacred Monogram (IHS) was popular in Stuart England.²⁵¹ Anna's Lutheran brother Christian IV also owned pieces of devotional jewellery. Among the limited number of surviving pieces are a Latin cross studded with rubies, emeralds, and table-cut diamonds, and an elaborate carved onyx pendant featuring Noah's Ark that he gifted to his second wife Kirsten Munk (1598-1658) (figures 2.22, 2.23).²⁵²

The pieces in Anna's jewellery collection and the items she purchased from Heriot provide scant evidence of her purported Catholicism, but Meikle and Payne have recently provided a compelling argument for Anna's possession of a number of Catholic items. Around the time of Anna's death, as the authors discuss, Anna's French Catholic page of the Bedchamber, Piero Hugon, removed a quantity of religiously contentious jewellery from Denmark House and sent it to Paris. He was later charged with theft, but Meikle and Payne raise the likely possibility that he was acting under Anna's orders, ensuring that no distinctly Catholic jewels were to be found among her belongings after her death.²⁵³ As I discuss in Chapter Three, such attentiveness would certainly accord with the lack of Catholic liturgical equipment found in Anna's accounts, and the absence of definitively Catholic paintings in her residences; Anna made sure that none of her possessions could compromise the monarchy, or her carefully cultivated outward conformity. Thus, while Anna did own a quantity of religious jewellery, only a very few pieces can be seen to represent her supposed Catholicism. This paucity of "Catholic paraphernalia" could have been a decision to

²⁵¹ Scarisbrick, *Jewellery in Britain*, 103.

²⁵² Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 174-76, nos.624, 629.

²⁵³ Meikle and Payne, "Lutheranism to Catholicism," 66-68. Amongst carpets, cushions, articles of clothing, pieces of embroidery and fabrics, silverware and rings, there were two Agnus Dei, a crystal box with images of the saints, four Latin prayer books, an English book of "popish prayers," one large and one small Crucifix, two priest girdles, a St Francis "hare girdle," and a silver-gilt plate with religious imagery. For the inventory of the goods that Hugon sent to Paris, see BL MS Add.7082, fols.46-54.

strategically maintain a certain ambiguity about the nature of her faith. By amassing a collection of broadly religious jewellery, Anna was adding to her show of outward conformity, and ensuring her possessions could not be held against her, or James, as evidence of suspected Catholicism.

Gift-giving and Exchange

As well as adorning the royal body, the jewels that Anna bought and commissioned would have formed part of the abundance of precious gems, ornaments, and pieces of plate that were required by the crown for gifts. These were presented to dignitaries, ambassadors, family members, and royal favourites; they were given away at weddings and christenings; they were gifted as rewards for devoted service; and they were exchanged on Valentine's Day, New Year's Day, and while on Progress. As Peck outlines, patron-client relations between the monarchy and the aristocracy were the foundation of Jacobean politics, and a central requirement of those relationships was the gifting and receiving of gifts.²⁵⁴ Like the jewellery that Anna wore, her giving of gifts functioned as sign of the wealth and magnificence of her person, her family, and the Jacobean monarchy.

As mentioned above, the Stuarts have been traditionally lambasted for their excessive liberality, held responsible for the dissemination of Elizabeth's collection of plate, and compared unfavourably to the general frugality exercised by the Tudor queen.²⁵⁵ However,

²⁵⁴ Peck, "Court Patronage and Government Policy," 28-29. For a comprehensive discussion of the patronage networks that underpinned the Jacobean court, and Jacobean politics more generally, see *ibid.*, 27-46, and Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption*, 30-46.

²⁵⁵ This tendency among historians to compare the Jacobean reign unfavourably with the Elizabethan is also noted by Peck, who calls for a reassessment of the Jacobean court, stating that exaggerated differences are often "drawn between the care with which Elizabeth husbanded the bounty at her disposal and the

we should remember that in order to maintain kinship and friendship bonds, patronage networks, and the loyalty of subjects and servants, which sustained the very fabric of the court, the monarchy was expected to distribute patronage in the form of government office, peerage, and privileges such as pensions, grants, or monopolies.²⁵⁶ An additional component of this rubric, which was on a smaller scale but of equal importance and greater frequency, was the giving of gifts. This extended beyond England to encompass foreign diplomats, other rulers, and relatives. These gifts were usually in the form of jewels and plate, but sometimes included money, animals, plants, garments, soft furnishings, and foodstuffs. When the Spanish Embassy, headed by the Constable of Castile, arrived in England to negotiate peace in August 1604, gifts were liberally given on both sides. Molin reports that the Constable gave Anna “jewels to the value of twelve thousand crowns” and that “each member of the [Privy] Council... many ladies, many noblemen, and all the Court officials have received presents.”²⁵⁷ The magnanimity of the Spaniards evidently paid off, and Molin was able to assert that they were “lauded to the skies; for in fact this is a country [England] where only those that are lavish are held in account; and since my arrival in this Court ten months ago, I have heard of nothing so often as presents.”²⁵⁸

As well as winning political favour, Spanish munificence was reciprocated by the English crown with James giving the Constable “a diamond worth six thousand crowns,” and distributing £8,000 worth of plate amongst the other members of the Commission.²⁵⁹ Anna

indiscriminate and lavish dispensing of patronage which characterised James I,” see “Court Patronage and Government Policy,” 27.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 30.

²⁵⁷ *CSPV*, vol. 10, 179, no.267.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, no.266.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, no.267.

also gave personalised presents to the chief commissioners. She bequeathed the Constable “a tablet of diamonds with a great pendant pearl hanging at it, having in it the pictures of the King and Queen’s Majesties,” which cost £1,000, and to Count Arenburg she gave a “jewel with an A and R” worth £260.²⁶⁰ This was not the only occasion that warranted expensive gifts to be paid by the Exchequer, however, and when the Spanish ambassador, Juan de Tassis, took leave of the Jacobean court in February 1606, Anna gave him a “chain of gold fashioned like snakes, enamelled green and set with diamonds” valued at £180.²⁶¹ Later that year, she spent £459 on “2 pictures of gold set with stone,” that she gave to the French ambassador Monsieur de Beaumont and his wife.²⁶² This continuous exchange of gifts among the political elite was a central part of court life in the early modern period, and one that had significant and far-reaching political implications.²⁶³ As such, when the Spaniards perceived that it would be beneficial to have Anna supporting the Anglo-Spanish match, the Marquis de San Germano, Ambassador-Extraordinary for Spain, was directed to bring her “large presents” in order “to win her to their side.”²⁶⁴ When the Marquis arrived in England, the gifts that he gave to Anna were clothes and jewellery.²⁶⁵ Even more clearly perhaps, when the Venetian ambassador, Marc’ Antonio Correr, witnessed Anna showing “special signs of graciousness” to the daughter-in-law of the French Ambassador by giving her “presents of some value,” he reported to Venice that France was in high favour, and that in

²⁶⁰ Frederick Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer, Being Payments Made out of His Majesty’s Revenues During the Reign of King James I* (London: J. Rodwell, 1836), 16.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 59. Goldsmith Nicholas Howker was paid £180 on 21 February 1606.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, 48-49. William Herrick and Arnold Lulls received £459 for the jewels on 11 October 1606. Herrick was a court jeweller and had been made “Jeweller to the King, Queen and Prince, for life,” on 9 May 1603, *CSPD* vol. 8, 72.

²⁶³ For a detailed discussion of the relationship between the exchange of gifts and tokens, patronage networks and political power in the early Tudor period see Harris, “Women and Politics,” especially 266-68.

²⁶⁴ *CSPV*, vol. 10, 341, no.515.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 350, no.522: Giustinian to the Doge and Senate, who reports that the “ambassador-Extraordinary from the King of Spain...has arrived...Yesterday he went to pay his respects to the Queen, and in his master’s name he presented her with a robe and other adornments.”

all likelihood there was to be a French match for Prince Henry.²⁶⁶ As these examples make clear, Anna used diplomatic gift-exchange and her own royal favour as tools of political leverage in the brokering of a matrimonial alliance for her sons.

Anna: A Figure of Largesse

The strategic and exceptionally expensive presents Anna was required to give to diplomats were generally paid for by the Exchequer. On a much smaller scale though, Anna secured jewels from Heriot to be given as gifts, and she gave away articles of clothing from her own wardrobe. As previously mentioned, many of Heriot's accounts were settled by Anna with money from her Privy Purse, although James authorised eight privy seals to lighten the queen's increasing debts.²⁶⁷ As I have outlined, Anna was inclined to buy, or specifically commission new pieces of jewellery for gifts rather than parting with items from her reserve group of jewels. Between March 1607 and April 1609, she bought three Valentine jewels for 20 shillings each, while in February 1610 she spent £3 on another jewel for a Valentine's gift, and later on 25 March 1613 she bought a fifth gold Valentine's jewel that cost £2.²⁶⁸ Further, although they are not specified as such, the large number of rings in Heriot's accounts suggests they were likely bought as gifts.²⁶⁹ During the 10-year period covered by the accounts, Heriot charged Anna for 766 items, of which more than half were rings and

²⁶⁶ CSPV, vol. 12, 133, no.202.

²⁶⁷ See above, pp.155-56, notes 118, 124.

²⁶⁸ Anna received one jewel between 20 March 1607 and June 1608, at a cost of 20 shillings, and two more between 10 June 1608 and 9 April 1609, at a cost of 20 shillings each, TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fols.25r, 26r. For the later Valentine jewels, see *ibid.*, fols.33v, 41v. Payne interprets the accounts to mean that Anna paid £40 to Heriot for Valentine jewels in 1609, see Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 139.

²⁶⁹ Similarly, Collins states that the jewels that James gifted "increasingly took the form of diamond rings and trinkets," *Jewels and Plate*, 139, no.2.

the majority of those were diamond rings.²⁷⁰ These must have been intended for lesser persons at court, for they pale in comparison to the costly jewels that Anna gave to ambassadors, political figures and family members, with most of them costing between £2 and £6.

In order to maintain kinship bonds with her mother and brother back in Denmark, Anna regularly engaged in gift exchange. Between 26 June 1607 and 13 September 1607, Anna received a diamond-encrusted tablet from Heriot, which was “to be sent to her ma:^{ts} mother y^e Queene of Denmark.”²⁷¹ This presumably contained a miniature of Anna herself. In August 1606, in addition to the expected exchange of gifts between the English and the Danish when Christian IV took leave of the English court, Anna sent back “some fine horses handsomely caparisoned” as a gift for her mother Sofie.²⁷² These were personalised choices. The horses would have been a welcome addition to Sofie’s very successful stud farm, while the miniature would have provided her with an updated image of her faraway daughter. In August 1616, horses were again part of a Danish-Anglo exchange, for Christian sent Anna 12 horses, together with a solid gold sideboard. In December of the same year, Anna reciprocated with a bed and a suite of “brocaded hangings of great richness.”²⁷³ These gifts were no doubt intended to showcase the wealth, craftsmanship and fashion of each

²⁷⁰ The rings that Anna bought from Heriot amounted to 416. The total number of items refers to each “itm” charged by Heriot and includes charges for mending jewels, for ewers, basins, and the portions of civet and musk that Heriot delivered to the queen. Sets of buttons and buckles, and pairs of pendants and earrings are treated as one item. In the instance where several entries are clearly related to one overall item - such as a jewelled tablet, the gold furnished to it, the attached pendant, and the cover for it are entered separately - this is counted as only one piece.

²⁷¹ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.24r.

²⁷² CSPV, vol. 10, 394, no.566.

²⁷³ CSPV vol. 14, 284, no.410; 395, no.577.

respective country, for beds and sideboards were not only exceptionally costly, but they commonly furnished rooms of ceremonial and diplomatic importance.

Newly bought items did not account for all presents though. Pieces from the secret Jewel House in the Tower were given away, generally by James, and on occasion, Anna dispersed with personal jewels and items of her own clothing.²⁷⁴ In giving away articles of dress to household members, Anna was following a practice carried out under Elizabeth. Regrettably though, as Arnold and Payne have pointed out, it is impossible to ascertain whether these were given as a mark of favour or as recompense for service.²⁷⁵ It was also very common for queens to provide gifts to their chamberers on the occasion of marriage, and this was a tradition that Anna continued. When she did give away apparel, the recipients were almost exclusively drawn from her household. For example, between December 1609 and July 1610, Anna gave Jane Mewtes, one of her Ladies of the Bedchamber, four elaborate gowns from her wardrobe. The following year, when Jane married Sir William Cornwallis, Anna bought her a “jewel of gold, set with diamonds” from Heriot for £60.²⁷⁶ Mewtes was not the only attendant to benefit from Anna’s munificence, and the queen gifted quantities of her clothing to other members of her Chamber staff.²⁷⁷ While most women received only one or

²⁷⁴ Collins, *Jewels and Plate*, 136-41, where Collins states that on 22 August 1604 after signing peace with Spain, James gifted the envoys from Spain and the Spanish Netherlands with plate that included “forty of the most superb pieces inherited by James from the Tudors.” He also states that in 1606 James developed an “aversion to further serious raids upon the Jewel-house for gifts,” choosing instead to pay goldsmiths for the creation of new jewels and plate.

²⁷⁵ Arnold, *Unlock’d*, 99; Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 139.

²⁷⁶ CUL Dd.I.26, fols.18r-v, 19v, 20v. For the jewels see Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 104-105, warrant dated 30 April 1610, and also cited by Scarisbrick, “Anne of Denmark’s Jewellery,” 230.

²⁷⁷ One piece of clothing was given to the following women: Audrey Walsingham, Lady of the Bedchamber and Keeper of the Robes; Bridget Annasley, chamberer of the Bedchamber; Dorothy Speckart, chamberer of the Bedchamber. The following women received two articles of dress: Thomasine Carew, Lady of the Privy Chamber; Dorothy Silken, a Danish gentlewoman of the Bedchamber; Susan, Countess of Montgomery, Lady of the Withdrawing Chamber; Elizabeth Carey, Lady of the Privy Chamber and Keeper of Charles, Duke of York; Lady Dorothy Eyre, Gentlewoman of the Bedchamber; and Bridget Fenslowe, who I have been unable to trace. One woman, Jyngell Silken, a Dutch gentlewoman of the Bedchamber, received three gowns. For each gift in

two gowns, Elizabeth Shaw, a Scottish Gentlewoman of the Bedchamber, was given five gowns, a white satin doublet, and a black satin skirt, while the Scottish Jane Drummond, Groom of the Stool and Anna's First Lady, received four gowns.²⁷⁸ Unfortunately, the inventory does not indicate whether these items of apparel were new or had been worn by the queen, and it does not provide any evidence as to the method of selection.

In July 1607, when Anna Livingstone went to visit Scotland, as mentioned above, the queen gifted her "a faire peare Pearle pendant with a stalke of gold."²⁷⁹ At the time of her marriage in 1612, Lady Livingstone received three other jewels from Anna's collection of jewels as inventoried in 1606: a knotted chain with decorative openings, set with diamonds, pearls, and rubies; a chain of knots and pearls with a pomander; and the diamond and ruby-encrusted jewel of the Annunciation discussed above.²⁸⁰ Lady Livingstone had been intimately connected to Anna for a number of years. She had been a member of the queen's household in Scotland, and her father had been the guardian of Princess Elizabeth.²⁸¹ On another occasion, the queen must have given Lady Livingstone a bejewelled miniature bearing her crowned monogram as she appears in a portrait by an unknown artist from 1612 wearing it pinned to her breast (figures 1.11, 1.12). Scarisbrick proposes that it was passed by descent through the Earls of Eglinton and Winton until it was bequeathed to the

the order listed, see CUL Dd.I.26, fols.22r, 21v, 21r, 24v, 19r, 20r, 23v-24r, 21r-v, 1v, 19v, 5r, 12r, 17v, 19r. For information regarding these women's respective positions and responsibilities, see Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 280-81.

²⁷⁸ For Shaw's gifts see Dd.I.26, fols.5r, 18v, 19r-v, 20r. For Drummond's gifts see CUL Dd.I.26, fols.17r, 19v, 21r.

²⁷⁹ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 200, no.64. Lady Anna was gifted the jewel on 23 July 1607; also cited in Scarisbrick "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 230, 232.

²⁸⁰ Scarisbrick, "Jewellery Inventory," 212, 213, 226. nos.196, 200, 321; also cited in Scarisbrick "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 232. Anna married the staunchly Presbyterian Alexander Montgomery, Earl of Eglinton (1588-1661).

²⁸¹ Meikle, "Meddlesome Princess," 138.

Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge in 1937. It remains in the Museum collection, and contains an original miniature of Anna of Denmark by Hilliard from c.1610.²⁸² Scarisbrick and Graham Reynolds further conjecture that it was given to Lady Livingstone on the occasion of her marriage in June 1612. This would have been an appropriate occasion for the giving of such a gift, and it is in keeping with the proposed date of the portrait. They further suggest that Livingstone's case is the one that Heriot delivered to the queen on 10 August 1610, which Scarisbrick claims had "the Queen's initial A and the letter C."²⁸³ While neither scholar provides a reference, it would seem most likely that the case would be recorded in Heriot's accounts. However, the only reference to a similar type of case was that delivered to the queen on 5 August 1615. Nevertheless, irrespective of the provenance and commission details, the miniature worn by Lady Livingstone in her portrait is clearly intended to be read as a sign of personal favour, and it is fitting that the enamelled red case bears letters that refer to the queen's family. As discussed above, the queen did use miniatures as personal gifts, and extant portraits of two other women in her circle show them wearing tablets adorned with the queen's cipher.

Anna did not only act as a fount of largesse: the receiving of lavish items, or smaller, more personalised gifts from subjects was a custom that carried on from Elizabeth's reign. By the close of the sixteenth century, Elizabeth regularly received pieces of clothing or jewellery rather than the more traditional gifts of plate or money.²⁸⁴ This practise continued under Anna. The number of courtiers who bequeathed Anna fabrics, carpets, or apparel as New

²⁸² Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 234. See also Marshall and Dalglish, *Art of Jewellery*, 22. The miniature is held at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

²⁸³ Scarisbrick, "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery," 234; Graham Reynolds, *British Portrait Miniatures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 24. cat. no.9; TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.43v.

²⁸⁴ Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 93; Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 137.

Year's gifts indicates the queen's passion for clothing and interior furnishings. White satin petticoats, elaborately embroidered in gold, silver, and coloured silks, which would have been hugely expensive, were regularly given to Anna as New Year's gifts. In 1608/9, for example, she received petticoats from Lady Margaret, Countess of Nottingham (c.1591-1639), Mary Gargrave, one of her Maids of Honour, from her Lord Chamberlain, Robert Sidney, Viscount Lisle and later Earl of Leicester (1563-1626), from Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk (1561-1626), James's Lord Chamberlain, and even from James himself.²⁸⁵ As mentioned above, petticoats were skirts, or under-skirts that were meant to be visible (figures 1.19, 2.4, 2.16). As such, they were often extremely expensive, being richly embroidered and edged with costly lace. For example, one white satin petticoat belonging to Anna is described as being

embroidered with a very faire border of gould and colour Silkes, in work like paunsies, thistle, Caterpillers and other devises: edged with gould Spangle fringe, & Lyned with flame-coloured taffeta.²⁸⁶

A further idea of the sumptuousness of these garments can be ascertained from the fact that the following year James gave Anna another petticoat that cost a handsome £100.²⁸⁷ On 17 June 1610, Anna gifted the plush-lined petticoat that she had received from the Earl of Leicester, which was splendidly embroidered with a seascape and birds, wild beasts, rocks, and a variety of fruit, to her sister Elizabeth, Duchess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1573-1626).²⁸⁸ At New Year 1609/10, Anna again received embroidered white satin

²⁸⁵ CUL Dd.I.26, fols.18r-v, 21r.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, fol.9v.

²⁸⁷ A warrant was issued on 26 January 1609 at Westminster to pay Henry Brookbank £100 "for a petticoat given by the King to the Queen," *CSPD*, vol. 8, 488.

²⁸⁸ CUL Dd.I.26, fol.21r. The inventory identifies the recipient merely as "the Duchess of Brunswick." There were two Brunswick lines: the main line of Brunswick-Lüneburg as well as the Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel line, which were both related to Anna of Denmark. It would seem most likely that the recipient was Anna's older sister Elizabeth.

petticoats from Lisle and Suffolk, and one from her son Henry.²⁸⁹ Anna continued to receive material goods as New Year's gifts. In 1616/17, Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery (1590-1676) gave her an embroidered sweet bag, and the following New Year she gifted the queen a cushion embroidered with the ensign of her brother, Christian IV.²⁹⁰ In addition, Lady Cheney chose to give Anna a piece of "Spanish purple taffata imbrodered wth Venice gold & silke" as a New Year gift, and the Earl of Leicester gave her "one peece of watchet Sarcenet Striped" that measured 18 yards.²⁹¹ Carpets were also deemed to be suitable gifts for the queen: Edward Somerset, Earl of Worcester (c.1568-1628) gave Anna two sumptuous velvet carpets that were extensively embroidered with gold and silk thread, which she installed in the North Gallery of Oatlands Palace.²⁹² These examples of gift-exchange underscore Anna's penchant for material furnishings and apparel, which came to be seen as appropriate gifts for a queen. They also highlight Anna's understanding of the political aspect of gift-giving that served to cement subject loyalty and maintain familial ties, and this is evidenced by her decision to give jewellery and clothes to members of her household and to her sister.

Conclusion

As this chapter has shown, inheriting and amassing a sizeable collection of valuable jewels, plate, hangings, and garments was a royal duty and one that James and Anna were obliged to fulfil. It was requisite in the early modern period for members of royalty to adorn

²⁸⁹ Ibid., fols.21r, 24r. Payne states that the petticoat gifted to the queen by Lisle cost more than £60, which can be used as an estimate for the cost of such gifts, see "Aristocratic Women," 137, citing *HMC DeL'isle*, vol. IV, 175.

²⁹⁰ Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 137.

²⁹¹ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.15r.

²⁹² ESRO Glynde MS 319, fol.2r.

themselves, and their courts, in material splendour, for it signified the wealth, power, and prestige of the kingdom. Anna was also able to harness visual adornment as a means to illustrate her dynastic cachet as a Danish princess. As a palpable sign of the riches and prestige of the English monarchy, Anna ensured she was always arrayed in an appropriate quantity and quality of jewels and dress, which successfully merited the attention of courtiers and foreign diplomats. This conferred magnificence not just on Anna, but on the Danish royal family and the Stuart dynasty.

It was more than generic magnificence, however, for Anna's visual assemblage was considered and strategic. In a bid to smooth the ascendancy of the Stuarts, Anna tactically maintained visual parallels with Elizabeth, continuing to wear her signature farthingale despite it having fallen out of fashion. Between 1607 and 1611, when the Stuarts were angling for a prestigious yet confessionally difficult match with Spain, Anna chose to purchase and wear bejewelled ciphers that pointed to her natal lineage, underscoring the power, prestige, and wealth that would come from a marriage alliance with the House of Stuart-Oldenburg. She also purchased a number of jewelled crosses, which she may have worn during audiences to signal her Catholicism to the Spanish. This illustrates her astuteness, for while she owned Marian jewellery that would have appealed to the Spanish Catholics and alarmed the English Protestants, she chose to wear generic crosses that allowed her to maintain a level of ambiguity about her own confessional identity. Anna again bought, and likely wore, jewelled ciphers and crosses in 1614/15, when it was thought that Spanish negotiations were intensifying. At this time too, Anna was seeking cures for ill-health and the crosses may have been purchased to assist with her personal devotions.

On the other hand, Anna could have been using the ciphers to highlight her distance from James's court, for at this time, she sought to oppose his associated faction, favourites, appointments, and celebrations. These are not mutually exclusive possibilities, however, and such jewellery may have been harnessed to realise all three aims. In any case, Anna's large amount of physical adornment was not trivial or insignificant, but was often highly considered and politically potent. Contrary to popular historiography, this chapter shows that the substantial sums of money spent on jewellery and apparel during the Jacobean reign were not the sole endeavours of James's recklessly indulgent and fanciful consort. James too, spent lavishly on jewellery. Yet, as I have argued, such expenditure served a crucial political function: as an established princely duty, visual opulence was vital in the communication of personal power and status. With James's accession to the English throne in 1603, the Stuarts desperately needed to purchase suitably royal jewellery and apparel that would legitimate the new reigning dynasty by showcasing their power and wealth, and by establishing visual links to the Tudors. This was further underscored through Anna's decision to wear articles of Elizabeth's clothing, and pieces of inherited jewellery such as Mary Tudor's marriage collar featuring her cipher along with that of Philip II.

The large amount of material goods and jewels that Anna received and gave away indicate she was a woman who clearly understood the inherently political value of such items and acts. The majority of Anna's gift-exchange occurred in the context of marriage. She bequeathed her female chamberers jewels and articles of dress on the occasion of their marriages, and strategically exchanged gifts with diplomats from countries she favoured as the source of matches for her children. In giving away both new and inherited pieces of jewellery and dress, the English queen consort fulfilled her duty to engage in royal largesse.

This served to maintain the subject loyalty and key networks of interdependence that were the very foundations of the Jacobean court. When Anna died on 2 March 1619, Chamberlain touched on her material magnificence for the last time, stating that her

jewells are valuablie rated at £400,000 sterling, her plate at £90,000, her redy coine 80,000 Jacobus peeces, 124 whole pieces of cloth of gold and silver, besides other silks, linnen...and so for all other kindes of hangings, bedding and furniture aunswerable.²⁹³

Importantly, Chamberlain measured this enormous material wealth in political terms, stating that “for quantitie and qualitie” it was quite “beyond any Prince in Europe.”²⁹⁴

²⁹³ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 2, 224.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

Chapter Three:

Buildings, Gardens, and Interior Décor

Anna of Denmark took a great personal interest in the layout, appearance, and contents of the royal palaces in her jointure. This chapter focuses on Anna's three principal residences: Somerset (Denmark) House, Greenwich Palace, and Oatlands Palace. Each residence is treated individually and, in each case, attention is given to the buildings and landscape projects that were carried out under Anna's aegis, together with the manner and form of the interior decoration.¹ These elements are combined in this chapter, for the concept of a "royal palace" in Jacobean England encompassed the physical exterior of the building, its surrounding gardens, and its interior decoration. This chapter is structured according to the hierarchical order found in the declared accounts of the Pipe Office during the Jacobean period. Almost without exception, the accounts follow the same order, beginning with the Tower of London and covering the royal residences in the order of descending importance. Accordingly, this chapter commences with Somerset House, moves to Greenwich Palace, and finishes with the palace of Oatlands in Surrey. As expected, however, the hierarchical structure of the Jacobean court means that the Pipe Office accounts begin with several of the king's palaces. James's central London residences of Whitehall, the new palace at Westminster, and St James are covered before reaching Anna's most important and central residence, Somerset House, which is followed by Greenwich. Subsequently, James's residences of Eltham, Theobalds, Enfield, Richmond, and Hampton Court are listed before Anna's third important property of Oatlands.

¹ The exception to this is the interior of Greenwich Palace as there is no extant inventory, surviving bills, or accounts for the palace during Anna's time. In the absence of documentary evidence, a discussion of the interior decoration of Greenwich Palace is not included in this chapter.

Anna's decision to favour these three palaces over the other residences in her jointure was presumably predicated on issues that included location, royal precedent, the scale of the property, the state of repair, current furnishings, and the seasonal calendar. As discussed below, both Somerset House and Greenwich enjoyed strategic positions close to the centre of London and were easily accessed from the Thames. Somerset House was within one kilometre of Whitehall, Westminster, and St James, while Greenwich, although more distant, had the added allure of a strong and symbolic history of royal use. Oatlands, on the other hand, was much further away, some 48 kilometres south west from Whitehall and central London, although it too could be accessed via the Thames. Perhaps, as a result of distance though, it was of comparatively less importance and Anna seems to have spent less time there. She favoured Oatlands more in her later years, and the majority of work was completed on the palace between 1616 and 1618. During this time, Anna chose to stay at Oatlands during the summer months, spending the colder period of the year at Greenwich, Somerset House, or with James.²

Whitehall Palace is commonly held to have been the central and most important residence for the Tudors and Stuarts.³ Barroll, however, claims that James favoured his Surrey palace of Hampton Court (over Whitehall) as his main 'London' residence, and together with Croft,

² Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 39, refers to Denmark House as "her [Anna's] own winter palace." See also Lionello's report on 28 October 1616, that "the queen returned from Oatlands on Monday, where she has spent this summer, to her usual residence at Greenwich," *CSPV*, vol. 14, 334, no.484.

³ Arthur MacGregor, "The King's Goods and the Commonwealth Sale: Materials and Context," in *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, ed. Arthur MacGregor (London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989), 21; Smuts, "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change," 104-05; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 26. Lewalski states that Anna led a "progressive withdrawal to her own court and affairs," adding that she only came to Whitehall for "state occasions" and "traditional festivities," choosing instead to spend time at Hampton Court, Denmark House, Oatlands, and Greenwich. This view fails to consider that Hampton Court was where James spent the majority of his time.

contends that James spent significant amounts of time at his hunting properties of Newmarket in Cambridgeshire and Royston in Hertfordshire, more than 70 kilometres north of London.⁴ If what Barroll suggests is correct, Oatlands would have been Anna's closest residence to James's preferred London residence. For, situated between Weybridge and Walton-on-Thames, Oatlands was only 11 kilometres south west from Hampton Court. Following this reading, Somerset House was considerably more remote, being around 22 kilometres north east from Hampton Court, while Greenwich was even further, with 27 kilometres separating it from the king's palace. As such, Oatlands was remote from the administrative centre of the Jacobean court, but near to James's preferred London palace and his household. For this reason, Anna's decision to spend much of her time at Somerset House and Greenwich Palace takes on an added significance. Anna located herself and her court close to the administrative and ceremonial heart of Jacobean London, rather than following the peripatetic nature of James's court, which may have been another way for Anna to distinguish herself from her husband.

In addition to the significance of palace location, it is important to note that Anna did not personally pay for the majority of the building projects that were completed at her three principal residences. These were paid through the centralised office of the Exchequer and, therefore, subject to the largesse of the king. The exception to this is the Queen's House at Greenwich, and some building work in the gardens at Oatlands, which were funded directly

⁴ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 38-39; Croft, "Robert Cecil," 136-37. Neither scholar provides references. According to Colvin, James did not visit Newmarket until February 1605, and he purchased a property there the following year. Colvin notes that Hampton Court did not receive any major additions under James, but was kept in a good state of repair. Improvements and new building work at Royston started in late 1604 and Colvin unequivocally states that "though rather more than a lodge, the King's House at Royston was in no sense a palace. It was a royal seat for the sole purpose of hunting." Whitehall on the other hand, received a comparatively significant outlay, although much of the expenditure is accounted for by the new Banqueting House of 1607-9. See Colvin, *King's Works*, 175, 144, 237-39, 321-22.

from Anna's Privy Purse. Both projects commenced around 1616, and it is possible that Anna's decision to personally front the costs was due to a lack of crown finance at this time. Cramsie demonstrates that by the start of 1616, the crown was drastically short of money. Throughout 1615, and much of 1616 too, James's financial councillors were preoccupied with the development of a programme to raise revenue. This sought to repay James's debts by borrowing on the expected income of new projects, while Cranfield dedicated himself to balancing trade, and revising import and export duties.⁵ Neither successfully alleviated James's debts or provided him with ready money and the new programme completely failed the following year (1617).⁶ It is unlikely that this financial shortage resulted in Anna's decision to personally fund her building projects, for the crown had been in financial difficulties throughout the 1610s.⁷ In this regard, it is telling that following Salisbury's death in 1612, Northampton would not consider taking up the treasurership until crown finance had been significantly reformed and he was granted immunity from all debts, deficits, and general failures of fiscal policy that had occurred prior to his taking the post. Writing to Carleton, Chamberlain reports that Northampton "is willing the state of revenue and treasure and debts should be thoroughly looked into, before he meddle withal, and then he to be accountable only for the time forward that he enters upon yt."⁸

⁵ Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*, 145-47. The "new projects" included, among others, disafforesting land for farming; selling licences for badgers, for the exemption from alienation (Wales), and from juries; increasing court and recusant fines; implementing the suspension of pensions; increasing lands for fee-farming; selling mills, old castles and deteriorating houses; requesting 1,000 people to each donate £100 to the crown.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 147-49.

⁷ For a detailed account of fiscal problems, policies, and governance throughout the decade, see *ibid.*, 117-50.

⁸ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 358, no. 141: 17 June 1612; Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*, 126-27; Peck, *Northampton*, 95.

More importantly perhaps, as mentioned in the Introduction, the state of Anna's finances were examined in March 1616. At this time Coke put forward 12 "directions and orders" to reduce her debts, curtail her expenditure, and increase her income.⁹ However, building was evidently excluded from the restrictions, for the second recommendation directs Anna "to spend but £1,000 a moneth over and above charges of diet and buildinge," while a marginal notation in another hand adds that "the king beare all the charges of diet, houskeping and of building."¹⁰ Evidently, Anna was not expected to curtail any building projects, and it was anticipated that these would be covered by James. This accords with the building accounts for the period, which indicate that it was customary for all building work to be paid by the Exchequer. Thus, Anna's use of her Privy Purse allocation to pay for the design and build of the Queen's House at Greenwich and building work at Oatlands is extremely unusual. It was perhaps the result of the fiscal shortages noted above. This is discussed further below, but if this was the case, then it points to the premium that Anna placed on building, conceivably underscoring her awareness of buildings as a means to signify power, taste, identity, and status. Anna's lack of financial control more generally, however, does not detract from her significance as a cultural agent. As outlined in the Introduction, this thesis adheres to the concept of "conjugal patronage," for it argues that as the intended recipient, Anna's interests, values, and motives shaped the manner and mode of building and decoration at her palaces.¹¹

⁹ TNA: PRO, SP14/68, fols.173r-v (24 March 1616); TNA: PRO, SP14/68, 175r-v (March 1616); Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*, 143.

¹⁰ TNA: PRO, SP14/68, fols.175r.

¹¹ On the concept of "conjugal patronage," see Introduction, 30-31.

This chapter continues the examination of Anna as a queen consort who distinguished herself from the aesthetics and favourites associated with her husband's court. The analyses show how Anna cultivated cultural avenues, such as architecture and garden design, which were not shared by James but were part of the patronage model of her natal court. It discusses how Anna successfully used her built environments as concrete signs of her political and social identity, factional alignment, and cultural distinction. This is apparent in her acquisition and display of curiosities and unusual imported furniture; her choice of artisans who were not in James's employ; her battle with Northampton over the stewardship of Greenwich Park; and her decision to host wedding festivities in competition with those staged by James at Whitehall. The discussion of the interior spaces of Anna's palaces reinforces my representation of her position as a royal woman of learning and cultural distinction. It shows how Anna understood the politics of display and the hierarchy of space, for she carefully adhered to precedence and decorum in the presentation of sumptuous suites of furniture, hangings, dynastic portraits, and religious pieces, yet she also advertised her personal values, attributes, and interests in the presentation of curiosities, religious paintings, exotic goods such as Chinese porcelain, carved objects, and a wide array of books. As a result, these analyses move beyond earlier scholarship that has derisively concluded Anna

was less interested in having a strident collection than in having one that could absorb and comfort her. For Anna was subject to extreme mood swings, and though given to gaiety and frivolity, could lapse into a depressed state in which brooding and rage alternated.¹²

¹² Wilks, "Art Collecting," 42.

Precedence, as Griffey demonstrates, was a matter of key importance to the Tudors and Stuarts, and Anna was no exception.¹³ As discussed in Chapters One and Two, the negotiation of Elizabeth's legacy permeated the visual iconography, ceremonial, political ideologies, and international diplomacy of the early Stuarts. Naturally, the Tudor queen also left her mark on the residences she had inhabited, for much of the layout, colour scheme, decorative features, and furnishings would have been indicative of her preferences and values. Elizabeth invested considerable attention and finances into, and spent large amounts of time at, the palaces of Greenwich, Hampton Court, Richmond, and Whitehall.¹⁴ In addition, the manor house of Grafton in Northamptonshire was signalled out for use on three progresses with an associated rise in expenditure, while Eltham was maintained at significant cost, despite the fact that Elizabeth rarely visited.¹⁵ By comparison, at Hampton Court, for example, Colvin outlines that Elizabeth had the Rich Chamber almost continuously worked on by her Sergeant Painter, George Gower (c.1540-1596), who added a succession of decorative embellishments.¹⁶ Structural work at Hampton Court was also completed in accordance with Elizabeth's needs. The entire Privy Kitchen was moved, for located beneath Elizabeth's Privy Closet, it was noted that "hir highnes cannot sytt quiet nor without ill saver" for the noise and smell, while the Pond Garden was drained to make way for a new walk for the queen, and all overlooking windows were boarded up to ensure her privacy.¹⁷

For Anna, however, the majority of the residences that made up her jointure had not been in recent royal use. The lengthy reign of the single Elizabeth had done away with the need

¹³ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

¹⁴ Colvin, *King's Works*, 107-111, 140-44, 229-30, 315-321.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 94-5, 82-3.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 142.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 141.

for consort palaces, and by the time James took the throne in 1603, the suite of residences that had traditionally comprised the jointure for Tudor consorts were no longer available. Therefore, Anna's built environments are likely to have required a degree of renovation, refurbishment, and redecoration in order that they be equipped with an appropriate level of magnificence. While this process would have afforded Anna some scope to fulfil her own ambitions and interests, she would have been operating within royal convention and an understanding of how jointure palaces should be laid out, furnished, and used. Of her three main residences, it was perhaps only Greenwich that retained the physical stamp of Elizabeth, and as this chapter shows, Anna chose to respect and preserve those elements. As discussed in more detail below, Greenwich held increasing importance for the Tudor queen throughout her reign. Colvin observes that, in the same manner as her father, Elizabeth used Greenwich as a "place for pleasure and decorative exuberance," choosing to maintain the banqueting house, as well as building a temporary structure in 1559 to house court festivities.¹⁸ In addition, she lavished attention on the gardens at Greenwich, ensuring it was fitted out with elaborate fountains, walks, arbours, gardens, and orchards. By comparison, Somerset House was never a main palace during Elizabeth's reign, and its primary use was as accommodation for important visitors and embassies. Similarly, Oatlands did not feature among Elizabeth's principal residences and expenditure on the palace was minimal, although late in her reign (1597-8), the interior panelling received a highly ornate decorative programme.¹⁹

¹⁸ Ibid., 107.

¹⁹ Ibid., 253, 212-13.

An extensive body of scholarship relates to the architectural projects carried out under successive Tudor and Stuart rulers, and architectural historians including John Bold, George Chettle, Howard Colvin, John Harris, Gordon Higgott, and Simon Thurley have published much of the relevant archival material.²⁰ In some cases, such as the work of Higgott and Bold, Anna's importance as a patron of innovative building projects is acknowledged. However, this is cited in regards to the Queen's House at Greenwich, where the main focus is placed on the contribution and achievements of the architect Inigo Jones.²¹ Thurley's thematic approach to the use of Somerset House is an important exception to this, for he endeavours to uncover the role the palace "played in London's political, religious and artistic life" for successive queens consort in the seventeenth century.²² Building on the secondary source material, this chapter provides a new approach by examining how Anna created an individualised environment at Somerset House, Greenwich, and Oatlands. While Jones is acknowledged in this chapter, attention is placed on the nature and significance of Anna's role as patron and occupant. Rather than discussing architectural features in isolation, I examine how Anna used the physical appearance, gardens, and contents of her palaces to articulate her values, ambitions, interests, and her difference from James in terms of her natal identity, her interest in the Italianate, and her alliance with the Pembroke-Southampton faction. This chapter shows that at each palace, Anna crafted environments where markers of her Danish royal lineage, intellectual prowess, and knowledge of Italian styles and traditions assisted in the construction of an identity beyond that of James's wife.

²⁰ See for example, Bold, *Greenwich*; George H. Chettle, *The Queen's House, Greenwich* (London: National Maritime Museum, 1937); Colvin, *King's Works*; John Harris, "Inigo Jones and His French Sources," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 19 (1961); "Inigo Jones and the Courtier Style"; Harris, Orgel, and Strong, *King's Arcadia*; Harris and Gordon Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings*; Harris, "Disneyland in Greenwich"; Gordon Higgott, "The Design and Setting of Inigo Jones's Queen's House, 1616-40," *The Court Historian* 11 (2006); Thurley, "Architecture and Diplomacy."

²¹ Bold, *Greenwich*, chapt. 2; Higgott, "Design and Setting."

²² Thurley, *Somerset House*, 1.

Building Magnificence

Anna's architectural projects provide a clear indication of her personal values and interests. Crucially, they also illustrate her acute understanding of the magnificence attached to building, and the statements of cultural prowess, identity, wealth, and political power that buildings could transmit.²³ According to Aristotle, the princely virtue of magnificence was primarily communicated through visible expenditure or "public ambition." He asserted that among the most "honourable" and "virtuous" types of expenditure was that "connected with... buildings" since houses were "a sort of public ornament."²⁴ Aristotle's text is addressed specifically to "the magnificent man," and it is worth noting that female architectural patronage in the early modern period was unusual, although not unique. Certainly, Elizabeth Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury (c.1521-1608), Anne Clifford, and Aletheia Talbot, were all notable architectural patrons.²⁵ In all three cases, these women were afforded a relative amount of financial and cultural independence from their husbands, which allowed them to make their own mark on the traditionally male-dominated architectural landscape of early modern England.²⁶ Nevertheless, I would suggest that Anna's architectural interests were inspired by her Danish childhood.

²³ For a discussion of the cultural and political power articulated by buildings and the ways in which these concepts were disseminated in the Jacobean period see Chapter 5, "'Examine but my humours in buildings, gardening, and private expenses': Cultural Exchange and the New Built Environment," 188-229 of Peck, *Consuming Splendor*. Peck's study unfortunately contains almost no mention of Anna of Denmark's agency in these areas, but is helpful for providing a context in which to consider her activities.

²⁴ *The Nichomachean Ethics*, trans. J. A. K. Thomson, rev. ed. Hugh Tredennick (London: Penguin, 2004), 89-93.

²⁵ On the architectural patronage of these three women, see for example Elizabeth V. Chew, "Female Art Patronage and Collecting in Seventeenth-Century Britain" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2000); and Chew, "Countess of Arundel and Tart Hall"; Karen Hearn and Lynn Hulse, *Lady Anne Clifford: Culture, Patronage and Gender in Seventeenth-Century Britain* (Yorkshire: Yorkshire Archeological Society, 2009); Alice T. Friedman, "Architecture, Authority, and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Country House," *Assemblage* 18 (1992).

²⁶ Chew, "Female Art Patronage and Collecting," 1-2, 11-12.

Anna's father, mother, and her brother were avid builders. Frederik transformed Kronborg Castle, in the town of Helsingør, into Denmark's first truly royal Renaissance palace and he made significant additions and renovations to Frederiksborg Castle in Hillerød.²⁷ Her mother Sofie, significantly enlarged and renovated her dower property of the castle of Nykøbing on Falster, and also built a highly successful stud farm.²⁸ It was Anna's brother Christian though, who was the most active. He built almost continuously throughout his reign, commissioning a large quantity of religious buildings (figure 3.1), civic edifices (figure 3.2), and royal residences, which included the rebuilding of Frederiksborg Castle (figure 3.3), with Mette Smed and Lars Bisgaard observing that Christian was "the most ardent building-enthusiast of all the kings of Denmark."²⁹ In England then, Anna took her cue from the example set by her parents, and continued by her brother. Significantly, her choice of architect, Inigo Jones, also came through the Danish court, for it was under Anna's cultural aegis that Jones first entered royal patronage in England. This connection has not been adequately acknowledged in the scholarship, but, in 1603, Jones designed an allegorical entertainment at the court of Christian IV and, following its success, the king recommended the theatrical designer to his sister Anna.³⁰ The following year, Jones was appointed designer for Anna's court entertainment, *The Masque of Blackness*, and he continued to fulfil this role right throughout the subsequent reign of Charles I (r.1625-1649). Later, in October 1615, Jones was appointed Surveyor General of the King's Works and he also carried out building projects for the queen consort, which are discussed below.³¹ On the other hand, it is worth

²⁷ Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 464-66.

²⁸ Wade, "Queen's Courts," 53.

²⁹ "Koldingus: The Architecture of Christian IV," in Heiberg, ed., *Christian IV and Europe*, 463.

³⁰ Wade, "Queen's Courts," 58-59; *Triumphus Nupitalis Danicus. German Court Culture and Denmark: The Great Wedding of 1634* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), 49. See also Joakim Skovgaard, *A King's Architecture: Christian IV and his Buildings* (London: H. Evelyn, 1973), Appendix IV, 122-23. The Anglo-Danish connection is noted by Thurley, *Somerset House*, 34, who cites Wade, *Triumphus Nupitalis*, 47-56.

³¹ Colvin, *King's Works*, 114.

considering the possibility that Anna's architectural patronage later served as a model of emulation for her brother Christian. As Thurley points out, following his return to Denmark after his stay at Somerset House in 1614, Christian ordered significant alterations to the works that were being carried out at Frederiksborg Castle. Chief among these changes was his decision to have a gallery extending from the inner lodgings and culminating in a closet, which mirrored Anna's layout at Somerset House.³² Evidently, there was a degree of cultural exchange between the English and Danish courts, and while Anna is highly likely to have been encouraged by the building programmes of her father and brother, it is also possible that her innovative architectural projects later inspired Christian.

Somerset (Denmark) House: The Queen's London Residence

At the time of James's accession in 1603, England had been without a queen consort for more than half a century and there was no longer a predetermined number of residences to fulfil Anna's jointure. Charged with formalising the list of Anna's properties and lands, Cecil looked to royal precedence and the manors that had been gifted to Henry VIII's six consorts.³³ Traditionally, the London residence of the queen consort had been Baynard's Castle, which stood between Blackfriars and Paul's Wharf with the south frontage on the river Thames and the north frontage on Thames Street.³⁴ First bestowed on Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536) in 1509, Henry VIII granted Baynard's Castle to all his successive wives, with the exception of Jane Seymour (c.1508-1537), and to his illegitimate son Henry FitzRoy, Duke of Richmond (1519-1536). In 1546 though, Catherine Parr (1512-1548) bestowed the

³² Thurley, *Somerset House*, 43, citing Skovgaard, *King's Architecture*, 57-58, although pages 128-29 seem to hold more relevance to the question of the sibling's exchanging architectural plans and ideas.

³³ *Ibid.*, 31. For Anna's properties and their respective rents see TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9; Lodge, ed., *Illustrations of British History*, vol.3, (accessed 20 October 2014), 206-207, 210-12.

³⁴ Colvin, *King's Works*, 50.

Keepership of Baynard's Castle on William Herbert, 1st Earl of Pembroke (1501-1570), where it remained by descent.³⁵ Consequently, Somerset House was proposed as an alternative and was formally assigned to Anna shortly after James's accession.³⁶ West of Baynard's Castle, Somerset House was closer to Whitehall, St James's, and Westminster, and like Baynard's Castle, it also enjoyed a strategic location with its south frontage on the Thames. Nevertheless, Elizabeth did not use Somerset House as a primary royal residence, for Whitehall was her London palace and she chose to utilise Somerset House as accommodation lodgings for visiting dignitaries and embassies.³⁷ During her lengthy reign, the Tudor queen usually visited the palace once a year, but the small expenditure of the Works indicates that this did not require any major extensions or renovations.³⁸ Importantly then, Anna inherited a residence that was largely unchanged by the presence or tastes of her Tudor predecessor. Unfinished at the time of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset's (b.1500) execution in 1552, Somerset House had been completed in a piecemeal fashion and was ripe for transformation.

In the beginning of the Stuart reign, Somerset House continued to function as lodgings for visitors and expenditure was accordingly slight, with just over £1,000 being spent between October 1604 and September 1607.³⁹ Under Anna's direction, however, Somerset House underwent a major reconstruction. Between 1609 and 1613, building work paid for through the Exchequer totalled more than £34,500, which Colvin summarises as "a sum unparalleled

³⁵ Ibid., 52.

³⁶ Ibid., 254; Thurley, *Somerset House*, 31.

³⁷ Colvin, *King's Works*, 253.

³⁸ Ibid., 253-54; Thurley, *Somerset House*, 28-29.

³⁹ TNA: PRO, E351/3240; TNA: PRO, E351/3241; TNA: PRO, E351/3242.

in the palace-building sphere since Henry VIII's time."⁴⁰ Coupled with the costs of furnishings, Thurley places the total expenditure at £45,000, and notes that by comparison, the new Banqueting House James commissioned from Jones at Whitehall cost £15,000.⁴¹ Boasting a new suite of royal apartments, two new galleries, a rebuilt upper court with new lodgings on the east and west, and a restored Strand frontage, Somerset House became a physical manifestation of the ambitions, tastes, and values of the queen.⁴² Although the reconstruction and extension followed traditional modes of palace planning, Colvin comments that the interiors were fitted out with a greater quantity of opulence in terms of materials and detailing than any of the previous refurbishment work carried out under the Stuarts. Pointing specifically to the building programmes in the early years of James's reign at Eltham and Whitehall, Colvin summarises that these projects were executed "in the current Elizabethan manner," and that it was only with the work carried out for Anna on the interior of Somerset House that a shift towards greater material magnificence is readily discernible.⁴³ In remodelling the interior, Anna ordered highly elaborate panelling, a large quantity of fretwork ceilings, an extensive use of marble, decorative chimney-pieces, and very ornate plaster- and wood-work, much of which would have been subject to painting and gilding. Adding to the decorative opulence was the use of expensive materials such as black "dornix" [small stone] and red "rance" [variegated marble] from Tournai, white and black marble, alabaster and black or dark grey "touch-stone" [hard stone] from Sussex,

⁴⁰ Colvin, *King's Works*, 255.

⁴¹ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 31.

⁴² For a detailed breakdown of Anna's reconstruction of Somerset House see Colvin, *King's Works*, 255-59; Thurley, *Somerset House*, 33-36.

⁴³ Colvin, *King's Works*, 32.

which were used throughout.⁴⁴ Following the extension and refashioning, Somerset House became Anna's primary residence.

Completed Renovations, a Wedding, and a Change of Name

Overseen by the Surveyor of the Works, Simon Basil (*fl.*1590-1615), the remodelling of Somerset House was completed by the close of 1613.⁴⁵ Crucially, the palace does not appear to have been fitted with a suite of apartments for the king. The Works accounts make reference to only one set of state and privy apartments, which is visually translated in Thurley's reconstruction and discussed in further detail below (figure 3.4). That Somerset House had only one set of royal apartments during James's reign is corroborated by the building activities documented at the palace between 1636 and 1639. During this time, a new set of state rooms was added and the first mention of a Bedchamber and Dressing Room for the king occurs in the accounts of 1637-8.⁴⁶ It seems therefore, that during Anna's residence at Somerset House, there was only one set of state apartments – and these were reserved for the queen. This is a very unusual arrangement and must have been tacitly allowed or sanctioned by James. Nevertheless, it worked to emphasise Anna's control and the degree of independence she had achieved from James, for she was the only royal figure to be in residence. In the Christmas season of 1613/14, Anna logically selected Somerset

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 32-33. See in particular TNA: PRO, E351/3244; TNA: PRO, E351/3245; TNA: PRO, E351/3246.

⁴⁵ There is no specific date for completion as decorative work continued to be carried out at the palace through 1618. However, expenditure reached a high point of £4,718.15s.6d. in the accounts of 1612-13, signalling the end of the major structural remodelling. The palace was sufficiently completed by February 1614, for Anna to host the wedding entertainments for Jane Drummond. See TNA: PRO, E351/3246; TNA: PRO, E351/3247; TNA: PRO, E351/3248; TNA: PRO, E351/3249; Colvin, *King's Works*, 258-9. Similarly, Thurely asserts that "by 1614 Denmark House was more or less completed," *Somerset House*, 36.

⁴⁶ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 55-56; Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

House to pointedly illustrate her distance from the factional politics, aesthetics, and physical space of James's court.

As outlined in Chapter One, between 1612 and 1614, death, divorce, and factional politics spurred Anna to distance herself from the policies, favourites, and visual language of James's court. Together with Prince Henry and Cecil, Anna worked to negate the power and influence of the rising favourite, Robert Carr, and the associated Howard network. Following the deaths of Henry and Cecil, Anna firmly aligned herself with the rival Pembroke-Southampton faction.⁴⁷ Anna's continued antagonism to the Howard-Carr faction was palpably displayed in the marriage celebrations of two court weddings, with Chamberlain declaring on 25 November 1613 that "all the talke now is of masking and feasting at these towardly marriages... The king bears the charge of the first, all saving the apparell, and no doubt the Quene will do as much on her side."⁴⁸ As previously mentioned, Carr and the newly divorced Frances Howard were married on 26 December 1613, and their marriage was strongly supported by James, who not only paid for the majority of the festivities, but also sanctioned the staging of the event at Whitehall. Anna was present at the proceedings where she "tasted wafers and ypocras [spiced wine]" with James, and then sat next to him during the performance of Campion's *Somerset Masque*.⁴⁹ Considering the hostility between Anna and the Howard-Carr group, it is interesting to note that during the masque "a tree was presented to the queen, signifying the olive," which was presumably intended as a token of peace.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ For the intricacies of court faction at this time, see Chapter One, 58-76.

⁴⁸ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 487, no. 185.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 495-96, no.188, Chamberlain to Alice Carleton: 30 December 1613.

⁵⁰ John Orrell, "The Agent of Savoy at the Somerset Masque," *The Review of English Studies* 28, no. 111 (1977): 304.

The presence of the queen consort at the wedding of James's favourite may have been interpreted as a sign of her blessing, but Anna quickly and competitively moved to host the wedding of one of her own favourites.⁵¹ On 3 February 1614, Anna's principal lady-in-waiting and chief confidant, Jane Drummond, married Robert Ker, Earl of Roxburghe (1569/70-1650) at Somerset House, with Chamberlain commenting that "the entertainment was great and cost the Quene... over £3,000."⁵² According to the Savoyard agent, Giovanni Battista Gabaleone, who was invited to the celebrations:

After supper their Majesties passed into a little courtyard which the queen had had wonderfully transformed with wooden boards and covered with cloth, with many lights... In this same room was performed a pastoral which, for its gestures and its rich costume, struck me as most beautiful.⁵³

During the entertainments, McManus claims that Anna kept Frances Howard's first husband, the newly divorced Earl of Essex, close to her person.⁵⁴ In doing so, Anna would have been able to visually communicate her disapproval of the faction endorsed by James. Divergence from the favourites and poetic styles of James's court were further spelt out by Anna's selection of poet and the content of the masque. The central piece of entertainment was the pastoral play *Hymen's Triumph*, written by Samuel Daniel and mentioned by Gabaleone above. The choice of playwright is significant, for as discussed in Chapter One, Daniel was firmly associated with the tastes and preferences of Anna's court: he was

⁵¹ The competitive nature of the two weddings has been noted by several scholars, see for example, Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 140-42; McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, 166-67; Pitcher, ed., *Hymen's Triumph*, v-vi. On the number of covert references in Daniel's play to the recent Howard-Carr marriage, see *ibid.*, xi-xii.

⁵² McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 507, no.192.

⁵³ Quoted in John Orrell, "The London Court Stage in the Savoy Correspondence, 1613-1675," *Theatre Research International (New Series)* 4 (1979): 82-83. On 12 April 1614, charges at Somerset House included £126.23d., for "the room for pastorall at Somersetthowse," BL Add MS 12498, fol.124r.

⁵⁴ McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, 167. McManus does not provide a reference for this statement.

frequently in the service of the queen, but never secured the patronage of the king.⁵⁵ The choice of Daniel for the Drummond-Roxburghe wedding festivities clearly located them in the queen's domain.

The style of Daniel's pastoral tragicomedy further secured this alignment, for *Hymen's Triumph* was markedly different to Jonson's crude and ribald contributions of *A Challenge at Tilt* and *The Irish Masque at Court*, which were performed in front of James as part of the Howard-Carr marriage celebrations.⁵⁶ Addressing the present anxieties concerning Irish colonisation, the all-male *The Irish Masque* offers a coarse mockery of Irish traditions, language, and dress, while Jonson's *A Challenge at Tilt* features a lengthy and pointed allusion to the wedding night, and to the contested virginity of the previously-married Howard, as one Cupid asks "was not the girdle about her... wherein all the joys and delights of Love were woven," to which the other Cupid replies "And did not I bring on the blushing Bridegroom to taste those joys?"⁵⁷ By comparison, Daniel's *Hymen's Triumph* is peppered with architectural metaphors and references to the virtue of women. Thus, women are lauded as "nature's chiefe / Viceregent vpon the earth" and the newly completed Somerset House is celebrated as a site of "fair roofes [and] sacred spaces" where "no wild, no rude, no antique sport" is permitted.⁵⁸ Anna's choice of playwright and the tone of the play clearly stood in marked contrast to those authored and performed for James, which pointedly

⁵⁵ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 140. On Daniel's connection to Anna and other members of her network, see 66-70.

⁵⁶ Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 33. *The Challenge at Tilt* was given on 27 December 1613, and the all-male *The Irish Masque at Court* was performed on 29 December 1613, and again, five days later on 3 January 1614. On these masques more generally, see David Lindley, "Embarrassing Ben: The Masques for Frances Howard," *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986); Scott, *Selfish Gifts*, 175-87.

⁵⁷ Ben Jonson, *A Challenge at Tilt [in, the Workes of Benjamin Jonson]*, Literature Online (London: Imprinted ... by Will Stansby [etc.], 1616), 996. See also Scott, *Selfish Gifts*, 177.

⁵⁸ Quoted in Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 33.

emphasised the variance between the two courts. While it is possible that the differing content and tone of the respective masques related to the gender of the marrying favourite, it is important to note that the masques were commissioned by royalty, hosted by royalty, and staged in a royal residence. As a result, the performances were indelibly linked to each respective court and contemporaries discussed them in relation to the royal patron and host with comparatively little interest in the marital couple. Furthermore, Anna's display of difference from the palaces, favourites, and playwrights associated with James also served to solidify the notion of her distinct court, with Chamberlain writing to Carleton that *Hymen's Triumph* was carried out "at Somersethouse or Quenes court (as y^t must now be called)."⁵⁹ This is confirmed by Thomas Lorkin who, writing to Thomas Puckering on 22 July 1614, reports that the king of Denmark had unexpectedly arrived in Yarmouth, hired a coach and immediately "addressed his course to the queen's court," where Anna was having "dinner privately in her gallery at Somerset House."⁶⁰

The distance of Somerset House from James's court was formally acknowledged by the king in his decision, three years later, to officially change the title of the palace to Denmark House, with Chamberlain commenting on 8 March 1617, that "the king dined that day [Shrove Tuesday] with the Quene at Somerset House, which was then new christened, and must henceforward be called Denmarke House."⁶¹ Thus, James signposted the residence as Anna's independent domain, while underlining the centrality of her natal lineage to her

⁵⁹ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 507, no.192.

⁶⁰ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. 1, 340.

⁶¹ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 2, 60, no.260; Colvin, *King's Works*, 260, citing TNA: PRO, SP14/90, no.105 (Chamberlain's letter to Carleton cited above). Although the name was not officially changed until 1617, Colvin suggests that it is likely that the residence was referred to as Denmark House as a "courtesy title among the queen's attendants" since as early as 1606, when Anna's brother, Christian IV, was lodged at the palace. For the remainder of this chapter, the residence will be referred to as Denmark House.

identity. This is the reading consistently put forward by scholars, such as Barroll, Knowles, and Thurley, although there is no positive evidence and no reason is given for the change at this specific date.⁶² It appears to be unusual for a palace to be renamed and I not aware of any precedent. It is unlikely that the change was made in recognition of Anna's ambitious programme of refurbishment or her decision to take up residence, for renovations had largely finished by the close of 1613 and Anna had lived there periodically since at least 1614.⁶³ Alternatively then, I would posit that James's decision to rename Somerset House may have been politically motivated by his desire to appease Christian IV. The previous month (February), had seen England play a decisive role in the peace negotiations that ended the Ingrian War between Sweden and Russia, and gave highly favourable terms to Denmark's traditional enemy of Sweden.⁶⁴ The Ingrian War had been raging since 1610 as King Charles IX (1550-1611) and then Gustavus Adolphus (1594-1632) sought to place a Swedish duke on the Russian throne.⁶⁵ While Christian IV must have been relieved that Sweden's imperial aims failed, he would also have been chagrined by the terms of the Treaty of Stolbovo, which was brokered by the English and the Dutch. The Swedish had secured England in a mediatory capacity as early as the close of 1613. The peace negotiations dragged on for more than two years, but when they were finally concluded Sweden was granted large and strategic territorial gains that essentially facilitated the country's rise to dominance in the Baltic region – superseding that of Denmark.⁶⁶ It is highly

⁶² Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 39; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 23; Thurley, *Somerset House*, 36.

⁶³ See for example Lorkin's letter of 22 July 1614, cited above, where he notes that Christian came to see Anna at her residence of Somerset House where she was then dining.

⁶⁴ Michael Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus: A History of Sweden, 1611-1632*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (London: Longmans, Green and co., 1958), 87-88. On the competitive nature of Swedish-Danish relations in the period, see 38-47, 60-72.

⁶⁵ On the intricacies of Russo-Swedish relations during the Ingrian war, see *ibid.*, 72-91. See also, Sven Lundkvist, "The Experience of Empire: Sweden as a Great Power," in *Sweden's Age of Greatness, 1632-1718*, ed. Michael Roberts (London: Macmillan, 1973), especially, 21, 30-31.

⁶⁶ Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus*, 82-83, 88-91.

possible therefore, that James's renaming of Somerset House was a bid to curry favour with Christian after assisting Sweden's triumph. The choice of Somerset House was highly logical, for it held a certain personal attachment for the Danish king. It was here that Christian stayed when he visited England in 1606 and again in 1614, and as noted above, the layout of the palace possibly influenced his own building plans at Frederiksborg.

Staging Identity in the Interior

An inventory of Denmark House was drawn up on 19 April 1619 following Anna's death on 2 March that year. One copy has been transcribed and published by T.M.W. Payne with an introduction, and the inventory has also received some scholarly attention from Thurley and Griffey.⁶⁷ Payne's introductory overview is useful in providing details surrounding the inventory's commission and highlighting some items that Anna had inherited from the Tudors, but it is much too brief to be of any great value.⁶⁸ Similarly, Thurley does not provide a detailed discussion of any of the contents of the inventory, but offers some helpful connections between the furnishings of a room, its function, and its location within the palace.⁶⁹ For the purposes of this study, the most relevant material is by Griffey, who analyses the contents of most of the rooms with a view to establishing both function and audience. Using the inventory of Denmark House from 1619, together with a later inventory of the palace drawn up in 1627, Griffey crafts a set of comparisons that examine Henrietta Maria's negotiation of Anna's legacy in terms of material goods and display.⁷⁰ By comparison, I focus solely on the palace during Anna's occupancy, which allows me to build

⁶⁷ See Payne, "Inventory." Three copies of the inventory are extant.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 23-26.

⁶⁹ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 41-43.

⁷⁰ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming. The 1627 inventory of Denmark House is in the Society of Antiquaries, MS 137 and a transcription will be included in Griffey's publication.

a broader discussion of the nature and significance of the contents and layout to Anna's political aims and her social position.

As noted in Chapter Two, inventories were commonly compiled on the event of a death or a change in ownership, and it is appropriate that a copy was appended to the grant assigning the property to Prince Charles.⁷¹ Ordered by room, the inventory does much to elucidate the layout, function, and decoration of Anna's London palace. An analysis of the type and placement of paintings, objects, hangings, and articles of furniture indicates that Denmark House was shaped by Anna to receive state audiences; to facilitate religious devotion; to communicate her political connections; and to evince her personal tastes, learning, and intellect.

While the title of the residence paid homage to Anna's Danish ancestry, so too did many of the interior furnishings, which clearly marked the palace as belonging to the realm of the queen consort. In Chapter One, I note that Anna's cipher, personal Italian motto, and the Danish coat-of-arms, appear with notable frequency on her soft furnishings, her clothing, and from 1614, in her visual iconography. This is further borne out by the inventory of Denmark House, which reveals that one of Anna's "headcloth of a bed" was embroidered with the Danish coat-of-arms as well as "her Ma:^{ts} name and her worde."⁷² Rather than her motto, however, it was more customary for Anna's furnishings to be embroidered with her

⁷¹ Payne, "Inventory," 25.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 40. This seems to have remained at Denmark House throughout the subsequent reign and appears in the 1649 Commonwealth Inventory, see Donald King, "Textile Furnshings," in *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, ed. Arthur MacGregor (London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989), 316, citing 110 [227].

cipher or, less commonly, with just the Danish coat-of-arms. The inventory of 1619 indicates that Anna's royal cipher A and R was seen adorning pillows, cushions, mattresses, quilts, pieces of tapestry, blankets, the backs of chairs, and even the frames of mirrors. In addition, the Danish arms could be seen on silver andirons and fire shovels, on crimson velvet canopies, comb cases, and Cloths of State.⁷³ It is possible that some of these goods, stamped with her familial origins, came with Anna as part of her bridal trousseau when she left Denmark for Scotland in 1589. As I have pointed out, Anna's decision to highlight her position as a Danish royal was one of the ways in which she underscored her difference from James. That Anna's material patronage was marked by her lineage was not unique, however; her successor, Henrietta Maria, showed similar concerns. As Griffey demonstrates, much of Henrietta Maria's early work at Denmark House was focussed on labelling the palace as the domain of a Bourbon princess through the addition of numerous *fleurs-de-lis*.⁷⁴ Henrietta Maria's lineage was also to colour her later programme of interior decoration at the Queen's House at Greenwich, which was dominated by French iconography.⁷⁵ Furthermore, like Anna, Henrietta Maria's familial allegiance extended beyond material goods, colouring her political activities of the mid-to-late 1620s. While Anna was noted to abhor the Dutch "on account of the King of Denmark" and to never allow "their ambassador to visit her," Henrietta Maria reorganised the personnel of her court to be exclusively pro-French in support of her brother, King Louis XIII (1601-1643) and the possibility of war with her husband Charles I.⁷⁶

⁷³ Payne, "Inventory," 28-29, 31, 34, 36-37. The comb case seems to have similarly survived the Caroline period and features in the Commonwealth Inventory, see King, "Textile Furnshings," 316, citing 106 [89].

⁷⁴ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

⁷⁵ Sykes, "Henrietta Maria's 'house of delight'," 332-34.

⁷⁶ CSPV, vol.14, 454, no.665: Giovanni Battista Lionello, Venetian Secretary to the Doge and Senate: 2 March 1617; Malcolm Smuts, "Religion, European Politics and Henrietta Maria's Circle, 1625-41," in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, ed. Erin Griffey (Aldershot, Eng., Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 20-21; Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 64; Sara

Returning to Denmark House under Anna, the palace was conveniently located in London on the Thames, and as the queen consort's main residence, would have been frequented by a veritable stream of aristocrats, high-ranking officials, dignitaries, and supplicants. In order to receive guests, hold formal receptions, and preside over semi-public meals in a manner befitting the queen consort of England, Denmark House had to be appropriately laid out and suitably equipped. The reconstruction of the palace between 1609 and 1614, together with an extensive decorative programme, ensured that this was the case. From this point onwards, the rooms of state consisting of the Presence, Privy, and Withdrawing Chambers were grouped on the south side of the inner court, while the eastern side of the inner court featured the privy apartments, arrayed with increasingly restricted access from the Great Bedchamber through the Diet and Coffer Chambers to the Little Bedchamber (figure 3.4).⁷⁷ The layout of the rooms indicates that the Great Bedchamber was likely used for intimate yet formal receptions, while the Little Bedchamber would have been where Anna slept.⁷⁸ In addition to the state and privy apartments, Denmark House boasted two galleries: the Cross Gallery and the Great Gallery. As Griffey argues, the furnishings of the two galleries indicates they were both used for receptions and audiences, but that the richer textiles in the Great Gallery points to it being the more formal of the two, while the array of precious objects displayed in the Cross Gallery suggests that it was comparatively intimate.⁷⁹ This is confirmed by layout, for the Great Gallery was the more central, being easily reached from both sets of apartments, while the Cross Gallery was much less accessible. It was situated in

J. Wolfson, "The Female Bedchamber of Queen Henrietta Maria: Politics, Familial Networks and Policy, 1626-40," in *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe*, ed. Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 318, 325-28.

⁷⁷ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 37, 41; Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

⁷⁸ Thurley, *ibid.*, 42.

⁷⁹ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming. The furnishings of the two galleries are discussed in more detail below.

the far eastern reaches of the palace between two relatively private rooms thought to have functioned as Anna's Oratory and her Library or closet (figure 3.4).

In keeping with tradition, the Presence Chamber at Denmark House was used for audiences and featured an over-mantle with the Danish coat-of-arms. The Great Gallery served a similar function, for it was equipped with a large quantity of sumptuous fixtures and personal heraldry.⁸⁰ In the Great Gallery, the requisite amount of majesty was communicated with a set of crimson velvet furniture that included a canopy, three high chairs, six scrolled chairs, three footstools, 22 high stools, three square cushions, and 19 long cushions, which shows that large audiences were expected.⁸¹ A further layer of luxury and denotation was provided by way of the Danish coat-of-arms that was stitched in gold thread on the canopy; Anna's crowned cipher appeared on each of the high chairs and a swathe of broad gold lace that made up the trimmings.⁸² Aside from this regal assortment, the gallery was sparsely furnished, with only a small painted wooden table, a billiard table, two mirrors, two brass candlesticks, and a pair of large brass andirons being listed. As Thurley and Griffey suggest, this dearth of furniture is likely due to the fact that by the time of the inventory, the main rooms had been cleared to make way for Anna's lying-in-state.⁸³ The panelled walls of the gallery, however, retained their original 56 paintings. Fittingly, the majority of these were portraits that announced Anna's eminent connections by way of blood and marriage, together with those that evidenced her own courtly network. The number of portraits in the Great Gallery totalled 21, which was the largest concentration in

⁸⁰ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 41.

⁸¹ Payne, "Inventory," 37.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 44; Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

the palace. Portraits of English, Spanish, and French royals were hung together with portraits of Anna's own immediate family: her brother, Christian IV and his son, Christian Prince-Elect of Denmark (1603-1647). Also on display were a number of portraits of English nobles including the Earls of Southampton, Worcester, Leicester, and Sir George Carew, who were all members of the Pembroke-Southampton faction that, as I argue in Chapter One, Anna championed in her bid to oppose the Howard-Carr faction favoured by James.⁸⁴ This suite of portraits was strategically chosen to complement the function of the space. Used for formal receptions, and positioned in a relatively public area of the palace, the Great Gallery would have accommodated a diverse range of foreign and local elites. As such, it was important to pictorially showcase the power and prestige of the royal occupant and the portraits clearly signalled Anna's allies and connections on the level of international diplomacy and domestic politics.

Anna's decision to display powerful dynastic portraits in the Great Gallery saw her following a time-honoured tradition of pictorially announcing her place in the European courtly elite. In doing so, she advertised her lineage and networks, which were concomitant with favour and power. More unusual, however, was Anna's display of a selection of landscapes, still lifes, an allegory, a mythological painting, genre scenes, and religious subjects.⁸⁵ While no artists are identified, this does not preclude the possibility that Anna acquired the works for reasons of personal taste. For, as Griffey observes, the absence of attributions was often due to the limited knowledge of the scribe, and it was not until the 1630s that the name of

⁸⁴ Payne, "Inventory," 37-38, fols.20r-v, 21r-v, 22r-v.

⁸⁵ An additional three paintings of "venetian women" were displayed in the "little attiring chamber close to the Gallery"; Payne, "Inventory," 38, fol.22v.

the artist became more commonly included in English inventories.⁸⁶ In any case, the breadth of the subject matter at Denmark House evidences that Anna was cosmopolitan and learned, and that she well understood the need to follow precedence in the suitable display of her political and personal connections.

In comparison to the Great Gallery, the location and furnishings of the Cross Gallery indicates it was a more intimate and restricted space. Situated in the eastern reaches of the palace, the gallery would not have been traversed by all visitors. Instead, it is likely Anna exercised some control over access, and with her oratory on one side and a closet or library on the other, it is probable the Cross Gallery afforded Anna with a relatively private room for recreation and contemplation that, on occasion, could still be used for semi-formal purposes. Fifteen portraits decorated the walls and, with the exception of one painting, they all served to showcase the prestige of Anna's bloodlines and her prideful connection to the Habsburgs for, as already mentioned, Anna was related to Charles V through marriage. However, in comparison to the Great Gallery, these portraits are characterised by a distinctly personal and familial element, and perhaps surprisingly, there are no portraits of any English sitters. Rather, a visitor to the Cross Gallery was greeted with a portrait of Joachim Frederick, Elector Brandenburg (1546-1608), who was the father-in-law of Anna's brother, Christian IV; pendants of the strongly Protestant Duke and Duchess of Württemberg and independent portraits of their five daughters; pendants of Philip III of Spain (1578-1621) and his wife Margaret of Austria (1584-1611); and pair portraits of Albert

⁸⁶ Erin Griffey, "A Brief Description: the Language of Stuart Inventories," Florence: *Studi di Memofonte* 12 (2014), online publication.

VII, Archduke of Austria (1559-1621) and Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia (1566-1633), the latter of which is still in the Royal Collection in London.⁸⁷

Despite the distinctively familial aspect of the portraits, Anna is likely to have still used the gallery for audiences. This is borne out by the furniture, for the gallery was fitted with two canopied high chairs that would have been reserved for the queen and king. These were accompanied by a suite of 13 stools (two with backs), two footstools, 12 long cushions, and two square cushions. The entire set was upholstered in cloth of silver, flowered with gold and trimmed with gold and silver lace which, as Griffey asserts, goes some way to proving the Cross Gallery was less formal than the Great Gallery, which boasted crimson velvet trappings emblazoned with heraldic designs.⁸⁸ Concomitant with its more intimate status, the Cross Gallery sported a large quantity of luxurious cabinets, tables, and mirrors, as well as three clocks, two of which could be classified as curios, being a gilt-silver gem-encrusted tortoise clock holding a pennant, and the other described as “A Coche of Ebony garnished wth silver drawn by two Lyons the Lyons the weeles and two personages all of silver.”⁸⁹ One of these may have been bought from the Southern Netherlands, for on 1 August 1617, Anna paid £11 to “A servant of Sir Dudley Carletons Ambassador in the lowe Countires for

⁸⁷ I would suggest that the Duke and Duchess of Württemberg were Frederick I (1557-1608) and Sibylla of Anhalt (1564-1614), and their five daughters. Sibylla was Anna’s aunt by marriage (she was the half-sister of Agnes Hedwig of Anhalt (1573-1616) who was the second wife of Anna’s uncle, Hans II of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg (1545-1622). Aside from familial connections, Württemberg was closely connected to England in matters of religion, and was a prominent member of the Protestant Union. Frederick I visited England in 1592 and in 1597 he was installed as a Knight of the Garter. In 1610, his second son, Louis Frederick, Duke of Württemberg-Montbéliard (1586-1631) made an official visit to England on behalf of the United Protestant Princes of Germany. In addition to the portraits at Denmark House, a 1608 portrait of Louis Frederick, by Gheeraerts, is currently in the Royal Collection in London (RCIN #404773), and is thought to have descended from James or Anna. On the portraits in the Cross Gallery see Payne, “Inventory,” 36, fol.18r. On the politico-religious relationship of the House of Württemberg to both Elizabeth and James, see William Brenchley Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First* (London: J. R. Smith, 1865), lv-ciii, cix, cxii-cxxi, 1-53, 55-66.

⁸⁸ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

⁸⁹ Payne, “Inventory,” 36.

bringing her Ma:^{tie} a Clock from his Maister.”⁹⁰ Curious and elaborate clocks were also on display at Oatlands, such as “A striking Clock with a sphericall motion of brass gilded... & a motion of the planetts in the top.”⁹¹

Anna was evidently known as a collector, and the objects displayed at Denmark House were considered to be of interest to fellow collectors. Writing on 19 April 1619, Anne Clifford notes that she “went to Somerset House and sat a good while there by the Queen’s corpse and then went into the privy galleries and showed my cousin Mary those fine delicate things there.”⁹² As would be expected, however, the majority of Anna’s collectables and curiosities were kept in the more private room of the closet and Cross Gallery. In the Stuart period, the closet was a small private room reserved for devotions or study. It usually adjoined the Bedchamber and often housed the occupant’s most prized possessions.⁹³

At Denmark House, Anna’s closet was positioned between the Great and Little Bedchamber, and contained at least eight boxes, two chests, and nine cabinets for the storage and display of objects.⁹⁴ Some of the cabinets were worthy of display in their own right, for they were crafted from exotic and expensive materials such as jasper, yellow amber, mother-of-pearl, ebony, pomander, and “Counterfeitt stones,” which would have required expert

⁹⁰ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1653.

⁹¹ Glynde MS 314, fol.4r. This may be the same clock referred to as “a clock with music and motions... for his Majesty’s service” that Hans Nilloe, a Dutchman, received £300 in August 1609. James may have bought the clock for Anna, or secured it on her behalf, see Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 97.

⁹² Katherine Acheson, *The Diary of Anne Clifford, 1616-1619: A Critical Edition* (New York: Garland, 1995), 167. The “privy gallery” is likely to refer to the more private Cross Gallery.

⁹³ On the location and function of the closet in seventeenth-century England, see Alan Stewart, “The Early Modern Closet Discovered,” *Representations*, 50 (1995); Peter Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France and Holland* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1978), 296-303; Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 129-30, 73-74.

⁹⁴ Payne, “Inventory,” 40-41, fols.27r-29r; Thurley, *Somerset House*, 36; Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

craftsmanship.⁹⁵ There was also a “great Cipres Cheste” that would have been imported from northern Italy, while a playing table or games board made of rich materials and described as “A p’re of Tables of white and yellow amber garnished wth silver the Table men and dice sutable in agreene Velvett Case” enabled the room to function as a space for intimate recreation.⁹⁶ Among these pieces of furniture and receptacles, Anna kept pieces of silver-gilt porcelain, carved pieces of rock crystal, agate, amber, and strings of coral.⁹⁷ Anna clearly owned a number of high-quality pieces, for she followed the contemporary practice of adding precious metals or gems to increase the value of the object. She paid her jeweller, Heriot, for “puting... a foote” on a Chinese porcelain cup, adorning 80 beads of coral with silver and for “silver gilding and garnishing” a jasper vessel.⁹⁸ Anna kept eight pieces of silver-gilt porcelain in a crimson velvet cabinet in her closet, and while the quantity does not compare to the extensive contemporary collections of Salisbury or Northampton, or the later collection amassed by Aletheia Talbot, it nevertheless places Anna as an early acquirer and appreciator of Chinese porcelain in England.⁹⁹ Anna’s ownership of Chinese porcelain, together with objects and pieces of furniture that were made of unusual - or expensive –

⁹⁵ The Pomander cabinet was evidently scented and is described as “A Cabonett of pomander laid one wood wth a Curious suite of pomander artificially wrought wthin it in a black Velvett Case,” Payne, “Inventory,” 41, fol.27v. According to Jervis, jasper was imported from Germany or Bohemia and a cabinet made of this stone would have been considered very unusual and striking; ebony, at this time, was considered to be both exotic and highly fashionable. Both the Jasper and Pomander cabinets remained in the royal collection and were sold in the 1649 Commonwealth Sale, the Pomander cabinet for the high price of £5, Simon Jervis, “‘Shadows, Not Substantial Things.’ Furniture in the Commonwealth Inventories,” in *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, ed. Arthur MacGregor (London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989), 279, 282.

⁹⁶ Payne, “Inventory,” 41, fol.28r; Jervis, “Furniture in the Commonwealth,” 278, 289.

⁹⁷ Payne, “Inventory,” 40-42, fols.27r-v, 28r-v, 29r-v.

⁹⁸ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fols.17v, 20r, 25r.

⁹⁹ On the porcelain owned by the Earl of Salisbury, see Susan Bracken, “‘Chyna’ in England before 1614,” *Oriental Art* 47 (2001): 8-10; on that owned by Northampton, see E. P. Shirley (ed.), “An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614,” *Archaeologia*, 42 (1869): 347-78; on the collection of the Countess of Arundel see Juliet Claxton, “The Countess of Arundel's Dutch Pranketing Room: ‘An Inventory of All the Parcells or Purselin, Glasses and Other Goods Now Remayning in the Pranketing Roome at Tart Hall, 8th Sept 1641’,” *JHC* 22 (2010): 188-96.

finely wrought materials, worked to signal her social and cultural eminence. Placed in the closet, access to these goods would have been strictly controlled, with admission being granted as a sign of favour, or in recognition of high status and power.

It is also likely that the queen kept her collection of books in the closet.¹⁰⁰ Although Anna had a Book Chamber with at least 80 books at Oatlands, she also kept nine books in her closet at Denmark House, which included a copy of the New Testament in French, an English translation of Pierre Davity's (1573-1635) *Les Estats, Empires et Principautez du Monde*, a French copy of Jean Liebault's (1535-1596) *Trois livres de l'embellissement et ornament du corps humain*, a two-volume folio of John Foxe's (1516-1587) *Actes and Monuments of these and Latter and Perilous Days, Touching Matters of the Church* (commonly called Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"), first published in 1563, and a copy of George Hakewill, Archdeacon of Surrey's (1578-1649), *An Answere to a Treatise Written by Dr Carrier*, from 1616.¹⁰¹ While Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* was a seminal text in the English Reformation and could be found in numerous churches and Protestant households throughout England, Hakewill's work was more uncommon. Hakewill was one of prince Charles's chaplains. His 300-page book was written in response to Dr Benjamin Carrier's (1566-1614) printed treatise, which justified his conversion to Catholicism and exhorted James to denounce Calvinism and join Rome.¹⁰² As Peter McCullough has shown, Hakewill's book looked to exonerate James from his association with a religious apostate, for Carrier had been his chaplain, but it also served

¹⁰⁰ Anna's collection of books are grouped together immediately after the contents of the closet. Unlike the rest of the inventory, which is ordered by room, they are merely titled "Bookes" and I would suggest that they were located in the closet and were given a sub-heading in the inventory, Payne, "Inventory," 42, fol.30r.

¹⁰¹ The Oatlands Book Chamber is discussed below. Davity's book (*Estates and Empires of the World*) was translated by Edward Grimeston (d.1640) and published in 1615 in London; Liebault's work (*Three Books of Embellishment and Adornment of the Human Body*) was published in Paris in 1582; Carrier's treatise was printed in 1613, *ibid.*, 42, fol.30r, and 44, notes 77-79. The books at Oatlands are discussed below.

¹⁰² McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 197.

as a “reference manual” for Charles when dealing with controversial Catholic issues. It is possible, that Anna too, used the text in this capacity.¹⁰³ However, it remains unknown whether Anna read these books, or whether they were merely for display. That said though, ownership is still significant here, for it points to Anna’s management of her self-presentation and her desire to be seen as a supporter of the Jacobean church. This is all the more pertinent considering that the books were located in the closet, for such spaces were intimate and restricted and visitors would only have been people that Anna was close to, those that she wished to impress, or who were of significantly high status and power.¹⁰⁴ The location of the books perhaps makes it more likely that Anna did read these texts, for as mentioned, closets were mainly reserved for study and reflection.¹⁰⁵ In the end though, it is unknown whether these books were read and discussed by the queen and close members of her court, or whether they were part of a calculated form of display, intended to communicate the queen’s Protestant piety to a select group.

As well as signposting Anna’s religion as being of a distinctly Protestant nature, this group of books evidence her proficiency in French, and her interest in history, geography, and “beauty practices.”¹⁰⁶ Among these books, only Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs* is noted by Suzanne Hull as being commonplace in English women’s libraries, and she adds that it was one of the few books mentioned by Thomas Salter in his strict and conservative guide to female education, *Mirror of Modestie*, which was published in 1579.¹⁰⁷ While I have been unable to

¹⁰³ Ibid., 197-98.

¹⁰⁴ Stewart, “Early Modern Closet,” 80-81; Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, 56.

¹⁰⁵ Stewart, *ibid.*, 81-82.

¹⁰⁶ The term “beauty practices” is used by Edith Snook to refer to forms of beauty care, activities, routines, and recipes in early modern England, see her *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England: a Feminist Literary History* (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 7, 21.

¹⁰⁷ Suzanne Hull, *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475-1640* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982), 103. On Salter’s approach to female reading and education, see 57-59.

trace any specific information pertaining to the other books that Anna owned, the subjects they cover were not unusual among female readers of the Tudor and Jacobean period. For example, like Davity's book on foreign empires, Anne Clifford is known to have read George Sandys's (1578-1644) *A Relation of a Journey... Containing a Description of the Turkish Empire, of Aegypt, of the Holy Land [etc.]* that was published in 1615.¹⁰⁸ Another history book, John Windet's *The Historie of France*, published in 1595, was considered suitable reading for English women.¹⁰⁹

Devotional guides, the Bible, and books on beauty practices were generally considered appropriate for female readership.¹¹⁰ Anna seems to have been concerned about her appearance, for her Swiss-born physician, Sir Théodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573-1655), created cosmetic recipes for her (and later for Henrietta Maria), which have survived in a manuscript entitled *An original record book of cases and consultations of Sir Theodore Mayerne*, held in the Royal College of Physicians in London.¹¹¹ The majority of the recipes in the 17 folios dedicated to cosmetics are for the face, teeth, and gums, indicating that Anna desired smooth white skin and red lips, and that she had dental problems. For example, Mayerne devised ointments for the queen for her "dry and scabrous skin of the face," for "roughness of the skin of the face," for "pimples/pustules and redness of the face and chest," and an oil for "removing shrivelled roughness of the skin," as well as a "red ointment for the lips."¹¹² He also crafted poultices and patches "for receding gums," a water "for the

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 230, STC 21726.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 177.

¹¹⁰ For examples of religious guides and books on beauty that were intended for women, or were owned and read by women in the period see *ibid.*, 168, 178, 182, 186, 194, 199, 204-205.

¹¹¹ Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power*, 48-49, citing RCP MS 444.

¹¹² RCP, MS 444, fols. 317-319. The section on cosmetics is titled *Cosmetics prescribed by me for [Reginae] of Great Britain Anna and Henrietta Maria from 1612 to 1643*. My thanks to Bill Barnes for the translation.

teeth and gums,” a balm “for sweetness of breath” and “opiates for the teeth.”¹¹³ These physical aspirations are apparent in Anna’s portraits where she consistently appears with a flawless pale visage and red lips (see for example figures 1.24-1.26, 1.33-1.35, 1.54, 1.60).

Religious Devotions in the Privacy of the Palace

Returning to the books in Anna’s possession at Denmark House, it is notable that her ownership of Foxe and Hakewill’s works do not accord with current scholarship that holds her to have been a covert Catholic. Scholars such as Loomie, McCullough, Meikle and Payne among others, have argued that Anna secretly practised Catholicism in her own residences and was aided by Catholic members of her household.¹¹⁴ Looking to Denmark House, Meikle and Payne follow Thurley’s suggestion that “the little room between the two galleries” likely served as a private oratory for Anna to secretly hear the Catholic mass and make confession.¹¹⁵ The tendency to read this room in such a fashion is due to its furnishings, for it was home to a crucifix in an ebony case and five paintings, four of which were religious in subject: the Walk to Calvary, Christ in the House of Martha and Mary, the Virgin Mary, and a Pietà. The two paintings of the Virgin, together with a coronation portrait of the Virgin Queen Elizabeth were fitted with green taffeta curtains, which usually served as a form of protection, or to control their visibility. For Thurley, the presence of these paintings establishes the room as Anna’s “secret oratory,” and he claims that aside from the Great Gallery discussed above, this was the only room in the palace that “was furnished with

¹¹³ RCP, MS 444, fols. 320-321.

¹¹⁴ Loomie, “Catholic Consort,” 313; McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 169-70, 174; Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 247-53; Meikle and Payne, “Lutheranism to Catholicism,” 61-65. It should be remembered that Anna was not unique in having Catholics in her household, for this was also true of Elizabeth I, James I, and Prince Henry. Henrietta Maria too, was noted to have both Catholics and Protestants in her circle, see Smuts “Religion, European Politics and Henrietta Maria’s Household,” 22-23.

¹¹⁵ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 43; Meikle and Payne, “Lutheranism to Catholicism,” 62-63.

devotional pictures.”¹¹⁶ This, however, is plainly incorrect, for Anna’s Great Bedchamber was fitted with four religious paintings - three featuring Christ and one of Mary Magdalene - while the cabinet held a miniature of St Anne and one of Christ, and the room beyond the Cross Gallery contained an image of the Resurrection.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, situated between the two galleries, this room was in a relatively “public” area of the palace. It would undoubtedly have received visitors, and would not have been suitable for the practise of covert Catholic observances.¹¹⁸ Most importantly, the presence of these religious paintings does not point to Anna’s Catholicism, but showcases her belief in the power of images to facilitate devotion, her determination to maintain a certain level of ambiguity about her religious beliefs, and her understanding of the politics of display. While Anna allowed herself a large quantity of religious paintings, she carefully ensured none of these could be held against her (or James) as a sign of popery, for such imagery also adorned the residences of numerous contemporary Protestants, both in England and on the Continent.

In the first instance, the painting depicting Christ in the House of Martha and Mary, which was hanging “in the little roome betweene y^e two galleries” formerly belonged to Anna’s strictly Calvinist son, Prince Henry, and has been identified with the work by Hans Vredeman de Vries (1526-1609) and Anthonis Blocklandt (c.1533-1583) remaining in the Royal Collection (figure 3.5).¹¹⁹ Throughout the 1630s, Anna’s other son, King Charles I, exhibited a proclivity for Marian imagery, hanging paintings of the Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalene in

¹¹⁶ Thurley, *ibid.*

¹¹⁷ Payne, “Inventory,” 39, 36, fols. 24r-v, 18v.

¹¹⁸ Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, 100-102.

¹¹⁹ Lorne Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 118-20, cat. no.73; Wilks, “Art Collecting,” 42. It subsequently ended up in the collection of Charles I and was displayed in the Long Gallery at Whitehall, see also Oliver Millar, “Abraham Van Der Doort’s Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I,” *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 37 (1958): 52, no.56. For the painting, see RCIN #405475.

his Bedchamber at Whitehall, while a large quantity of religious paintings were displayed in his cabinet that included the Virgin, Christ and numerous saints, and even a supposedly very Catholic image – a Madonna Lactans which, like Anna’s version, was equipped with its own curtain.¹²⁰ Further evidence of the persistence of religious imagery within a Protestant context is found in the well-known commission of Rembrandt van Rijn (1606-1669) to produce a series of seven paintings of the Passion for the Stadtholder Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange (1584-1647) in 1628.¹²¹

More pertinently perhaps, a discussion of the devotional aids used by Anna’s own siblings, who were staunchly Lutheran, further dispels the argument that Anna’s covert Catholicism is evident in her possession of religious artworks. Both Christian IV and Anna’s younger sister Augusta, Duchess of Gottorp (1580-1639), are known to have had magnificently decorated private oratories. Christian’s oratory at Frederiksborg Castle, for example, was hung with paintings featuring scenes from the Life of Christ by a selection of artists including the Dutch Pieter Lastman (1583-1633) and the Danish Pieter Isaacsz (1569-1625). It also featured a painting of a penitential Christian kneeling before the Crucified Christ (figures 3.6, 3.7).¹²² Following a vision of the suffering of Christ in December 1625, Christian IV commissioned a painting of the scene of the *Ecce Homo*, which survives along with

¹²⁰ For the Marian images in the Bedchamber see “Abraham Van Der Doort’s Catalogue,” 36, nos.6, 9, 10; for the religious paintings in the cabinet see 79, no.17; 80, nos.19, 21; 81, nos.26, 28; 82, nos.31, 33; 83, nos.36-38; 84, nos.40, 41; 85, no.44; 86, nos.53, 55; 87, nos.58, 59; 89, nos.68, 70, 71; 90, no.75, 76; 91, no.78. For a discussion of Charles’s collection of religious paintings see Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming. Anna’s Madonna Lactans was displayed in the cabinet at Oatlands Palace and was fixed with a green taffeta curtain, Glynde MS 320, fol.8r.

¹²¹ On Frederik Hendrik’s commission, and Rembrandt’s production of Passion imagery for a Protestant clientele more generally, see for example Peter Black and Erma Hermens, *Rembrandt and the Passion* (Munich: Prestel, 2012), 43-73.

¹²² Heiberg, *Christian IV and Europe*, 64-65.

Christian's hand-written note explaining the subject and his vision (figure 3.9).¹²³ In addition, the Royal Chapel at Frederiksborg was dominated by a magnificent ebony and silver-gilt altarpiece, dating to 1606-8, which featured the Crucifixion in the central panel (figure 3.8).¹²⁴ In the case of Augusta, a quantity of her stamped devotional objects have survived, which show that she owned an elaborate gilt-silver ebony altarpiece featuring the Crucifixion with the compartmentalised panel wings offering scenes from the Passion (figure 3.10).¹²⁵ In addition, she possessed a personal gold and enamel altar set adorned with sapphires and precious stones. Comprising a wine jug, oblate box, chalice, and paten, the set was richly engraved with various scenes from the Passion (figure 3.11).¹²⁶ As these examples attest, Lutherans not only accepted religious images in a domestic setting, but in contrast to Calvinists, they continued to use them to facilitate religious devotions. As a result, Anna's ownership and use of religious imagery cannot be used as evidence of her Catholicism, for had she remained Lutheran such works would still have been considered appropriate.

Writing on Anna's collection of paintings at Denmark House, Griffey recognises that Anna "felt a particular affinity with Passion imagery," which she notes was not shared by her Catholic successor, Henrietta Maria.¹²⁷ It was, however, evidently shared by her Lutheran sister, Augusta. Anna's proclivity for Passion imagery preceded her arrival in England, and around 1595 she received a gold altarpiece "with the history of the passion, fynlie wrocht

¹²³ Ibid., 63-64.

¹²⁴ Mogens Bencard, "Ebony and Silver Furniture at Frederiksborg Castle," in *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective*, ed. Michael Anderson, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen and Hugo Johannsen (Copenhagen: National Museum, 2011), 327.

¹²⁵ Heiberg *Christian IV and Europe*, 202-205, nos.713, 14.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 204-205, no.714.

¹²⁷ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

[finely wrought] in imagrie,” from Friar Morton.¹²⁸ In line with Tara Hamling’s research, these various examples remind us that religious imagery persisted after the Reformation, and that its existence and use cannot always be seen as an index to the confessional identity of the owner.¹²⁹ For contemporaries, Anna’s possession of objects featuring Marian and Passion imagery did not indicate that she was a Catholic. We should remember too, that the act of withdrawing to a private closet for religious meditation was not restricted to Catholics, for the Puritan diarist, Lady Margaret Hoby (*bap.*1571-1633), makes frequent mention of retiring “priuatly in my Cloisit... wher I praied.”¹³⁰ Evidently, even the puritanical in seventeenth-century England had hallowed spaces in their houses for private devotions. Thus, the little room that joined the two galleries at Denmark House, which would have been likely seen by visitors to the palace, could just as likely have been understood as a space reserved for Protestant reflections, rather than Catholic worship.

Further information concerning Anna’s confessional identity can be gleaned from warrants and her household accounts, which do include a quantity of religious items, although again, Anna does not appear to have ordered any items that could be considered definitively Catholic. A warrant issued around May 1603 for the queen’s closet includes “forty foure ells of fine holland cloth for foure Surples,” while the household accounts list communion table-cloths, traverses, and religious vestments.¹³¹ Both documents also detail a number of religious texts, although the notary does not stipulate the nature of the books. For example,

¹²⁸ Meikle and Payne, “Lutheranism to Catholicism,” 52, citing Christian Barnekow archiv, University of Lund, Letters A 2.1.

¹²⁹ On the existence and use of religious images and objects in post-Reformation England, see Hamling, *Decorating the 'Godly' Household*, 52-65.

¹³⁰ Quoted in Stewart, “Early Modern Closet,” 81.

¹³¹ TNA: PRO, SP14/1 f.250r-251r; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648. The

the warrant provides for “two bibles in England and two Dussen of Service bookes.” Similarly, the books for Anna’s “use and Service in her Clossett” in the household accounts of 1604 are merely listed as “one Bible covered with red velvet ruled and guilt 100s. 8 Psalters with the new Testament bound together and two great Communion Service Bookes 100s.”¹³² This seems to have been standard practice, for the same cursory language is used for the religious texts issued for Elizabeth, James, and Henry.¹³³ Even when Henrietta Maria ordered Bibles and service books for her closet in October 1625, they were merely noted as “Two large bibles and 36 service books,” although they would have been undoubtedly Catholic.¹³⁴

While some of the items ordered for Anna’s closet would now be more commonly connected with Catholic worship, Hamling has recently shown that priestly clothing and even Eucharistic equipment remained commonplace in Reformed Church services and were only denounced by some Puritans.¹³⁵ Indeed, in April 1595, Queen Elizabeth I’s Clerk of the Closet received a selection of goods that were very similar to those ordered by Anna. These included service books, communion linen and table cloths, surplices, and English bibles.¹³⁶ A comparable assortment of goods was also used by James in his closet; a warrant dated 14 February 1604 testifies to the king ordering bibles and service books as well as lavish cushions and a fine array of costly fabrics such as crimson taffeta, cloth of gold, and Turkey carpets to adorn the closet and be draped over the communion tables.¹³⁷ Furthermore, a

¹³² TNA: PRO, SP14/1 f.251r; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646.

¹³³ BL Add. MS 12498, fol. 225r-v

¹³⁴ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming, citing TNA: PRO, LC5/38, p.106.

¹³⁵ Hamling, *Decorating the 'Godly' Household*, 40-43.

¹³⁶ McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 19, citing BL MS Add 5750, fol.40.

¹³⁷ BL Add. MS 12498, fol. 225v, see also *ibid.*, 19-20.

warrant dated 9 November 1604 shows that the eldest son and heir to the throne, Henry, who has been historically lauded as a militant Calvinist, similarly had service books, coffers, a great Bible, costly purple velvet cushions, and “twentie two ells of fine holland for Srplesses” delivered for his closet.¹³⁸

Seen in this context, the religious texts in Anna’s closet at Denmark House and the array of religious furnishings she had delivered for her use would not have been seen as indications of popish leanings, for they were in keeping with the items sanctioned for use in the Reformed Church services attended by her husband, her son, and Elizabeth. It is also worth noting that these objects were significantly less decorative than those used by her Lutheran siblings in their devotions. If Anna was indeed, as scholars have argued, a covert Catholic, then her inventory and accounts should be seen as evidence of Anna’s political acumen in her determination not to let her Catholicism damage the monarchy. Thus, she strategically surrounded herself with religious goods and a large volume of images that were confessionally ambiguous. They would have aided her private prayers and reflection, while not being specifically Catholic. It is perhaps more reasonable though, to consider that the equivocal nature of these religious goods suggests a woman who was not a devout Catholic, but one who adhered to the principles of her Lutheran upbringing, continuing to use religious imagery in the context of her personal observances.

Devotional aids that were specifically Catholic, such as rosaries, Agnus Dei, and Roman catechisms, however, may have been the domain of select Ladies of the Bedchamber such

¹³⁸ BL Add. MS 12498, fol. 225r.

as Jane Drummond, who is considered by Meikle, Payne, and Loomie to have smuggled priests into Anna's palaces for her to hear Mass and make confession.¹³⁹ As discussed in Chapter Two, the likelihood that Anna's Catholic Bedchamber servants acted in this capacity is borne out by the actions of her French Catholic page of the Bedchamber, Piero Hugon, around the time of her death in 1619. At this time, as Meikle and Payne have recently discussed, Hugon removed a quantity of religiously contentious jewellery from Denmark House and sent it to Paris. He was later charged with theft, but the authors raise the possibility that he was acting under Anna's orders, ensuring that no distinctly Catholic jewels were found among her belongings after her death.¹⁴⁰ Such attentiveness would certainly accord with the lack of Catholic liturgical equipment in her accounts, and the absence of definitively Catholic paintings in her residences. Again, however, this type of evidence does not prove the nature of Anna's confessional identity, and it is just as likely that Anna did not own any Catholic liturgical equipment for the very reason that she had not genuinely converted from Lutheranism.

While Anna spent time and Crown funds constructing a palace that was laid out and furnished in a manner befitting the main residence of a queen consort, it is likely that her vision for Denmark House also involved the surrounding lands. This is evident in the decision to re-orientate the state lodgings so that they overlooked the grounds. Originally, the northern windows of the Presence Chamber, Privy Chamber, and Withdrawing Chamber all looked out onto the Inner Court. During the renovations, however, these windows were

¹³⁹ Loomie, "Catholic Consort," 308, 312; Payne, "Aristocratic Women," 241-43, 247-69; Meikle and Payne, "Lutheranism to Catholicism," 64-65. It should be pointed out that the Agnus Dei continued to feature in both Anglican and Lutheran services.

¹⁴⁰ Meikle and Payne, "Lutheranism to Catholicism," 66-68.

filled in and new windows were constructed on the opposite side, so that the view was now directed over the grounds and to the Thames beyond.¹⁴¹ The significance of this decision is confirmed by the function of this suite of chambers, for the state apartments were among the most prestigious rooms of the house and it was here that formal audiences, receptions, semi-public meals, and official ceremonies were carried out.¹⁴² Thus, the most important rooms in the palace served to cast the resident, Anna of Denmark, as the purveyor of all that extended beyond the windows. Crucially, this view included the manicured gardens and the magnificent mount of Parnassus that was designed by the French hydraulic engineer Salomon de Caus (1576-1626). As will become clear below, this visual link would effectively cast Anna, in Luke Morgan's words, as "a 'tenth muse' if not a new Apollo."¹⁴³

French-Italian Garden Design

On the southern side of Denmark House, the grounds sloped away to the Thames, providing the palace with a dominating aspect from both the gardens and the river. As mentioned above, the palace had not been regularly used by Elizabeth, and the gardens had received little attention during her reign. This all changed under Anna, whose horticultural patronage at Denmark House saw the transmission of French and Italian styles of garden-making and design to England. Before work commenced on the palace, the grounds were transformed and, between 1607 and 1609, work began on a new terraced privy garden to the east of the palace.¹⁴⁴ In 1609, William Goodrowse, was paid the costly sum of £400 for "raising and

¹⁴¹ Thurley, *Somerset House*, 36, 41.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 41. On the changing layout and function of the chambers in state apartments in Tudor and Stuart residences see, for example, Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, 88-94, 99-100, 110.

¹⁴³ Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 120-21.

¹⁴⁴ TNA: PRO, E351/3243.

levelling” the new garden.¹⁴⁵ Later, in 1613-14, payments were made through the Exchequer for “rayling about the walke and knottes in the garden,” which are likely to refer to the terraced privy garden.¹⁴⁶ Based on French designs that originated in Italy, it was an early example of the symmetrical patterned garden, which Anna has been credited with introducing and popularising in England. An example, thought to be that at Denmark House, features in the background of Anna’s seminal portrait from around 1614 (figures 3.12, 3.13).¹⁴⁷ The accounts for 1607-9 show that the west end of the privy garden was earmarked for Mulberry trees, although it is unclear if they were ever planted. Mulberry trees were possibly already present at Greenwich for the accounts include reference to making “a Chamber for the Queenes Silke woormes making a shutting for a Chymney there, making xxiiij [24] boxes for the said woormes.”¹⁴⁸ By 1616, Mulberry’s were in place at Oatlands, for between 1616 and 1618 there was £6.3s.7d. disbursed for “Ironwoorke of Severall Sortes for the Silkewormehouse.”¹⁴⁹ Along with their corresponding silkworm houses, the tree planting was a conscious effort to support James’s initiative to cultivate a national silk industry, and trees were also planted at St James’s Palace in 1609-10.¹⁵⁰ Between 1610 and 1611, in keeping with French fashions, Anna had an orangery built at Denmark House, which Paula Henderson designates as one of the first in England.¹⁵¹ Anna’s

¹⁴⁵ Colvin, *King’s Works*, 255, citing TNA SP40/2, fol.67. Colvin states that Goodrowse was “a sergeant surgeon,” but gives no indication as to the meaning of this title or position.

¹⁴⁶ TNA: PRO, E351/3248.

¹⁴⁷ Strong, *Artist and the Garden*, 14, 35-36; *Renaissance Garden*, 87.

¹⁴⁸ TNA: PRO, E351/3243.

¹⁴⁹ TNA: PRO, AO1/2485/344; Colvin, *King’s Works*, 213, citing TNA: PRO, E351/3388. Anna’s commission of a silkworm house can be seen as an example of the British colonial expansion in the Jacobean period and James’s ambition to see England rival the French monopoly on silk production. For a discussion of the cultivation of a silk industry as a colonial enterprise in relation to changing patterns of material consumption in England, see Peck, *Consuming Splendor*, 1-3, 73-111. For a compelling discussion of Anna’s role in Jacobean colonial expansion see Roper, “Unmasquing the Connections,” 45-59.

¹⁵⁰ Peck, *Consuming Splendor*, 1, 73-74; TNA: PRO, E351/3244.

¹⁵¹ TNA: PRO, E351/3245; Paula Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden: Architecture and Landscape in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2005), 146.

most innovative and ambitious work on the gardens though, is found in her patronage of De Caus the following year.

The Italianate Mount of Parnassus

De Caus arrived in London towards the end of 1610 and by March 1611 he was working for Anna at Greenwich. Until he left for Heidelberg in November 1613, he worked periodically for the queen at Greenwich and Denmark House, for Prince Henry at Richmond, and for Robert Cecil at Hatfield House.¹⁵² Unfortunately, as Strong and Morgan comment, there is very little archival evidence or primary source material related to De Caus's work in London, and his work for Anna is particularly poorly documented.¹⁵³ Reference to De Caus at Denmark House appears in the Works accounts of 1611-12, where special mention is made of "sondry woorkes about the fountaine in the garden and buildinge a house towards the Thames for Monnzer de Cois to make the Rocke in for the fountaine." The accounts also include payment for "Soape and oyle for the Engine and Crane" and "Ropes for the Crane and Slynge," which are likely to be connected to De Caus's work. Further mention of the fountain is found in a payment of £50 to Richard Barnwell for "makeinge and settinge vpp of an Engine to force vpp water from a well at the end of the Terrasse in the garden to the great Cesterne over the Strand Lane w^{ch} Serveth the new ffountaine with water."¹⁵⁴ These entries make clear that the fountain required complex hydro-engineering. Water would

¹⁵² For the chronology of de Caus's work in England from 1611 to 1613, with relevant manuscript sources, see Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 54-58. Note that as discussed below, Morgan asserts that De Caus did not work for Anna until November 1612, but a bill indicates that he was actually engaged at Greenwich from March 1611. See Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 153.

¹⁵³ Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 90; Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 55, 57-58, 113-15.

¹⁵⁴ TNA: PRO, E351/3246; also cited by Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 90; Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 112. Strong notes that De Caus also received £998.11s., for work done on the gardens at Denmark House and Greenwich, although he does not give any details or a date, see Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 227, note 3, citing BL Lansdowne MS 164, fol.447.

have had to have been pumped up from the Thames, and an intricate network of pipes, taps, cisterns, and valves would have been necessary to ensure an adequate and consistent water supply. It was also large in scale, for Robert Smythson's (1535-1614) plan of 1609, shows the new additions to Denmark House and the preliminary work being carried out at the gardens, indicating that the fountain was to have a basin diameter of 100 feet (30m) (figure 3.14).¹⁵⁵

While the details of the fountain at Denmark House are unclear, both Strong and Morgan have linked it to the written account by Johann Wilhelm Neumayr (1572-1641), a German attendant to Duke Johann Ernst of Saxe-Weimar (1594-1626), who visited Denmark House and Greenwich Palace in 1613. Writing of the gardens at Denmark House, Neumayr stated that

To one side stands a Mount Parnassus: the mountain or rock is made of sea-stones, all sorts of mussels, snails, and other curious plants put together: all kinds of flowers grow out of the rock which are a great pleasure to behold. On the side facing the palace it is made like a cavern. Inside it sit the Muses, and have all sorts of instruments in [their] hands. Uppermost at the top stands Pegasus, a golden horse with wings. On the mountain are built four small arches, in each rests a naked statue of marble. They have cornucopiae in [their] hands and under their arms jugs from which water flows into the basin about four good paces wide, and is all around the mountain... It is thus a beautiful work and far surpasses the Mount Parnassus in the Pratolino near Florence.¹⁵⁶

Indeed, De Caus was heavily influenced by the sixteenth-century Tuscan garden, particularly Pratolino, and designs for Parnassus garden mounts, which are very similar to that seen at Denmark House, are included in his treatise of 1615: *Les Raisons des forces mouvantes*

¹⁵⁵ Mark Girouard, "The Smythson Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects," *Architectural History* 5 (1962): 33, 75 (no. 1/13); also cited in Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 87, 91, but incorrect page number given.

¹⁵⁶ Quoted in Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 90-91, citing Johann Neumayr von Ramssla, *Des Durchlauchtigen hochgebornen Fürsten...* (Leipzig, 1620), 211. The duke himself also noted the splendour of the Parnassus and similarly concluded that "it far surpasses the Parnassus Mount in the Pratolino near Florence." Quoted in Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners*, 166.

(figures 3.15, 3.16).¹⁵⁷ Although authorship of the Denmark House Parnassus cannot be definitively proven, this highly symbolic water feature is pertinent to a discussion of Anna's cultural activities and the construction of a visual iconography. Aspects of location, engineering, scale, and iconography indicate that it held a larger function than merely marking the garden as a site for thought and reflection.

The Parnassus would have dominated the gardens at Denmark House, and as Neumayr makes clear, it was one that intimately connected the palace to Tuscan precedents. Aside from the connection to Italian Renaissance garden design, Anna's choice of iconography is significant, for in Greek mythology Mount Parnassus was home to the nine Muses and, therefore, to knowledge and the arts. During the Renaissance, Mount Parnassus became closely connected to Mount Helicon where the winged horse Pegasus stamped his hoof and released the Hippocrene, a sacred spring of inspiration.¹⁵⁸ Consequently, in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century poetry, Parnassus, the Muses, Apollo, or the Hippocrene Spring were often invoked to praise a ruler as a patron and guardian of the arts and literature.¹⁵⁹ At this time too, fountains of Parnassus or Pegasus became a common feature in Italian gardens and could be seen, for example, at the Villa Lante at Bagnaia, at the "Park of Monsters" in Bomarzo, the Villa Medici at Pratolino, and the Villa d'Este at Tivoli.¹⁶⁰ Here, as at Denmark House, they served to identify the residence as the home of the Muses; as a place of reflection and thought under the inspiration of nature, which in turn, inspires the arts.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 115-19. The treatise was revised and republished in Paris in 1624.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 120.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ Claudia Lazzaro-Bruno, "The Villa Lante at Bagnaia: An Allegory of Art and Nature," *Art Bulletin* 59 (1977): 555.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

Anna's role as the patron and protector of the arts was also celebrated in the interior of the palace, for in the Cross Gallery there was a large mirror with a frame bearing "the three faculties & the seaven liberall sciences" in embroidery and needlework.¹⁶² The mirror would have allowed Anna's image to be conflated with visual representations of the liberal arts and the three philosophical characteristics of the soul, thereby paying deference to her intellect, patronage, and learning. The mirror would only have been seen by a select few, but the Parnassus in the east garden by the Thames would have been widely noticed by people travelling on the river and by important visitors to Denmark House. Importantly, as mentioned, Anna had reoriented all windows of the State Apartments in order that they overlook the garden and the fountain was large in scale. The significance of such a considerable, highly visible, and explicit symbol of cultural erudition at Anna's principal residence cannot be overestimated. Noting the transformative powers of Parnassus in Italian precedents, Morgan concludes that the grotto fountain cast Denmark House as a new Parnassus, which by extension meant that "its proprietor, Anne of Denmark, like Isabella d'Este before her, was a 'tenth muse' if not a new Apollo, because of her enlightened patronage of the arts."¹⁶³

Set in the context of Anna's wider cultural interests and self-representation, the Parnassus is a logical manifestation of the queen's visual identity and wider cultural interests, which were marked by an internationalist outlook, innovative choices, and a proclivity for the

¹⁶² Payne, "Inventory," 36, fol.17v.

¹⁶³ Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 120-21.

Italianate.¹⁶⁴ As I suggest in Chapter One, Anna's Italianate inclinations are likely to have stemmed from her highly cultured childhood in Denmark. At the Oldenburg court, Anna was exposed to a wide array of travelling performers, musicians, and dancers as well as elaborate pageants, plays, and mummings. In this regard, it is notable that Anna's brother Christian exhibited a similar preference for Italian traditions, artists, and styles.¹⁶⁵ Dominating the gardens at Denmark House, Anna's preference for the Italianate also coloured the significant building work that she embarked upon at her other London residence: Greenwich Palace.

Greenwich Palace:

Royal Precedence, Royal Rituals, and Political Ambition

Unlike Denmark House, which was assigned to Anna shortly after James's accession, Greenwich Palace was not added to her jointure until 19 February 1614.¹⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Anna's needs and aspirations shaped the residence from the start of the Jacobean reign. Situated on the south bank of the Thames, approximately eight kilometres from London, Greenwich was both strategic and convenient, but it was also a particularly appropriate residence for a queen consort. All of Henry VIII's six queens had resided at Greenwich, and the palace had been favoured by Elizabeth in the last two decades of her reign. Under Anna, Greenwich continued to function as a "place of pleasure" while also providing a stage for key matters of diplomacy and court ceremonial.¹⁶⁷ Following the lengthy reign of a single

¹⁶⁴ The connection to Italian precedents is undeniable, and strengthens the possibility of De Caus's authorship, for as Morgan comments, De Caus's time in Italy at the close of the sixteenth century was the formative experience of his career and all of his subsequent work was "fundamentally Italianate," being coloured by "his intimate knowledge of... Tuscan motifs, methods, and topoi," *ibid.*, 198-200.

¹⁶⁵ See above, 118-119.

¹⁶⁶ Colvin, *King's Works*, 113.

¹⁶⁷ As quoted in *ibid.*, 107.

monarch, it is logical that Greenwich required remodelling in preparation for the royal couple. Since Elizabeth had chosen to use the king's lodgings, it is unsurprising that the Stuarts ordered work to immediately begin on the queen's apartments in order to ensure Anna had a suitable suite of rooms.¹⁶⁸ The accounts of 1604-5 show that carpenters were paid for "boordinge floores for a privie kitchen made for the Quene," while bricklayers and tilers were noted to have made "a newe Chimney and footpace in the Quenes lodginge," and plasterers to have repaired the Great Chamber and the Presence Chamber on both the king and queen's side. In addition, various alterations and repairs were made to rooms for Anna's maids with the lodgings for Lady Walsingham (Mistress of the Robes) and Lady Derby (Lady of the Privy Chamber) receiving particular attention.¹⁶⁹ The following accounts for 1605-6 show that carpenters were paid to make "a pticon [partition] wth a doore in the gallerie going to the aforesaid Lodging or vpper banquetting howse all for the queenes Ma:tie" as well as "rearing and setting up of the tymbber frame and the roofe of the newe pryvie kitchin for the Queene," while plasterers were paid to plaster "the walles and Ceelings in the new Lodging in the tyltyard for the queene."¹⁷⁰ It is unclear whether the orders for the queen's apartments came from James, or from Anna herself, but in either case the palace was evidently prepared for housing a royal couple shortly after the accession.

¹⁶⁸ Simon Thurley, "Architecture and Diplomacy: Greenwich Palace under the Stuarts," *The Court Historian* 11 (2006): 128; TNA: PRO, E351/3239.

¹⁶⁹ TNA: PRO, E351/3240.

¹⁷⁰ TNA: PRO, E351/3241.

The English Births

As well as being remodelled to support a royal family, Greenwich was chosen as the site for a momentous occasion: a royal birth. Anna retired to Greenwich Palace for the period of her lying-in and, on 8 April 1605, she was delivered of her third daughter, Princess Mary, following the earlier births of Elizabeth (1596-1662) and Margaret (1598-1600) in Scotland.¹⁷¹ Significantly, Mary was the Stuarts' first English-born child and the first royal child born in England in more than 65 years. The choice of Greenwich was extremely politic, for it underscored the continuity between the Tudor and Stuart dynasties: Greenwich had been chosen as the birthing site for Henry VIII, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and by selecting it for the birth of Princess Mary, the Stuarts cast themselves as the legitimate inheritors of Tudor tradition.¹⁷²

In expectation of the royal birth, the court was at Greenwich by 28 March 1605, and Anna may have been there earlier, for Carleton reported on 10 March 1605 that

here [Greenwich] is much adoe about the Queen's lying down, and great Suit made for Offices of carrying the white Staff, holding the Back of the Chair, Door keeping, Cradle rocking, and such like Gossips Tricks.¹⁷³

A high degree of magnificence was expected to accompany such a momentous occasion, which the Stuarts ensured on both a private and public level. The "bearing clothes" and

¹⁷¹ One of the midwives was Alice Dennis who received £100 from the King "for her pains and attendance upon the Queen," see Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 23.

¹⁷² For works done at Greenwich in preparation for Anne Boleyn's lying-in see Colvin, *King's Works*, 105, citing MS Rawlinson D.776, fols.2, 43, 65.

¹⁷³ Letter to Ralph Winwood, 10 March 1605, in Edmund Sawyer, *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I...* (London: printed by W. B. for T. Ward, 1725), vol. 2, 52, STC T149866 http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO?c=1&stp=Author&ste=11&af=BN&ae=T149866&tiPG=1&dd=0&dc=fic&docNum=CW106210422&vrsn=1.0&srchtp=a&d4=0.33&n=10&SU=OLRL+OR+OLRI&locID=auckland_ecco. Writing to Winwood from Greenwich on 28 March 1605, Calvert states that "The King, Queen, and all are now at Court, and there purpose to be some time. The Queen expects delivery within a Month. There is great Preparation of Nurses, Midwives, Rockers, and other like Officers to the number of forty or more," *ibid.*, 54.

cradles listed in the inventory of 1611 of Anna's wardrobe goods, which was discussed in Chapter Two, were presumably ordered for the queen's English births. One cradle was noted to be "litle" and had a pallet and head cloth made of cloth of tissue, with a white damask train that was garnished with lace buttons and with loops and a fringe of gold and silver silk.¹⁷⁴ The second cradle was infinitely more lavish and seems to have been inherited from the Tudors. Occurring in a list of goods from "the Wardrobe of Queen Elizth," it is described as a "Cradle of State" covered with crimson velvet that was garnished with gold and crimson silk, lined with crimson satin and fitted with five pillows.¹⁷⁵ In addition to the three gold-fringed bearing sheets of lawn (fine linen), there was an extremely costly 9ft-square (2.75 m²) crimson velvet bearing cloth that was adorned with a broad gold-and-silver lace and finished with a fringe of gold.¹⁷⁶

As well as being the site of the birth, Greenwich was selected as the location for Princess Mary's christening on 5 May 1605, in the Great Chapel. As befitted a grand royal ceremony, spending at Greenwich for the year 1604 to 1605 amounted to £2,623.6*d.*, which was one of the highest totals spent on the residence during James's reign.¹⁷⁷ Predictably, the Works accounts show that the chief concerns were ensuring that the ceremony and accompanying entertainments were suitably royal. Calvert relayed to Winwood on 6 April 1605, that

The Queen expects her Delivery every Houre, and Prayers are dayly said every where for her safety. There is great Preparation for the christening Chamber, and costly Furniture provided for Performance of other Ceremonies.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ TNA: PRO, LR2/121, fol.22r.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, fol.22v.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, fols.10r, 13v.

¹⁷⁷ TNA: PRO, E351/3240.

¹⁷⁸ Quoted in Sawyer, *Memorials of Affairs of State*, vol. 2, 57.

Two cant (bow) windows were installed in the Great Closet so that James and Anna were afforded a private view into the Chapel Royal. An 8ft-square (2.4 m²) railed “hallpace” was set up in the Chapel, and further rails were installed “to keepe out the presse of people,” while several “greate Cupboordes for plate” were built in the Great Chamber.¹⁷⁹ Workmen were also required to construct a new confectionery, a new wine cellar, and a new cockpit near the friary; to alter and mend “verie manie lodginge and offices aboute the house”; to make repairs to the Banqueting House; to ready the cock-pit, the tiltyard, and the bear-baiting pit; and to install stands of wine and beer in both the buttery and the cellar.¹⁸⁰ The extensive work carried out at Greenwich in expectation of the birth highlights the importance the Stuarts placed on having an English-born child. By this time, James and Anna already had three children who had survived infancy, but they had been born in Scotland, and England had not witnessed a royal birth for almost 70 years. As I argue in Chapter One, the Stuarts’ desire to have an English-born Prince or Princess was not driven by issues of dynasty, but by a desire to legitimise and popularise their position as the new and foreign ruling family. In addition to the new work carried out at Greenwich, the white marble fountain that had stood in the privy garden during Elizabeth’s reign was repaired and cleaned in order to contribute to the overall sense of visual continuity between the two reigns.¹⁸¹ However, as mentioned above, the importance of precedence was most patently spelt out by the choice of location.

On the day of the christening, the three courts at Greenwich were “hung about with broad cloth,” and in the Chapel Royal

¹⁷⁹ TNA: PRO, E351/3240.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

In the midst of the quyer was erected a most stately canapy of cloth of gold, 12 foot square, within the which upon a foote pace of foure degrees, stoode a very rich and stately font of silver and gilt, most curiously wrought with figures of beastes, serpents, and other antycke workes.¹⁸²

Carried by Cecil's niece and a Lady of the Withdrawing Chamber, Elizabeth de Vere, Countess of Derby (1575-1627), Princess Mary completed a formal procession "from the Queenes lodgings through both the great Chambers, and through the presence, and downe the winding stayres into the Conduit Court."¹⁸³ Royal favour, rank, and kinship was advertised in the choice of godparents, which consisted of James's two cousins, Ludovick Stuart, Duke of Lennox and Richmond (1574-1624), and Lady Arbella Stuart (1575-1615), as well as the high-ranking Dorothy Percy, Countess of Northumberland (c.1564-1619), and Anna's brother, Duke Ulrik of Holstein (1578-1624), who was visiting England at the time.¹⁸⁴ The manner of the ceremony followed tradition and Anna was appropriately absent from the elaborate proceedings. In keeping with custom, the queen remained in confinement until the last ritual of the royal birth was performed: the queen's churching. As the site of the lying-in, the birth and the christening, Greenwich was also the location for the ritual churching of the queen, which was carried out on 19 May 1605 "according to the booke of Common Prayer."¹⁸⁵ This was a ceremonial celebration of Anna's survival of childbirth and marked her formal return to society after her period of confinement. It was eagerly anticipated by the court, with the Florentine agent, Ottaviano Lotti, reporting on 13 May that "from next week her Majesty [Anna] will let herself be seen in public, and beautiful tilts

¹⁸² John Stow, George Buck, and Edmund Howes, *The Annales, or a Generall Chronicle of England, Begun First by Maister Iohn Stow...* (London: Printed by Thomas Dawson impensis Thomæ Adams, 1615), 863, <http://www.lib.umi.com/eebo/image/18157> STC 23338

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 864.

will be held in those days as is the custom, along with other festivities of mirth.”¹⁸⁶ On the occasion, Anna was supported to the Chapel Royal by Princess Mary’s godfathers, who were followed by “a great trayne of Ladies... [and] great lordes.”¹⁸⁷ The strength, unity, and affection of the young Stuart couple was visually signposted during the formalities. James and Anna met before the altar and then “imbracing each other with great kindnesse, went hand in hand together, untill they came to the Kings presence Chamber doore, where they parted, dooing great reverence each to other.”¹⁸⁸

Greenwich continued to be a site of political and cultural importance for the Stuarts. It was again chosen as the location for the lying-in and birth of Anna’s seventh and last child, Princess Sophia, on Sunday 22 June 1606 with £1,247.17s.4d. being disbursed for the “Childbed.”¹⁸⁹ Unfortunately, the princess passed away the next day, and the following Thursday she was “solemnly, conveyed by Bardge covered with Blacke velvet... vnto the Chappell Royall, in Westminster, and was there enterred.”¹⁹⁰ Just as Anna had been absent from Mary’s christening, so too was she absent from Sophia’s burial, for she remained in confinement at Greenwich until 3 August, when she was churched at the Chapel Royal.¹⁹¹ The choice of Greenwich as the location for the ceremonies associated with the births of their two English-born children clearly indicates the Stuarts were keen to follow precedence and uphold the traditions established by their royal predecessors.

¹⁸⁶ Quoted in John Orrell, “The London Stage in the Florentine Correspondence, 1604–1618,” *Theatre Research International (New Series)* 3 (1978): 161.

¹⁸⁷ Stow, Buck and Howes, *Annales*, 864.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.* On these ceremonies, see also Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 104-107; Payne, “Aristocratic Women,” 116-17.

¹⁸⁹ Stow, Buck and Howes, *Annales*, 883; BL Lansdowne 165/31, fol.102r.

¹⁹⁰ Stow, Buck and Howes, *Annales*, 883.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 886. On the birthing rituals associated with Princess Mary and Sophia, see also Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 104-107.

On 19 February 1614, as mentioned above, Greenwich was formally settled on the queen.¹⁹²

The official grant seems to have prompted Anna to take a more authoritative hand in the building work at the palace. While earlier additions were certainly made for Anna's benefit, the Works accounts show her increased agency once the palace was in her jointure. Roofs that had been newly laid with lead sheets were described as having been promptly "taken up for the Carpenters to alter the roofe and then newe laide againe" at the express "commandement from the Queene," which testifies to Anna taking an active and directorial role.¹⁹³ As mentioned above, Anna's main reconstruction of Denmark House was mainly finished by the close of 1613, and it is clear that once she was assigned Greenwich, she poured her efforts and crown finances into its renovation, expansion, and decoration. Between 1614 and 1619, crown expenditure at Greenwich consistently outweighed that of Denmark House and, in some years, it was more than double.¹⁹⁴

Creating a Queen's Court

As well as devoting ceremonial significance, considerable amounts of time and crown financial resources to Greenwich, Anna also invested the residence with a political potency. This first occurred in 1613/14 when the queen used the palace as a physical sign of her aversion to the Howard-Carr faction, and secondly in 1617, when she selected it as the site for royal administration and politics.¹⁹⁵ As I have outlined in Chapter One, the years 1612 to 1614 saw a major factional realignment at the Jacobean court. Initially, Anna and Prince Henry united against James's rising favourite, Robert Carr. The deaths of Prince Henry and

¹⁹² Colvin, *King's Works*, 113.

¹⁹³ TNA: PRO, E351/3249.

¹⁹⁴ TNA: PRO, E351/3249; TNA: PRO, E351/3250; TNA: PRO, E351/3251; TNA: PRO, E351/3252; TNA: PRO, E351/3253.

¹⁹⁵ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 138-43.

Robert Cecil in 1612 cleared the way for the dominance of the Howard-Carr faction, and led Anna to align herself with the opposing Pembroke-Southampton network. As I have argued, Anna palpably displayed her antipathy to the Howard-Carr faction in three crucial ways, one of which was her rivalry with the Earl of Northampton, over land and control in the borough of Greenwich.

Between 1611 and 1613, Northampton set about increasing his land and titles in the borough of Greenwich.¹⁹⁶ He bought property, secured the lease of the meadow and parsonage, and gained the custody of the orchard, garden, pond and game birds.¹⁹⁷ These he added to the office of keeper of Greenwich Park, which he had been granted, with reversion to Carr, on 19 February 1605.¹⁹⁸ Towards the close of 1613, however, James evidently decided to add Greenwich Palace to Anna's jointure. Writing of the matter on 25 November 1613, Chamberlain reports that "the Quene by late pacification hath gained Greenwich into her joynter."¹⁹⁹ I would suggest that James's decision to gift Anna the residence is evidence that he was at pains to placate his wife in the months leading to the controversial Howard-Carr wedding, which would see Anna's rival network at court dramatically increase their influence and favour at court. The promise of the palace and the imminent wedding seems to have spurred Anna into action. In the same month of the Howard-Carr wedding, Anna openly pitted herself against Northampton for the stewardship of the park. For his part, however, Northampton was personally and politically invested in retaining his post. Writing to Sir Thomas Lake on 9 December 1613, the earl notes the

¹⁹⁶ Peck, *Northampton*, 73-74

¹⁹⁷ TNA: PRO, SP 14/75, fol.80, December 1613; Peck, *Northampton*, 74.

¹⁹⁸ *CSPD*, vol. 12, 197.

¹⁹⁹ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 1, 487, no.185.

queen, or his “wrathful mistress,” is causing him to suffer “dayly alarmes... that her Majesty will thrust me out of my Littell celle in the park of Grenwich.” He continues that he was bought up in the borough and would be “gladde” to die there, for Greenwich affords “refreshementes of my spirites.”²⁰⁰ Writing to Lake two days later, Northampton adds that he has enlisted Carr to entreat with James on his behalf and makes clear that his reputation and status are in jeopardy, for he claims that if his stewardship is revoked, then “to enjoy the lodge without the park would make me ridiculous.”²⁰¹

While it is clear that Northampton wished to retain keepership of the park for matters of sentiment and prestige, Anna’s reason for desiring the post are less apparent. I am not aware of any evidence relating to her motivations, but the timing of the dispute would suggest that Anna was seeking to reduce Northampton’s power just as his faction was about to cement their influence through marriage. On this occasion, though, James sided with Carr and Northampton, confirming the earl in his keepership with rights to “herbage and pannage” on 20 December 1613.²⁰² Later, on 19 February 1614, James assigned Greenwich to Anna for life.²⁰³ While Anna’s actions were likely encouraged by her open contempt of Northampton and the associated Howard faction, her attempt to reduce his holdings in the area should also be seen as a sign of her strong sense of possession. It is probable that she wished to gain the keepership in order to disburse it to one of her own clients and thereby maintain control over the area.

²⁰⁰ TNA: PRO, SP 14/75, fol.70.

²⁰¹ Ibid., fol.78; Peck, *Northampton*, 74.

²⁰² TNA: PRO, SP 14/141, fol.161; Peck, *Northampton*, 74, citing *CSPD*, vol. 9, 216. Conversely, Wilks states that Anna campaigned “for the revocation of Northampton’s grant of his house” rather than the keepership of the park, see Wilks, “Art Collecting,” 41, citing CUL MSS Dd.III.63.14; CUL MSS Dd.III.63.19.

²⁰³ Colvin, *King’s Works*, 113.

In 1617, Greenwich again became the focal point of the queen's political and personal ambitions. As discussed in Chapter One, Anna was afforded a position of notable importance during James's Scottish progress. Although not made Regent, she must have been a dominant force in the six-person ruling council appointed by James, for it was mostly comprised of her associates and allies. Furthermore, all meetings were held at Anna's palace of Greenwich. In his dispatch to the Doge and Senate, on 27 April 1617, Lionello observes that "the Council meets frequently at Greenwich, where the queen generally lives. The prince [Charles] is going there to-morrow to stay some weeks."²⁰⁴ It is interesting that Anna did not elect to have the council assemble at her London residence of Denmark House. This choice was clearly tactical, for although Denmark House was more central, it was also more contentious. Renamed "Denmark House" earlier that year, the palace functioned as a concrete site of Anna's power, control, and jurisdiction and, as noted above, Denmark House was unique in that it was not equipped with a set of apartments for the king. If the council had convened at Denmark House, it is likely to have incited fears and suspicions of the nature and extent of Anna's political aims and aspirations. Greenwich, on the other hand, was still firmly in Anna's domain, but was not invested with the same degree of separatism from the king. As a result perhaps, the queen consort was shrewdly able to increase her level of authority over the council without raising concern.

Gardening with Tradition and Innovation

As mentioned, Elizabeth was not a significant architectural patron, but she does appear to have been invested in the upkeep and beautification of Greenwich. While she did not add

²⁰⁴ CSPV, vol. 14, 495, no.741.

any significant rooms to the palace, between 1567 and 1570, she spent close to £3,000 on cleaning, restoring, and embellishing the exterior of the residence with ornate stucco work.²⁰⁵ During her lengthy reign, as Colvin asserts, Greenwich continued to function as a “place of pleasure and decorative exuberance,” as it had under Henry VIII.²⁰⁶ The extensive gardens and orchards were maintained, and Elizabeth added decorative arbours and a large quantity of richly carved and painted seats. She also added two elaborate fountains and had a second temporary banqueting house built to hold the courtly entertainments of July 1599.²⁰⁷ Throughout the 1580s, Greenwich became Elizabeth’s chosen residence outside of London, and her favour is reflected in the large expenditure of 1583, when she spent £3,151 on remodelling the exterior.²⁰⁸ Unlike Denmark House then, which, as Somerset House, Elizabeth had used as lodgings for visiting dignitaries, Greenwich was shaped by the Tudor queen’s personal tastes and had been coloured by her physical presence.

Occupying a palace that had physically housed Elizabeth and captivated her in later life, seems to have influenced Anna’s own approach to Greenwich, especially where the gardens and outdoor furnishings were concerned. Under the Stuarts, Greenwich continued to function as something of a rural retreat, with restorative work being carried out on the banqueting house, while Anna had Elizabeth’s seats and arbours maintained, as well as adding some of her own garden furniture. An orchard was planted along with a new garden that boasted “divers sorts of fruit Trees & Plants” in November 1609.²⁰⁹ As mentioned above, the Tudor fountain in the privy garden was cleaned and restored in preparation for

²⁰⁵ Colvin, *King’s Works*, 107-108.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 107.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 107, 110.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 108, 110.

²⁰⁹ BL RP 9392.

Mary's christening, and Anna conscientiously maintained the structure throughout her time as the occupant of Greenwich. As soon as Anna was granted the property in 1614, she had the fountain cleaned, polished, and she had the water supply improved. The following year, she ordered "8 maskeheades for the fountayne," which were "gilded with fine gould," and she ordered for "the vpper pte of the Piramides of the same fountayne of white marble wth a ball and Pike" to be remade.²¹⁰ Two years later, the fountain was again cleaned.²¹¹ As well as conserving the Tudor fountain, Anna turned it into a point of visual interest. Upholding Elizabeth's penchant for viewing and resting stations in the garden, Anna had eleven seats in the privy garden marbled, before installing a further six painted seats "with tafferells [carved panels] turned ballesters and leaves being of weynescott," from which the fountain would have been clearly visible.²¹² Increasing the enchanted nature of the grounds, Anna added an ornate aviary and a substantial fountain.

The construction of a large and lavish birdhouse in the gardens of Greenwich was begun between 1606 and 1607. Although this predates Anna's formal possession of the palace, it seems to have been built for her. A bill for wire costing £18.14s.11*d.* is itemised as "wyerwoorke for the quenes birdcage" and the original location was described as "nere the Queenes Lodginge."²¹³ It was an elaborate structure comprising a slate roof, 90 yards (82.3m) of wire netting, an interior finished with lime and hair, and "Collumbes rayles Ballisters Architrave Freeze and Cornishe" that were stopped, primed, and painted by the Sergeant Painter, John de Critz.²¹⁴ De Critz's bill of £20.19s.1*d.*, included his charge for

²¹⁰ TNA: PRO, E351/3249; TNA: PRO, E351/3250.

²¹¹ TNA: PRO, E351/3253.

²¹² TNA: PRO, E351/3248; TNA: PRO, E351/3249.

²¹³ TNA: PRO, E351/3242; TNA: PRO, E351/3244.

²¹⁴ TNA: PRO, E351/3242.

painting the roof white and green; for painting “all the wyerworke” green; for painting the cornices and columns green; painting 54 pins green, and “for prymeinge the bricke and layinge it in stone color.”²¹⁵ The following year, the lower part of the structure was boarded up and carpenters were paid to make “a Case for the pype goeing up to the Birdhouse and raying a Cersterne there wth a Steele for it and a cover.” That same year, payments were made to plumbers for “sodering [soldering] the pipe goeing up to the Birdhouse and putting to peece of pipe to it and a Stopcock [tap or short pipe],” while bricklayers constructed “a vaulte with Bricke for the Stopcock w^{ch} goeth up to the birdhouse.”²¹⁶ Evidently, the birdhouse was a highly complex structure that was furnished with its own water supply.

Between 1611 and 1612, the roof of the birdhouse was raised, re-guttered, and re-slatted. It was also significantly enlarged and embellished with Jeremy Talcott, bricklayer, being paid £28.10s. for his “woorkmanshipp only” in

bringing vp with bricke vj peces, two of them double wth five arches x^{en} foo: [10 feet] broad the pece breakinge out wth ribbes wth xvj^{en} Neeces [16 niches] wth a revaile runninge betwene the ribbes arched over every one, wth a Chaptrell [capital of a pilaster] rounde about the said buildinge wth freze architrave and Cornish wth pennelling [panelling] and rannceinge it all in coulo^{rs} the saide woorke beinge for a birdhouse in the garden.²¹⁷

Judging from the entries in the Works accounts, the birdhouse was both large and elaborate. Comprising five archways, the frontage extended more than 50 feet (15.25m) and was interspersed with niches, which as Colvin suggests, may have been entry points for birds in the manner of a dovecote.²¹⁸ Evidently, work on the birdhouse in 1611-12 was so extensive that it was individually listed in the final accounts for the palace. Grouped

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ TNA: PRO, E351/3243.

²¹⁷ TNA: PRO, E351/3246.

²¹⁸ *King's Works*, 113.

together with a fountain, the two structures totalled £542.5s.10d., which was a third of the money disbursed for the entire palace that year.²¹⁹ The scale and complexity of the birdhouse raises the distinct possibility that it was related to De Caus's so-called "grotto-aviary," and, perhaps not incidentally, the fountain that was listed with the birdhouse has also been linked to De Caus.²²⁰ Before turning to De Caus's work at Greenwich, the palette used for the birdhouse warrants mention. Green and white were the Tudor livery colours, which serves to cast the impressive edifice into the realm of Elizabeth's aesthetic legacy and reinforces the visual link between the two royal women – a link, as I have argued, that Anna frequently invoked as a means to distinguish herself from James.²²¹

Salomon de Caus and the Gardens of Greenwich

The colour palette of the birdhouse was apparently chosen to highlight Anna's legitimacy as the rightful heir to the Tudor queen and previous resident, Elizabeth. The physical structure, however, was clearly impressive and innovative, and it may have been worked on by De Caus, who is known to have been occupied in the gardens of Greenwich in 1611 and 1612. Notably in 1612, the same year that Talcott was paid to radically extend and ornament the birdhouse, De Caus received £205 "for performance of sundry works in Greenwich garden."²²² The bill was paid by the Exchequer on 20 November 1612, but importantly, the

²¹⁹ TNA: PRO, E351/3246. This is also noted by Morgan who goes on to say that "exactly what these [structures] consisted of is not indicated." Morgan fails to consider the extensive information regarding the birdhouse that is found in the individual task work for the year as cited above. See Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 113. The birdhouse is similarly singled out in the charges for August to October 1612, as noted in the volume compiled by Sir Julius Caesar, BL Add MS 12498, fols.82r, 84r, 86r.

²²⁰ As quoted in Morgan and Strong, see Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 115; Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 96.

²²¹ Hayward, "Crimson, Scarlet, Murrey," 139.

²²² Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 153.

original writ was dated 14 March 1611.²²³ This indicates that Anna had engaged De Caus as early as March 1611, even if the work, or the payment, did not materialise until 1612.²²⁴ The extremely large sum and De Caus's renowned expertise in hydraulics makes it likely he was enlisted to design and oversee the installation of the water system, and was perhaps involved with restructuring or extending the physical birdhouse. Furthermore, the amount of money is consistent with the high costs associated with the design and installation of water supplies for fountains and garden features. For example, when Cecil was looking to construct a water parterre at Hatfield House, the Dutch hydraulic engineer Simon Sturtevant (c.1570-1624?) supplied him with a "perfect estimat" of the charges involved in "bringing the water" to the designated site. The set-up of the necessary cistern, pipes, and machinery amounted to £131.8s.9d.²²⁵ De Caus himself was subsequently employed at Hatfield, when it was realised that Sturtevant's designs did not result in an adequate water supply. As part of the modifications De Caus carried out at Hatfield, he received £110 on 25 April 1612 for "a fontaine in the east garden," which would have been only one of his many projects there.²²⁶ Given the ambitious scale of the birdhouse/grotto as outlined in the Works accounts, the system that was required to supply water could feasibly have merited the large payment that De Caus received. Although he cannot be definitively linked to the

²²³ This is my interpretation of the excerpt printed by Devon, which accords with Devon's own statement that "The period when the transaction or circumstance took place upon which the order was made is frequently inserted after the date of the order itself." See Devon, *ibid.*, 24. Conversely, Morgan states that De Caus was paid in November 1612 for work carried out at Greenwich, but he does not give a date for the employment, and the passage infers that the work was carried out sometime earlier that year. Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 58. See also, Colvin, *King's Works*, 113.

²²⁴ My reading of the accounts accords with Strong's dating, who asserts that De Caus was originally in the employ of Anna before being enlisted by Henry. By contrast, Morgan declares that De Caus was first working for Henry, at least from May 1611, and then for Anna from March 1612 through to February 1613. On the dating of De Caus's work in England see Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 87-110; Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 55-58.

²²⁵ Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 107, citing R. T. Gunton, "The Building of Hatfield House." Unpublished typescript held at Hatfield House, July 1895, 78, estimate dated 30 January 1611.

²²⁶ Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, citing Gunton, "Building of Hatfield House," 4.

birdhouse, it is still conceivable that the numerous extensions, reconstructions, and repairs to the birdhouse listed in the accounts were carried out according to De Caus's plans and under his supervision.

Determining the nature and extent of De Caus's work at Greenwich is very difficult, for as mentioned, there is a distinct lack of archival evidence.²²⁷ Indeed, there are few documentary sources relating to the gardens at Greenwich in general. Consequently, both Strong and Morgan rely heavily on Neumayr's written account of 1613 where he states that:

Farther on one comes to a grotto. [It] is a small house from the front and on both sides mostly open, with great iron railings there. On the wall are three different arches, thus all along the whole wall embellished with snails, mussels, mother-of-pearl and all kinds of curious sea plants; in some places flowers, grass and all sorts of lovely herbs grow out. In the middle arch stands a figure, half a woman and half a horse in the right size, also made from shells and mussels; it gave water from itself unto the ground. In the other two arches were other figures, from which water also sprang: on the ground sea stones were put together like a rock. In some places there grew also flowers and small shrubs out of wood. There was also something of grass therein: on the wall sat on a branch a cuckoo... This house was also in the roof open in several places, although protected by wire grating, so that the birds, of which a great number were flying around inside could not get out."²²⁸

Both scholars have suggested that this would likely have been the work of De Caus, who published designs for a structure that combined a grotto with a birdhouse (figures 3.17, 3.18). Unfortunately, however, there is no concrete evidence to support the claim. While Neumayr's description does not wholly accord with the entries related to the birdhouse in the Works accounts, there are nonetheless some notable similarities. Both structures had arcaded frontages, both were furnished with wire grating, and both were designed to contain a multitude of birds. Furthermore, the structure that Neumayr describes must have

²²⁷ Ibid., 96-97; Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 55, 57-58, 113-15.

²²⁸ Quoted in Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 96, citing Neumayr, *Durchlauchtigen*, 211. Strong adds that the accuracy of Neumayr's account is confirmed by a very similar account given by Sieur de Mandelslo in 1640, citing *Les Voyages du Sieur Albert de Mandelslo* (Leiden, 1719), 775-76.

been serviced by its own water supply, since water “sprang” from each of the figures in the arches. This would likely have involved an intricate setup of vaults, cisterns, taps, and pipes of the kind that had been fitted to the birdhouse at Greenwich, and of the kind that had established De Caus’s reputation. Lastly, it would be surprising to find that two large garden structures housing birds and water features were erected at Greenwich, with one missing from the Works accounts, and the other being kept from Neumayr during his tour of the palace.²²⁹ Nevertheless, in the same manner as the Parnassus at Denmark House, the question of authorship does not detract from the significance of the grotto-birdhouse to Anna’s wider cultural programme.

Anna’s “Curious Devise”: The Queen’s House

The Queen’s House at Greenwich has become one of the most celebrated English buildings of the early modern period. As one of the few remaining structures designed by Jones, and as the first example of classical architecture in England, the Queen’s House has attracted a large amount of scholarly interest. As is well known, Jones commenced work on the Queen’s House in 1616; work formally stopped on 30 April 1618; and by the time of Anna’s death, on 2 March 1619, it is likely that only the foundations and several layers of brickwork had been completed.²³⁰ Despite the brief and unfinished nature of the commission, it is important to the present study, for it was personally funded by Anna, and she herself appointed Jones as both the accountant and designer.²³¹ As such, the Queen’s House provides the only concrete example of Anna’s independent architectural patronage. Nevertheless, my discussion of the

²²⁹ De Caus’s absence from the Works accounts is most likely due to the fact that, like Jones, he kept his own “books” in which he recorded his monthly expenses. These books have unfortunately not survived, see Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 105.

²³⁰ Colvin, *King’s Works* 114-15.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 114.

project will not be extensive, for the building and its architect have been the subject of considerable research and publication by architectural historians including Chettle, Colvin, Higgott, Harris, Bold, and Paula Henderson.²³² The broad nature of the scholarship, coupled with the unfinished status of the project on Anna's death, means that my focus is solely on the aims and activities of the patron and intended resident: Anna of Denmark.

Envisioned as a hunting lodge, by 1659 the completed Queen's House at Greenwich was referred to as the "House of Delight."²³³ Here Anna was to escape the stresses of public court life, entertain select guests, and indulge in leisure activities such as hunting. The new lodge replaced an old Tudor gateway and, spanning an existing road, it linked the gardens of Greenwich Palace on the north, or river side, with the hunting park on the south side (figure 3.19). It would have served two principal functions: as a hunting lodge on the south, and as a viewing platform on the north. As Higgott outlines, the current ground plan of the Queen's House, with the exception of the north terrace, is consistent with what Jones originally designed for Anna. He adds that the south (park) side is most likely to have been the original entrance, and the main function of the building was to increase the accessibility and magnificence of the leisure activities in the royal park.²³⁴ A royal hunt could be conveniently and comfortably watched from the loggia and, from there, Anna could easily usher her guests to the Great Hall, or if necessary, to the State Apartments beyond (figure 3.20).²³⁵ By

²³² See for example, *ibid.*, 96-123; Chettle, *Queen's House*; Harris and Higgott, *Inigo Jones*; Harris, "Disneyland in Greenwich"; Paula Henderson, "Secret Houses and Garden Lodges: The Queen's House, Greenwich, in Context," *Apollo* 148 (1997): 29-35; Higgott, "Design and Setting"; Harris, Orgel and Strong, *King's Arcadia*; Bold, *Greenwich*. I am aware that Sophie Carney completed her PhD on the Queen's House at the University of Roehampton and the National Maritime Museums, Greenwich in 2013. I personally contacted the author, but was unable to gain access to any parts of the thesis.

²³³ Quoted in Sykes, "Henrietta Maria's 'house of delight'," citing Philpott, *Villare Cantiarum* (1659), 162.

²³⁴ Higgott, "Design and Setting," 136-38, 143-45.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, 144.

comparison, the north (river) side of the Queen's House was designed to pay homage to the traditional function of Greenwich Palace as a site of international diplomacy and ceremonial. Under James, the palace was frequently used to stage welcome receptions for important visitors and ambassadors who were conveyed by ship from Gravesend.²³⁶ Significantly, as Higgott notes, the Queen's House was set 335 metres back from the river, and on ground at least three metres higher than the palace. As a result, the building afforded views of the gardens and the palace, and crucially, eastward along the Thames where dignitaries and guests would have arrived by boat.²³⁷

As has been stated, before building commenced in October 1616, Jones was required to submit two separate plans, receiving £10 "for making the first module [design] of the new building at Greenwich" and a further £16 for "making and perfecting the second module of the same buildings at Greenwich in the form the same was to be builded and finished by the Quene Ma: commaundement," which was paid through the Privy Purse.²³⁸ While this is often mentioned by scholars, its significance usually goes without comment. As the wording makes apparent, Anna was an active patron. She clearly had firm ideas for the project and was content to give Jones directions, and while this is not generally acknowledged, it has been noted by Bold, who states that "the project was initiated by Anne, and owes more to her ideas and desires than has been adequately acknowledged."²³⁹

²³⁶ On the historic importance of Greenwich Palace as a site for international relations and court ceremony, see Thurley, "Architecture and Diplomacy," 125-28.

²³⁷ Higgott, "Design and Setting," 137-38.

²³⁸ The complete account lodged for the work completed at Greenwich under Anna is printed in Chettle, *Queen's House*, Appendix IV, 97-103; the original manuscript is TNA: PRO, AO1/2487/356. Also cited in Higgott, "Design and Setting," 136; Bold, *Greenwich*, 45; and Colvin, *King's Works*, 114. Tracing the trail of money is rather confusing, and Colvin outlines that "Jones received the queen's money at the hands of one of her officers but declared the account before the Exchequer in the usual way."

²³⁹ Bold, *Greenwich*, 44-45.

This is further borne out by Higgott's analysis of Jones's preliminary drawings of late 1615 or early 1616 and the executed foundations of the building, which he concludes contain notable differences that "point to the Queen revising her requirements for the site at least a few months before the start of work."²⁴⁰ I would add that what is even more significant about Anna's involvement in the design, is that this was the first truly classical building in England, predating designs for the Banqueting House by almost three years.²⁴¹ Thus, Anna emerges as a patron who was innovative and cosmopolitan: she was abreast of architectural styles and fashions that were well established on the continent but not yet popular in England. Indeed, in the same manner as the garden structure of Parnassus at Denmark House, the plan for the Queen's House was heavily indebted to Italian precedents.

The design for the Queen's House drew on the work of three seminal Italian architects of the Renaissance: Giuliano da Sangallo (c.1443-1516), Vincenzo Scamozzi (1552-1616) and Andrea Palladio (1508-1580).²⁴² It was essentially designed in the manner of a sixteenth-century Italian villa, which was completely novel in England. Perhaps the small scale and informal function of the building would have made the use of a new classical language of architecture more appropriate. Of course, Anna's novel building did not reach completion during her lifetime. By the close of Jones's account on 30 April 1618, labour and materials had only been required for "taking downe the olde house over the Parke gate there, as in digging the foundacon of the new buyldinges making of Sello^{rs} and bringing vp the brickwalls

²⁴⁰ Higgott, "Design and Setting," 136.

²⁴¹ Colvin outlines that Jones received his first payment of £200 from Anna on 8 October 1616 and that the design and preparation of the project would have begun earlier that year. By comparison, it was only after the second Banqueting House at Whitehall burnt down, on 12 January 1619, that Jones was commissioned to work on a replacement building, see *King's Works*, 114, 328.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, 114-15; Harris and Higgott, *Inigo Jones*, 64-71; Higgott, "Design and Setting," 141-43, 145-46.

to the said new buyldings,” which amounted to £1,122.6s.2d.²⁴³ Nevertheless, Anna’s decision to appoint Jones as the architect and accountant for the project; to request, or at least accept, a language of architecture that was not popular in England; to order changes to his first proposal; and to pay for the building from her Privy Purse, clearly positions her as an active architectural patron, who in this case at least, was acting separately from her husband.

While Anna should be celebrated for her innovative architectural patronage, we should remember that the Queen’s House was not finished in her lifetime, and Jones’s first classical building came to fruition under James’s aegis, with the Banqueting House at Whitehall in 1622.²⁴⁴ Whether James was inspired by Anna’s plans at Greenwich is unknown, but his decision to have the Banqueting House built according to classical principles was extremely significant. While elements of classicism can be found in English funerary monuments, gates, and building façades dating back to the 1540s, what set the Banqueting House apart from these precedents was the clarity and coherence of the classical language of architecture, and the function and location of the building.²⁴⁵ The Banqueting House served an important function in court ceremonial and it was located very visibly in the heart of Jacobean London. As a result, the strict adherence to the classical principles of decorum, symmetry, and restraint is even more important. By comparison, previous uses of a classical language of architecture were tentative, being frequently mixed with decorative Gothic flourishes. Further, they were to be found on structures that were far removed from the

²⁴³ TNA: PRO, E351/3389, fol.1v.

²⁴⁴ Colvin, *King’s Works*, 330.

²⁴⁵ For a discussion of the rise of classical architecture in England from the 1540s through to the middle of the seventeenth century see Mark Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture: Its Rise and Fall, 1540-1640* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press for The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2009), 126-216.

centre of the Jacobean London.²⁴⁶ While James's aesthetic decisions were important, it is rarely acknowledged that Anna's planned classicising building pre-dates the Banqueting House by several years.

Anna's choice of an Italian classical language of architecture for her new lodge works to link Greenwich to her other main properties. Denmark House and Oatlands palace were also marked by highly visible Italian structures in the gardens. Denmark House boasted a monumental Mount Parnassus and symmetrical cut-work parterres, which held their origins in sixteenth-century Tuscan garden design. This is similarly true of the elaborate grotto-birdhouse at Greenwich, which was possibly designed by De Caus and is likely to have been inspired by Italian precedents. The Italianate thread also extends to the work that Anna personally paid Jones to execute at her palace of Oatlands.

Oatlands Palace: Classicism in the Garden Buildings

In the same manner as Greenwich, Oatlands Palace in Surrey, approximately 37 kilometres west, had a long history of royal ownership and, like Greenwich, was only settled on Anna well into James's reign, being formally added to her jointure on 29 August 1611.²⁴⁷ Oatlands had become Crown property in 1537, spurring Henry VIII to make substantial renovations and extensions in order to transform the residence into a suitably regal palace with

²⁴⁶ See for example Sir Robert Dormer's tomb at Wing, Buckinghamshire dating to around 1555 and the Gate of Honour at Cambridge University from 1573. On the mix of classical and gothic in these structures, see Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture*, 145-56, 159-60. A notable exception to this is the Strand frontage of Somerset House, which was the first attempt to create a unified classical building, although Girouard points out that the classical façade barely covers the traditional Tudor frontage. Designed and built for Edward Seymour, Protector Somerset, between 1548 and 1551, it was never finished and by the time of James's reign, the palace was in need of extension and renovation. On Somerset House under Somerset see, *ibid.*, 142-45; Colvin, *King's Works*, 252-53.

²⁴⁷ Colvin, *King's Works*, 213.

accommodation lodgings for a royal household.²⁴⁸ With the state and privy apartments recently completed, expenditure at the palace during Elizabeth's reign focussed on provisions for the household, and a new range, 217 feet long (66m), was built in the outer court containing kitchens, boiling-house, coal-house, store-house, and buttery.²⁴⁹ In 1597-98, ornamental work was carried out on the interior and exterior, with the queen's lodgings and gallery being painted with imitation red-and-black brickwork using Spanish black and red ochre. Importantly, the wainscot panelling of the South Gallery also received attention, being fitted out with a decorative programme that Colvin asserts was "the most elaborate of its kind in all the records of the palaces under Elizabeth."²⁵⁰ Executed in oil paint with lavish amounts of gold and silver, the scheme stretched 206 yards (188m). It featured arabesque patterns, sections of marquetry, crests, leaves, and perhaps some inscriptions of the Lord's Prayer, for the entry in the Works accounts states that some of the panels were "wrought with leaves and paternosters of fyne goulde and silver."²⁵¹ Importantly, this indicates that having sections of Christian prayer painted in a highly ornate manner, and in a relatively accessible room, was considered appropriate in a Protestant palace.

When Anna was granted the palace, it must have been relatively satisfactory, and in comparison to Denmark House and Greenwich, the Works accounts show that expenditure at Oatlands throughout Anna's occupancy was considerably smaller. The annual spend between 1611 and 1619 was only around £100.²⁵² The major exception to this is the period

²⁴⁸ On Henry's building programme at Oatlands see *ibid.*, 206-209.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 209, 212.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 212.

²⁵¹ Quoted in *ibid.*, 213, citing TNA: PRO, E351/3233.

²⁵² TNA: PRO, E351/3246; TNA: PRO, E351/3247; TNA: PRO, E351/3248; TNA: PRO, E351/3249; TNA: PRO, E351/3250.

of 1617-18, which saw the disbursement of £1,159.2s.8d. – significantly more than was outlaid at either Denmark House or Greenwich that year.²⁵³ The chief expense seems to have been a new bake-house, while Anna’s wardrobe was fitted with joists and a new floor, and six chimneys in her privy lodgings were taken down and rebuilt in black and white marble.²⁵⁴ Anna’s main focus at Oatlands, however, was on the gardens, and much of this work was paid out of her Privy Purse, providing solid examples of her patronage. The timing of Anna’s increased agency at Oatlands is significant, for it coincides with her commission of the Queen’s House at Greenwich, which, as noted, was similarly financed through her Privy Purse. Indeed, Jones’s account for his work on the Queen’s House also includes the work that he carried out at Oatlands in 1617 (discussed below), clearly highlighting the close relationship between the two ventures.

As mentioned above, it was expected that James would cover all building work, and it is uncertain why Anna chose to use her Privy Purse allocation. It is plausible that economic hardship was the cause and perhaps since they were lesser residences James did not consider the work a priority. This does not seem to be the case, however, for the crown had been experiencing financial difficulties throughout the 1610s and the Pipe Office accounts for the period from 1 October 1615 through to 30 September 1616 is documented at £11,619.14s.2d., which does not indicate that any strictures had been implemented.²⁵⁵ Expenditure at Greenwich was second only to Newmarket that year, with £1,328.19s.6d., being disbursed, the majority of which was for “the Quenes new buylding,” which appears

²⁵³ TNA: PRO, E351/3252. The previous year is also of note, for expenditure reached £476.2s.1d., see TNA: PRO, E351/3251.

²⁵⁴ TNA: PRO, E351/3252.

²⁵⁵ TNA: PRO, E351/3250. It was slightly down from the year before though, when total expenditure reached £15,258, see TNA: PRO, E351/3249.

to have abutted Anna's lodgings, being two-storeys in height and extending into the garden on the south side with a three-arched terrace.²⁵⁶ It would seem plausible, therefore, that Anna's decision to use her personal income for the Queen's House at Greenwich and the classicising gates at Oatlands was a consequence of her desire to exert greater control over her building projects. Interestingly, when Henrietta Maria resumed building work on the Queen's House in 1630, she too, paid for it through her Privy Purse.²⁵⁷ This perhaps indicates that the lodge was considered to be the queen's exclusive project and therefore under her financial and directorial jurisdiction. In any case, Anna's use of her Privy Purse suggests that the projects at Greenwich and Oatlands were of high personal value and it also points to her cultural agency increasing in her later years when she focussed on palaces south of London. Oatlands in particular, as mentioned, was situated at a significant remove from the centre of London, and this distance may have gone some way to sanctioning Anna's agency and patronage.

Between 10 August 1616 and 30 September 1618, Sir John Trevor, the Keeper of Oatlands, was engaged in building work, and was paid for

makeinge of a newe brickwall to compasse and enclose her Ma:^{ts} vineyarde at Otelandes and the longe privy walke adioyninge to the same, as in levellinge the grene about the vineyarde, being trenched very deepe to kill the fferne rootes, and in makeinge another brickwall about the newe garden there, and likewyse for making a Silkwormehouse.²⁵⁸

The vineyard was laid out to the south of the privy gardens. I am unaware of any other Jacobean palaces with vineyards, and this unusual venture may have been related to Anna's interest in Italian culture. The wall that Trevor built to surround it was just over three

²⁵⁶ Ibid; Colvin, *King's Works*, 113-14.

²⁵⁷ Colvin, *ibid.*, 119.

²⁵⁸ TNA: PRO, AO1/2485/344, fol.1r.

metres high and stretched for more than 213 metres.²⁵⁹ There were two gates in the wall, which were supplied by Inigo Jones, who was also paid from the queen's Privy Purse. These were built over the course of June and July 1617, with Jones receiving £135.13s.10d. for his charges in "taking downe the olde bricke gate, which was made in winter 1616 before the ende of her Mats gallery, mureing [building] vpp the walles there, and making two other gates, as also in making the greate gate there."²⁶⁰ At 3.65 metres high, Jones's great gate rose just above the wall and featured "doricke columnes cutt rusticke with a frontispice [pediment] and a square table of marble sett over the same."²⁶¹ As Harris and Higgott have made clear, Jones's rusticated entrance took inspiration from the Italian architects Palladio and Sebastiano Serlio (1475-1554), whose work he had seen in Italy.²⁶² Jones's designs for the gate are extant (figures 3.21, 3.22), and it also features in the background of Anna's hunting portrait by Van Somer, which hung in the South Gallery at Oatlands (figure 1.50).²⁶³ Importantly, Jones's great gate serves to unify Anna's two properties of Greenwich and Oatlands, for like the Queen's House discussed above, it continues in the same classicising vein, underscoring Anna's interest in Italianate architecture. Indeed, the reverse side of the gate, which would have faced the vineyard, features the same rough-cut treatment of stone that Jones proposed for the walls of the Queen's House (figures 3.19, 3.20).²⁶⁴

Following Anna's death on 2 March 1619, Oatlands seems to have been initially used by James. The king does not appear to have been concerned with any of Anna's other

²⁵⁹ Colvin, *King's Works*, 213.

²⁶⁰ TNA: PRO, E351/3389.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, and noted by Colvin, *King's Works*, 214.

²⁶² Harris and Higgott, *Inigo Jones*, 76, cat. no.17.

²⁶³ TNA: PRO, E351/3389.

²⁶⁴ Harris and Higgott, *Inigo Jones*, 78.

residences, and his interest in Oatlands is likely to have been due to its close proximity to his favoured palace of Hampton Court. The Works accounts for 1619-20 record a quantity of repairs being made “against his Ma:^{ts} comeing thether,” and mention is first made of work being done to ready “the Lorde Marques of Buckingham his lodginge.”²⁶⁵ That same year, De Critz was paid for painting two large wall dials at the entrance to the house and in the inner court. The former had a diameter of 24 feet (7.3m), and featured James’s crowned letters. The dial in the inner court also sported James’s cipher, but it was more elaborate with “the Seven planetts and twelve Signes” of the Zodiac, together with “the fower quarters of the yeare, with shippes hilles dales.”²⁶⁶ With the death of his wife, James had repossessed Oatlands Palace and branded it as his own.

Lineage, Learning, and Piety in the Interior

During her possession of Oatlands, Anna was evidently pleased with the new vineyard and Jones’s great gate that she had commissioned, for she chose to commemorate them in her hunting portrait by Van Somer, which hung in the South Gallery at Oatlands next to the vineyard (figure 3.23).²⁶⁷ As Knowles has rightly pointed out, the painted inclusion of the vineyard in the portrait would therefore have created a *trompe l’oeil* effect in conjunction with the actual vineyard that was visible beyond the window.²⁶⁸ Like Denmark House, Oatlands had two galleries – the North and the South - although there were significantly fewer paintings. As Griffey notes, the placement of paintings at Oatlands seems to have largely followed tradition, although there was a distinct element of variety since no single

²⁶⁵ TNA: PRO, E351/3253.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

²⁶⁷ ESRO Glynde MS 317, fol.4r.

²⁶⁸ Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 31.

room was limited to one specific painting genre.²⁶⁹ Both galleries featured the expected collection of dynastic portraits, but the South Gallery had a significantly higher concentration with 15, while the North Gallery only had four.²⁷⁰ In addition, a portrait of Anna's "deceased brother" was kept in her cabinet.²⁷¹

Notably, there were five portraits of members of Anna's natal family at Oatlands, as well as portraits of her favourite maids, Mary Middlemore and Jane Drummond, but there was not one image of her husband or any of her children.²⁷² A similar paucity of Stuart portraits is apparent at Denmark House, which had one of the king, but again none of her children. Of the eight portraits recorded at Greenwich, there was a portrait of Prince Charles, but images of Anna's natal family were present in greater numbers with portraits of her maternal grandfather, Ulrik, Duke of Mecklenburg (1527-1603), her brother-in-law Christian II, Elector of Saxony (1591-1611), and her niece Sophia Hedwig of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Countess of Nassau-Dietz (1592-1642).²⁷³ Although this may seem surprising, it is perhaps another case of Anna identifying first and foremost as a daughter of Denmark. Furthermore, rather than members of her immediate family, it would have been her maids Anna was close to, for they played a key and intimate role in the queen's private and everyday life. In addition, Anna was evidently fond of her Jester Tom Derry (figure 3.24), and her Receiver-General and Vice-Chamberlain Carew, for their portraits hung in the North Gallery at Oatlands, as well as

²⁶⁹ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

²⁷⁰ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fols.7r, 8r, 9r.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, fol.8r. By the time of the drawing up of the inventory, Anna had only one deceased brother: Hans, Prince of Schleswig-Holstein (b.1583), who died on 28 October 1602.

²⁷² Both women had been part of Anna's Household since 1603, with Mary Middlemore as a maid of honour and Jane Drummond as a Lady of the Privy Chamber, see TNA: PRO, LR6/154/9.

²⁷³ Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners*, 163-64. Aside from a group portrait of English Lords, the rest of the portraits were of members of the international courtly elite. The portrait of Sophia Hedwig remains in the Royal Collection in London, RCIN #406168.

at Denmark House.²⁷⁴ Unlike Anna's London residence of Denmark House, however, Oatlands was characterised by a greater variety of display and by the presence of highly personal images in the main galleries, which would have been more appropriate as it was a lesser residence.

As well as portraits, both galleries at Oatlands were hung with a number of religious pieces, although the North Gallery had twice the number of the South Gallery. An additional six religious paintings were found in Anna's cabinet. In the same manner as the paintings at Denmark House, however, these images were specifically chosen for their generalised piety, and would not have been taken as evidence of the queen's apparent Catholicism.²⁷⁵ The North Gallery also had five mythological works, one battle painting, and a genre scene that hung by the stairs.²⁷⁶ While this might seem as though the South Gallery was the more formal of the two, it should be remembered that the above-mentioned portraits of Anna's maids were hung here, together with two paintings of buffoons, or jesters. Probably

²⁷⁴ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.9r; Payne, "Inventory," 38, fol.21v; 39, fol.24v. Anna's two favoured artists, Gheeraerts and Van Somer, both painted portraits of Derry, raising the possibility that they were commissioned by the queen. Both portraits were later inventoried in the Commonwealth Sale in 1649, and Gheeraerts's portrait from 1614 is thought to be that currently in the collection of the National Galleries of Scotland (PG 1111) (figure 3.24). Derry's portrait inventoried at Denmark House may have been by Van Somer. On the two portraits of Derry, see Hearn, ed., *Dynasties*, 194, cat. no.31.

²⁷⁵ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.8r. As mentioned above, this was where Anna's *Madonna Lactans* was displayed. The other paintings were three works featuring Christ and two Old Testament subjects. The lobby of the cabinet was hung with a painting of Christ raising Lazarus. In an undated inventory of Oatlands, these works are listed as being in the "Oratory" together with a number of religious paintings that were formerly in the galleries. It is likely, as Griffey conjectures, that this list was drawn up when Anna was seriously unwell and the paintings either sent to the queen at Hampton Court, or relocated to Denmark House. See ESRO Glynde MS 321 and Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

²⁷⁶ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fols.8r, 9r. The mythological paintings were of Lucretia; Hercules, Theseus and Proserpina; Jupiter and other gods at a feast; Venus and Adonis; and Diana and "her maides viewing their quarry of red deere, hares Conyes etc.," which, as mentioned in Chapter One, has been identified as the painting by Rubens and Synders remaining in the Royal Collection, London (figure 1.63).

favoured for its illusionistic conceit, one of the jester paintings was by a sixteenth-century Flemish artist and originally belonged to Prince Henry (figure 3.25).²⁷⁷

It was also in the North Gallery that Anna chose to display Hugo van der Goes's (c.1430-1482) famed *Trinity Altarpiece*, which is now in the Scottish National Gallery in Edinburgh (figure 3.26). The altarpiece first appears in the Oatlands inventory of 7 October 1617, where it is described as "Two large leaves of one fine picture to bee folded, but now unioynted, & of y^e Coronacon of a king & Queene of Scotland, unhangd."²⁷⁸ Anna must have acquired it sometime after October 1616, since it does not appear in the previous inventory that was taken of the palace that month. Painted in 1478, the triptych is believed to have been commissioned by Edward Bonkil, Provost of Trinity College (*fl.*1461-1488) for the Collegiate Church of the Holy Trinity at Edinburgh.²⁷⁹ As Thompson and Campbell logically suggest, the triptych was likely secured by James I during his Scottish progress in 1617, either on behalf of Anna, or as a gift to his wife.²⁸⁰ It may be that Anna was looking to add to her collection of Flemish paintings, for she already owned the above-mentioned jester painting, in addition to two works considered by J. Steegman to be in the style of one of the Franckens that were described in the inventory of Oatlands in 1616 as "A picture of o^r Savior & y^e woman of Samaria at y^e well" and "A picture wth o^r Savior healing y^e woman y^t had y^e bloody issue."²⁸¹ Moreover, Anna also owned an important early sixteenth-century

²⁷⁷ Campbell, *Early Flemish Pictures*, 131, cat. no.83; Wilks, "Art Collecting," 42.

²⁷⁸ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.9r.

²⁷⁹ Colin Thompson and Lorne Campbell, *Hugo Van Der Goes and the Trinity Panels in Edinburgh* (Edinburgh: Trustees of the National Galleries of Scotland, 1974), 17, 37-38.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 17. As noted in Chapter One, James arrived in Scotland on 13 May 1617; he left on 4 August, and arrived back in London on 15 September 1617, see Nichols, *Progresses*, vol. 3, 300, 390, 436.

²⁸¹ ESRO Glynde MS 315, fol.3r. Both paintings were still in her collection by December 1618 (ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.8r), by which time she had acquired another painting of Christ and the Woman of Samaria, one of which accompanied her to Hampton Court during her last illness. Following Anna's death they entered the collection of Charles, who gifted them to Mary Feilding, Marchioness of Hamilton (c.1612-1638) in 1637. Both

version of Marinus van Reymerswaele's (c.1490/95-c.1567), *The Moneylenders*, which was displayed in the Great Gallery at Denmark House, and is currently in the Royal Collection (figure 3.27).²⁸² The inventory lists a further five paintings in the Great Gallery with Dutch origins identified in their titles, such as "a picture of a Dutch Citchin" and "a Dutch picture of bread Cheese and Bacon."²⁸³ Interestingly then, Anna's preference for Italianate styles of garden design and architecture did not carry through to her collection of paintings, which shows an inclination for northern European works. In this, she may have been influenced by the tastes of her brother Christian whose own collection was coloured by a significant number of works by Dutch and Flemish artists including Dirck Barendz (1534-1592), Bartholomeus van Bassen (1590-1652), Jacob van Doort (d.1629), Cornelis Norbertus Gysbrechts (c.1630-1683), Gerrit van Honthorst (1590-1656), Isaac Isaacsz (1599-1665), Karel van Mander (1548-1606), and Adam Willaerts (1577-1664).²⁸⁴

Aside from artistic merit, the Trinity panels would have been personally resonant to the Stuarts, for the donor portraits feature the only other Danish-Scots marriage alliance: James's great-great-great grandfather, King James III of Scotland (1451-1488), and his wife Margaret of Denmark (1456-1486), who was Anna's great-great aunt. The importance of the piece did not go unnoticed. After Anna's "remooove" from Oatlands due to ill health on 7 October 1617, Charles seems to have gained possession of the altarpiece, choosing to gift it

works are currently in the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts. On the provenance and authorship of the two paintings see J. Steegman, "Two Unpublished Paintings from the Collection of Charles I," *BM XCIX* (1957). The presence of these two works at Oatlands has also been noted by Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 54; Wilks, "Art Collecting," 42.

²⁸² It is listed in the inventory as "A picture of two Jewes userers [sic.]," see Payne, "Inventory," 38, fol.22r; On provenance and iconography see Campbell, *Early Flemish Pictures*, 114.

²⁸³ Payne, "Inventory," 38, fol.22r.

²⁸⁴ On Christian's collection see Heiberg, *Christian IV*, 73-119.

to his favourite, Buckingham.²⁸⁵ A later notation on the 1617 inventory of Oatlands, written on 8 March 1618, reads “Sent for to the prynce by the Lo: Cary [Sir Robert Carey] chamberlain was theare geaven since to the Duke of Buckingham.”²⁸⁶ Anna’s hunting portrait by Van Somer was similarly sent to Charles at this time, highlighting the significance of the painting. Further corroboration of Anna’s declining health is found in the cessation of work at the Queen’s House on 30 April 1618. It is unknown whether Anna had requested the altarpiece, or James thought it would make a suitable present, but either way, Anna’s possession of the Netherlandish masterpiece should not be discounted and, together with the other paintings she amassed, points to a queen who was actively engaged in the contents and display of her collection, and was conversant with the power of images. For despite the paucity of evidence relating to Anna’s attainment of paintings, her personal tastes, and preferences must have shaped the nature of the works at her palaces and, at the very least, she would have been involved in the commission or acquisition of portraits of her maids, members of her family, and her courtly network.

The lack of documentary evidence connected to Anna’s collection has also been noted by Wilks, who chooses to discount almost all evidence of Anna’s agency, and derisively concludes it is most likely that she “appropriated much of Henry’s collection,” which was “insufficient for her needs, and acted as a stimulus for her to collect more,” for she needed a collection “that could absorb and comfort her.”²⁸⁷ However, in the absence of fact, it is

²⁸⁵ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.9r.

²⁸⁶ It is uncertain whether the altarpiece was ever given to Buckingham, and if it was, it was only for a brief time. By 1624, it was in Charles’s possession when it is recorded in a list of the Prince’s paintings at Oatlands. By the time of the Commonwealth Sale it was at Hampton Court, see Thompson and Campbell, *Hugo Van Der Goes and the Trinity Panels*, 17; Campbell, *Early Flemish Pictures*, 43.

²⁸⁷ Wilks, “Art Collecting,” 42.

impossible to substantiate Wilks's claim that Anna's collection was largely made up of works that had belonged to her eldest son. As Wilks concedes, Henry's collection was never catalogued, which makes it exceedingly difficult to trace any of the paintings that originally belonged to him. Furthermore, the works belonging to Anna and inventoried at Denmark House in 1619, and at Oatlands in 1616 and 1617, are without attributions, acquisition dates, or information pertaining to provenance.²⁸⁸ Without further facts, Anna's method/s of acquisition remains unknown, as does the identity of many of the artists and any previous owners. We should also remember that while the portraits Anna owned may have been a source of "comfort" for the queen, as Wilks suggests, more importantly, they showcased her dynastic prestige and her membership of a powerful faction that was not shared with James.

Much of the visual imagery at Oatlands specifically pertained to the natal lineage, court faction, and devotional faith of the resident queen. Anna's determination to mark Oatlands as part of her domain extended to the furnishing textiles as well. Like Denmark House, Anna's cipher, motto, and coat-of-arms appears on a quantity of hangings and carpets.²⁸⁹ Interestingly, Oatlands initially contained a quantity of items belonging to Henry VIII, which were later removed from the palace, possibly at the queen's behest. These included a crimson velvet Cloth of State with portcullises in loops of gold, and a border featuring "esses" (SS) and roses, together with crimson silk cushions that were embroidered with gold lions and dragons. They remained in the crown hands, for they are listed in the

²⁸⁸ Ibid.

²⁸⁹ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fols.1r, 3r, 4r

Commonwealth Inventory of 1649.²⁹⁰ It is possible that Anna wanted to brand the palace with her own letters and badges, or equally, that the furnishings – particularly Henry’s Cloth of State – was required at a more important residence. Either way, without the Tudor goods, the inventories show that Anna crafted a highly personal and suitably magnificent setting at Oatlands. It is important to remember too, that Anna chose to hang a large number of portraits of people who were connected to her through blood, marriage, faction, or household appointment, which highlights her close involvement in the politics of display.

Displayed in relatively accessible rooms of the palace, these connections and allegiances would have been seen and understood by visitors to Oatlands. Although first-hand accounts of the impression of these portrait displays is not available, Oatlands was used by Anna for formal receptions and guests would have included ambassadors, courtiers, and international and local figures of rank and title. These guests would have been escorted to the State Apartments along a suitable route that likely included the galleries or would have been met in the gallery itself. The strictly regulated means of access are described in detail by John Finet (1570/71-1641), Master of Ceremonies, under both James and Charles. Finet’s notebooks reveal the obsession of foreign ambassadors with precedence, which was visibly articulated through the passage taken to the event, the type of seat provided, the position in the room relative to others, and proximity to the royal person with touching or kissing being seen as a sign of favour. Ambassadors were regularly concerned to know whether the “Solemnitie” or event was “for publicke, or for private,” referring to whether it would be

²⁹⁰ ESRO Glynde MS 314, fols.1r, 2r; the inventory is undated, but it must have been from Anna’s time, for a set of bed hangings is accompanied by a note in the margin “geven away by Queene Anne 1618,” ESRO Glynde MS 314, fol.3r. For the presence of these furnishings in the inventory of Henry’s goods in 1547 and the Commonwealth Sale in 1649, see King, “Textile Furnshings,” 315, 317.

seen by others at court or not.²⁹¹ While audiences were usually held in the State Apartments, Anna met with ambassadors in other rooms of her palaces, and in January 1616, for example, the Venetian ambassador Foscarini recounts being received by Anna “in the gallery at Greenwich.”²⁹²

The aspects documented by Finet are palpably apparent in the lengthy description by the Italian priest Horatio Busino of the Venetian ambassador extraordinary, Pietro Contarini’s “audience of the queen” at Oatlands in September 1618. Contarini was presumably provided with an account of the expected proceedings, for Busino notes that “it would have been exceedingly grand and pompous by the instructions given, but on the appointed day a provoking rain fell incessantly.” Nevertheless, by paying attention to issues of rank and precedence - listing the people present, noting their order, and their manner of seating – Busino is able to conclude that the occasion was “most stately and grave.” He further notes how “the arrival at the palace of the chief ladies of title,” together with “some of the principal noblemen,” provided an element of “greater display,” and is pleased to report that Contarini “was led by the Lord Chamberlain into the presence chamber and was graciously received by her Majesty, who gave him her hand. After he had kissed it respectfully her Majesty gave him her arm, a singular favour.” Unfortunately, these detailed records rarely contain information about the furnishings. Interested in modes of entry, Busino records that Anna “withdrew to her own apartments from one end of the presence chamber, whilst from

²⁹¹ John Finet, *Finetti Philoxenis: some choice observations of Sr. John Finett knight, and master of the ceremonies to the two last Kings touching the reception, and precedence, the treatment and audience, the puntillios and contests of forren ambassadors in England* (London: Printed by T.R. for H. Twyford and G. Bedell, 1656), 12. Questions about “public” and “private” are also found in *ibid.*, 13, 19-20, 200. For a discussion of the politics of court space and the value of access, with reference to Finet, see Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

²⁹² CSPV, vol.14, 96, no.139: to the Doge and Senate.

the other they led his Excellency [Contarini] to dinner.” Of the dinner itself, Busino happily remembers that “the table was distributed beautifully and profusely... indeed it would compare as a whole with the most famous banquets of Italy or elsewhere,” but of the decoration of the room, or any others, he is regrettably quiet.²⁹³

Visual and Imported Splendour

Although visitors to Oatlands have not left records of their impressions, a sense of the interior can be reconstructed from surviving inventories. Just like the inventory of Denmark House drawn up in 1619, the inventories of Oatlands dating to 1616/17 are replete with textiles including Cloths of State, canopies, screen cloths, suites of hangings, carpets, cushions, and sets of furniture with matching upholstery. A large quantity of fine and exotic carpets were spread throughout the palace, being described as “a new Turkey Carpet” or being of “Turkey worke,” or “fayre embrothered... China worke,” or “lyned wth Changeable Chyna silke,” while two exceptionally long “Persia” carpets were displayed in the South Gallery, extending to 25 feet (7.8m) and 18 feet (5.5m) respectively.²⁹⁴ As mentioned in Chapter Two, Anna’s passion for textiles was apparently well known and such items were deemed to make suitable gifts. Two elaborately embroidered carpets in the North Gallery, for example, were presents from Edward Somerset, Earl of Worcester.²⁹⁵ Further, on 24 December 1611, Cecil bought a costly suite of richly embroidered, green velvet hangings for £1094.10s., which he gifted to the queen.²⁹⁶ It may well be this set that is listed in the

²⁹³ *CPSV*, vol.15, 314-15, no.535: 14 September 1618: Busino to the Signori Giorgio, Francesco and Zaccaria Contarini.

²⁹⁴ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fols.1r, 2r.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, fol.2r.

²⁹⁶ G. Dyfnallt Owen, ed. *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury*, vol. XXIV, Historical Manuscripts Commission (London: HMSO, 1976), 201.

inventory of Oatlands Palace of 1617, hanging in the Outer Withdrawing Chamber and described as a

Suite of greene velvet... wrought into cut flowers betwixt a waved worke, y^e frames painted on a greene ground wth flowers of gold, laced wth a gold spangled lace, fringed wth gold fring above & belowe wth greene silk & gold, & embrothered wth y^e Queenes Letters & Crownes.²⁹⁷

As well as sumptuous textiles, much of the furniture at Oatlands was costly, made from fine or foreign materials, and furniture of state that was appropriately upholstered in rich fabrics. Anna owned five tables and one cupboard of “wainscot,” which as Simon Jarvis comments, referred to imported oak that was usually of an extremely fine quality, and was often gilded. Anna also possessed a folding table of “Spotted Virginia wood” that was not commonly imported until the 1630s.²⁹⁸ Additionally, there were two “Chyna” tables, one of which was gilded, and a “folding skreene of China Worke,” which were either imported from China or made in a “Chinese” style.²⁹⁹ Evidently, the interior of Oatlands was decorated to impress, for it was outfitted with an appropriate level of magnificence and was stamped with Anna’s identifying badges. For example, Anna’s Bedchamber was equipped with a set of satin hangings bearing “her Mats letters & Crowne in one pane, & her Mats Motta in ye other,” while a crimson velvet carpet was described as being “embrothered wth her mate letters & crown in silver.”³⁰⁰ In addition, the upholstered furniture in the South Gallery was embroidered with “her maty Ltrs & crowne silver.”³⁰¹ Importantly though, it also contained numerous pieces of high-quality and uncommon imported goods that pointed to Anna’s

²⁹⁷ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.3r. The hangings are also listed in the inventory of Oatlands of 1616, see ESRO Glynde MS 315, fol.4r.

²⁹⁸ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fols.6r, 7r; “Furniture in the Commonwealth,” 281, 287.

²⁹⁹ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fols.6r, 9r.

³⁰⁰ ESRO Glyne MS 320, fol.1r.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*, fol.4r.

personal tastes, her connections, and her prowess in the knowledge of rare and foreign countries and their fashions.

The Intellectual Queen Consort

In addition to paintings, textiles, and furniture, Anna had a robust interest in books, and while some were present in the inventory of Denmark House of 1619 discussed above, it is at Oatlands that evidence of the queen as an avid reader and learner comes to light.

Oatlands contained a Book Chamber or Library with at least 80 books.³⁰² The room was equipped for guests with one high chair, two high stools, two low stools, and a foot stool, plus four long cushions and one square cushion. The entire suite was upholstered in silver camlet that was patterned all over with green flowers and fringed with green and silver silk.³⁰³ Further comfort and luxury was found in the provision of three carpets, and the library also had three tables, one of which was specially designed with degrees or recesses to hold books.³⁰⁴ The display and possible protection of special books seems to have been a concern of the queen, for she paid her jeweller Heriot to make and gild four glass cases to hold “two great books.”³⁰⁵

³⁰² ESRO Glynde MS 314, fol.4r. Also noted by Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 27. Unfortunately, the books are not itemised, but the existence of a library in itself is not unusual. As noted in Chapter One, Elizabeth was exceptionally learned and she, together with her sister Mary I, had libraries. Elizabeth frequently received manuscripts and books as New Year’s Gifts, which underscores her interest in the written word, see Jane Lawson, “This Remembrance of the New Year: Books Given to Queen Elizabeth as New Year’s Gifts,” in *Elizabeth I and the Culture of Writing*, eds. Peter Beal and Grace Ioppolo (London: British Library, 2007). For the contents of Mary and Elizabeth’s libraries, and those of their books that are extant, see T. A. Birrell, *English Monarchs and their Books: from Henry VII to Charles II* (London: British Library, 1987), 21-26. It should also be remembered that James had an extensive library and has been credited as the first English monarch “systematically to keep printed dossiers on subjects that interested him,” and he owned a large quantity of books on subjects as diverse as fresh fruit, hunting, the German empire, theology, tobacco, and witchcraft, see *ibid.*, 26-30.

³⁰³ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.4r.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, fols.2r, 7r.

³⁰⁵ TNA: PRO, LR2/122, fol.22r.

While the inventories of Oatlands do not provide any details as to the types of books that Anna owned, supplementary information can be found in the queen's household accounts. The documents indicate that Anna regularly purchased books from Florio, her Italian tutor and Groom of the Chamber. In 1605, Florio received £6.14s. from the queen's Privy Purse for supplying Anna with a copy of the Italian *Histories* by the writer Matteo Bandello (c.1480-1562), two dictionaries, two dialogues in Italian and English, as well as writing material consisting of a gilt paper book, pens, ink, and pin-dust.³⁰⁶ On 22 February 1607, Florio was paid for an "Italian Bible for her Maiestie," which was presumably very sumptuous, for it cost the large sum of £4, while the other book in the account – "a copy of "Plutarches lives in english" - cost only 20 shillings. The following month, on 21 March, Florio received 100 shillings "for Plutarches lives in frenche in large folio" and a copy of his "a world of wonders in English," which was dedicated to the queen.³⁰⁷ The accounts also show, as Knowles comments, that Anna was an enthusiastic supporter of writers and poets, frequently disbursing money for books that were presented to her, written for her, or dedicated to her.³⁰⁸ These purchases and payments provide further evidence of Anna's interest in the Italianate, for she bought works from the Italian poet Balthasar Nardi, and while his pieces are not itemised, they must have been considerable, or highly elaborate, for he received £30 in November 1615.³⁰⁹ In addition, as mentioned above, Florio dedicated his Italian-English dictionary of 1611 to the queen, appropriately titling it *Anna's New World of Words*.³¹⁰ As I outlined in Chapter One, Anna's predilection for the Italianate extended to

³⁰⁶ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646.

³⁰⁷ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648.

³⁰⁸ See for example, TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1646; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1650; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1655, and Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 27.

³⁰⁹ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1650, see also Knowles, *ibid*.

³¹⁰ Knowles, *ibid*; Franklin. B. Williams Jr., *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1962), STC 11099.

her patronage of the theatre as she repeatedly favoured playwrights such as Campion and Daniel who were known for their interest in Italian literature, and the former in particular was influenced by the Florentine *intermedi*.³¹¹ In this context, it is worth noting that Anna owned a table “of Italian verses wth a Crimsone Curtaine Spotted wth her Ma:^{tyes} armes & letters wth the Crowne,” which was listed as being “made by S^r ffrancis Castilian” and displayed in the South Gallery.³¹²

As well as securing books for her own use and satisfaction, Anna bought books for her children, paying Florio £4.16s. by a warrant dated 21 January 1607, for “divers Italian Books,” which were intended for Princess Elizabeth, and later, a further 20 shillings “for other bookes sent to the Lady Elizabeth.”³¹³ Notably, the queen also left Charles 36 books that were sumptuously bound in crimson, purple, or green velvet, which he later kept in his cabinet at Whitehall.³¹⁴ As Anna’s household accounts and the inventories of Denmark House and Oatlands Palace evidence, the English queen consort was learned, multi-lingual, and culturally sophisticated. Anna obviously owned books that she valued highly, for she paid for a quantity of them to be carried between Greenwich, Denmark House, and Whitehall, as she moved between the residences.³¹⁵ For her last journey, however, it was not books that Anna requested but paintings. After suffering a prolonged period of ill health, Anna moved from Oatlands to Hampton Court in December 1618. Anna’s move was presumably motivated by issues of comfort and care. As one of James’s most frequented

³¹¹ Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 35; Pitcher, *Hymen’s Triumph*, v-ix.

³¹² ESRO Glynde MS 315, fol.3r; ESRO Glynde MS 319, fol.8r. Jervis notes that “table” in this context would have been similar to a notice-board. This piece remained at Oatlands throughout the Caroline period and is recorded in the Commonwealth Inventory, Jervis, “Furniture in the Commonwealth,” 289. I have been unable to trace the identity of Sir Francis Castilian.

³¹³ TNA: PRO, SC6/JAS/1648.

³¹⁴ Millar, “Abraham Van Der Doort’s Catalogue,” 124, nos.19-36.

³¹⁵ Knowles, “Anna of Denmark,” 27.

palaces, it must have been furnished, staffed, and equipped to a sufficiently high standard. There is also the possibility that Anna moved in order to be closer to James. Although the king stayed at Whitehall during Anna's final illness, he did visit her with Chamberlain reporting on 2 January 1619, that "on the Wensday following [26 December 1618] [James] went to visit the Quene at Hampton Court, whither he went again on Monday [31 December 1618] the last of our Christmas Holy-dayes."³¹⁶ Moving to Hampton Court would have greatly improved James's access to the queen, for the palace was much easier and faster to reach from Whitehall than Oatlands was.

Accompanying Anna from Oatlands to Hampton Court were six paintings depicting Christ, which were hung "in her gallery."³¹⁷ Griffey asserts that the suite of paintings would have provided devotional solace, serving as "an exemplar for a noble, Christian death."³¹⁸ Indeed, Anna dutifully looked upon the paintings, as a report by one of Anna's attendants to a French woman states that the queen came "to hir gallerie everie day allmost, yit still wayk [weak] of hir leggs that scho [she] could not stand wpone them."³¹⁹ As discussed in this thesis, the nature of Anna's confessional identity generated a large amount of speculation and suspicion during her lifetime, and similarly accompanied her in death. It was widely reported that she died an honourable Protestant death, for the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London "kneiled at hir bed syde... and thairefter said a prayer, and word

³¹⁶ McClure, *Chamberlain*, vol. 2, 196, no.311.

³¹⁷ ESRO Glynde MS 320, fol.12r.

³¹⁸ Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming.

³¹⁹ *Account of the Last Moments of Anne of Denmark*, vol. 1, Abbotsford Club Miscellany (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837), 5; also cited by Wood, "Portraits of Anne of Denmark," 54. The letter is dated from Denmark House, 27 March 1619. The author is an unknown Scots, but she provides a very detailed breakdown of Anna's last days, indicating that she must have been at Hampton Court, and then at Denmark House during the queen's lying-in-state. I suggest that the recipient is a French woman, for the letter speaks of "your contrie man, Pira", who must be Piero Hugon, French Groom of the Bedchamber mentioned above.

by word scho [she] follows them” until 2 March 1619, when “hir hart, hir eyes, hir face, was fixed upon God.”³²⁰ This testimony has, however, been doubted by Lewalski, Meikle and Payne, who suggest that the account was “probably fictionalised” to ensure that the queen was reported to have died “a good Protestant death.”³²¹ Indeed, this would have been crucial to maintaining her reputation and that of the monarchy as the figurehead of the only true faith – the Church of England – but there is no positive evidence to doubt the sincerity of the testimony. As I argue in the preceding chapters, the evidence for Anna’s Catholicism is circumstantial and problematic, and it should be treated with caution. Furthermore, I suggest that Anna did not convert to Catholicism for reasons of personal piety but sought to uphold a certain equivocacy about her confessional identity for distinct political gain.

Conclusion

During her time as English queen consort, Anna poured considerable resources into the enlargement, refurbishment, and beautification of her three principal residences: Denmark House, Greenwich Palace, and Oatlands Palace. While much of this was paid through the Exchequer, the Queen’s House at Greenwich and the gardening structures at Oatlands, both of which commenced in 1616, are significant as they were paid through Anna’s Privy Purse and therefore offer tangible examples of her architectural patronage. As I have argued, Anna’s decision to pour personal financial resources into these relatively late projects should be seen as examples of the priority she placed on building, and her heightened sense of autonomy from James. The distance of these residences from the administrative and

³²⁰ *Account of the Last Moments*, 5, 7.

³²¹ Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 27, 334, note 55; Meikle and Payne, “Lutheranism to Catholicism,” 68.

ceremonial centre of London may have gone some way to sanctioning Anna's architectural freedom.

The analyses in this chapter show that at all three of her palaces, Anna promoted policies, favourites, and aesthetics that were different from those of James's court. First and foremost, this is apparent in Anna's indefatigable interest in architecture and gardens, which was not shared by her husband, but was perhaps inspired by her childhood and the patronage model provided by her parents and her brother, Christian. Furthermore, she chose to have innovative structures built at all of her royal properties, and commissioned artisans such as De Caus and Jones, who were conversant with the style, fashion, and tradition of architecture and garden design that was common on the continent, but not yet present in England. Thus, the Parnassus at Denmark House, the Queen's House at Greenwich, and the stone gateways at Oatlands, were inspired by Tuscan precedents, while the formal gardens and orangery at Denmark House paid homage to French models, which had filtered through from Italy. These structures underscored Anna's cultural prowess, for they demonstrated her knowledge and understanding of foreign customs, and of their modes of construction and design. Moreover, they provide additional proof of Anna's fondness for the Italianate, while the Parnassus in particular raises the distinct possibility that Anna herself, and other members of the court, viewed the queen consort as a sophisticated patron and protector of knowledge and the arts.

In semi-public locations then, Anna announced her personal interests and social distinction through terraced gardens and building projects. Similarly, this continued in the more private interior spaces of her residences. Both Denmark House and Oatlands Palace were clearly

signposted as *her* properties, with a quantity of Danish family portraits and the frequent appearance of her arms, cipher, or motto, on textiles, articles of furniture, silverware, and Cloths of State. In addition, the contents of Anna's palaces signalled her tastes, intellect, and cultural accomplishments. She owned and displayed a number of unusual and expensive objects and pieces of furniture, such as Chinese porcelain with silver-gilt mounts, crystal boxes, elaborate clocks, wainscot tables, a jasper cabinet, and a folding table made from imported Virginia Oak. Anna further owned a significant quantity of books, which spanned at least three different languages and covered a diverse array of subjects from religious tracts to dictionaries to books on beauty practices, history, and geography.

The inventories of Denmark House and Oatlands palace show that Anna well understood the hierarchy of court space and the power and importance of display. Both residences were equipped with an appropriately splendid array of costly textiles and imported furniture. Following tradition, Anna dutifully hung the semi-public galleries with dynastic portraits and religious imagery to showcase her networks and provide a sense of her piety. Set at quite a distance from London, Oatlands was a less strategic palace than Denmark House and Greenwich, which seems to have granted Anna a greater sense of freedom, for the gallery at Oatlands was also home to portraits of her favourite jester, Tom Derry, and her maids, Mary Middlemore and Jane Drummond. It was here too, that Anna deemed it appropriate to display her powerful and ambitious hunting portrait by Van Somer (figure 1.60). In the restricted space of the Bedchamber and closet, Anna kept a portrait of her deceased brother, together with a host of religious images and a number of books and curiosities. While both palaces were equipped with a large quantity of religious paintings, none of these works could be seen as evidence of her suspected Catholicism. As I have

argued, Anna's collection of religious works, including a quantity of Marian imagery, and even a somewhat contentious Madonna Lactans, was entirely in keeping with the paintings owned by Protestant royals in England and on the continent. In addition to the absence of Catholic liturgical goods in her accounts and inventories, Anna's collection of religious imagery points to a queen of considerable political acumen, who strategically maintained a certain level of ambiguity about her faith for political benefit. While a select number of Catholic dignitaries and elite Scottish and English Catholics believed the queen to be a co-religionist, Anna does not appear to have owned any goods that could be seen as evidence of popery.

While the possession of specific types of goods announced her personal taste and ambitions, Anna's actions also reinforced her distance from James's court, and provide evidence of her sense of ownership over her properties. Importantly, Denmark House was unique among Anna's palaces as it was not fitted with rooms for the king. Equipped with only one set of state and privy apartments for the owner and resident – Anna of Denmark – the queen's London palace was clearly marked by a level of separation from the king. Further, if James's main 'London' palace was Hampton Court, as Barroll claims, then Denmark House was also at a significant geographical remove from James's court, lending further weight to Thurley's suggestion that the king rarely visited.³²² The notion of Anna presiding over a separate court at Denmark House to that of the king was clarified in the 1613 Christmas season. Following James's patronage of the Howard-Carr wedding at Whitehall, Anna hosted the Drummond-Roxburghe marriage celebrations at Denmark

³²² Thurley, *Somerset House*, 36; Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 38.

(Somerset) House. That she was successful in using her residence to demonstrate her distance from James's court can be measured by the fact that the palace was subsequently known as "the Queen's court." More importantly, in 1617, James officially changed the name of the palace, thereby formally and indelibly linking it to Anna, while paying homage to her natal lineage. As outlined above, however, it may have been a way for James to curry favour with Christian IV, following England's central role in brokering the Swedish-Russian peace of 1617 with favourable terms to Sweden - Denmark's historic rival.

Anna's strong sense of possession, and the significance of built environments to her personal identity, is similarly apparent in her actions concerning Greenwich Palace. Anna evidently felt entitled to preside over both the palace and its surrounding lands, for she was severely chagrined by the fact that her adversary, the Earl of Northampton, had established his country seat in the lodge at Greenwich Park. Furthermore, the earl continued to steadily add to his properties and offices in the borough, which led Anna to challenge him for the Keepership of the royal park in 1613. Although Anna was ultimately unsuccessful in this venture, her desire to oust Northampton, and take control of the park for herself, evidences her firm identification with her residence, her sense of entitlement, and her ambition to make her mark on both the palace and the borough. In 1617, Greenwich Palace was again made the focal point of Anna's political ambitions. As a member of the six-person ruling council that James had elected to preside over England during his Scottish progress, Anna was fortunate that it was comprised mostly of her allies, and she managed to have all council meetings at Greenwich. Accordingly, her palace of Greenwich was the physical site of English government and administration, which significantly heightened the prestige and dominance of the resident, Anna of Denmark. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter One,

Anna's sense of authority and power was spelt out during the performance of *Cupid's Banishment* in 1617, for Anna chose to occupy the position of key spectator – a position that was almost exclusively reserved for James.

The analyses in this chapter evince Anna's keen understanding of the cultural, dynastic, and intellectual cachet that could be conveyed through building and garden projects, and through the acquisition and display of objects, paintings, and articles of furniture. They indicate that Anna understood the power and magnificence attached to building and that, unlike James, she sought to be known as a patron of innovative architecture and garden structures. With the commission of the Queen's House in 1617, for example, Anna instigated the creation of the first classical building in the country, which would be brought to fruition in the 1630s for her successor, Henrietta Maria.

Anna took the occupancy of her jointure palaces seriously, territorially defending and decorating them in a manner that paid homage to her principles and aspirations. At Denmark House, Greenwich Palace, and Oatlands Palace, Anna created and maintained built environments that presented her as a woman of social and cultural distinction, learning, Danish descent, and a member of the Church of England. In her later years, Anna exercised greater autonomy and agency over her architectural projects, financing building work in the gardens at Oatlands and funding the Queen's House at Greenwich. This independence was likely sanctioned by the informal nature of the projects and the distance of Greenwich and Oatlands from the centre of London. Nevertheless, as Jones expressly reminds us, both cases offer clear evidence of Anna's patronage and her direct involvement in the

appearance, layout and function of her residences, for the Queen's House was "to be builded and finished by the Quene Ma: commaundement."³²³

³²³ TNA: PRO, AO1/2487/356, and cited above.

Conclusion

Focussing on Anna of Denmark's cultural interests and political aims, this thesis recognises the important role that she played in the highly politic world of the Jacobean court. It determines how Anna's political acumen enabled her to strike a delicate balance between supporting James and the monarchy, and promoting her own clients and agendas. For, throughout her time in England, Anna strove to distinguish herself aesthetically and factionally from her husband. She aligned herself with the rival courtly network, she patronised artists who were not in James's employ, and she funded building projects at her palaces of Greenwich and Oatlands from her Privy Purse. Furthermore, Anna pursued her interests in architecture and gardening design, which were not shared by James; she positioned herself as the successor to the potent iconographic legacy of Queen Elizabeth; and she marked her clothes, jewellery, interior furnishings, and visual and verbal persona with references to her natal Danish lineage.

Yet Anna was a woman of contradictions and inconsistencies. While she skilfully negotiated a level of freedom from James, she also fulfilled her traditional role as queen consort and remained answerable to the king in all things. Anna seems to have been genuinely respectful of James's decisions and policies, and she consistently worked for the success and strength of the Jacobean monarchy. This is clearly seen in her determination to maintain a certain equivocalcy about her faith for distinct political gain. For, rather than a merely personal matter that James tried to keep hidden, Anna's rumoured Catholic sympathies brought certain advantages for herself and her husband, especially in international politics. Anna's purported Catholicism was used to promote four significant political aims: firstly,

balancing the Kirk and the aristocratic Catholic faction in Scotland; secondly, James's political accession to the English throne; thirdly, brokering of the Anglo-Spanish peace in 1604, and lastly, the English bid for a Spanish match. To this should be added the political and cultural polycentrism of the Jacobean court. For, as I have stressed throughout this study, the early Stuart court was notable for its multiple centres of power. The king's court remained pivotal, but to this was added the important satellite courts of his wife and heir, as well as the houses of prominent courtiers and favourites. To some extent, each centre was able to support differences in policy, taste, and faction.¹

Contrary to the work of scholars including Jennifer Hallam, Karen Hearn, Barbara Lewalski, and Clare McManus, I do not accept that Anna sought to establish a rival court to the king's, or that her relationship with James deteriorated so that "the King and Queen ceased to cohabit in 1607," and by 1614, Anna was completely "estranged" from her husband.² While I emphasise, throughout this thesis, that Anna was successful in securing a level of independence, I have found no evidence to suggest that James interpreted her difference as a form of defiance, or a threat. It should be remembered that Anna's distance from James was largely contained to the cultural realm, and the pair remained united on the level of international politics. Furthermore, as I suggest in Chapter One, Anna's support of the rival faction at the Stuart Court may have been to James's distinct benefit: affording him reliable intelligence from both networks and allowing him to manage expectations and disappointments to keep the political peace. James certainly relied on Anna politically, for

¹ On the heterogeneous nature of the Jacobean court see Peck, "An Introduction" in *Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, 3-4; *Court Patronage and Corruption*, 68-74; Smuts, "Cultural Diversity," 104-105; *Court Culture*, 10, 65; Croft, "Robert Cecil," 135-38, 142-43.

² As quoted in Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 26; as quoted in Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts*, 35. See also Hallam, "Re-Presenting Women," 289-301; Hearn, *Dynasties*, 192, cat. no.130; McManus, "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court," 84-89.

not only did they work together using Anna's Catholic connections to execute confessionally problematic domestic and foreign policy, but in 1605 James ordered the Privy Council to meet at her residence during his absences, and he appointed her as one of a six-person council to govern England during his progress to Scotland in 1617.

A figure of cultural importance, political relevance, and confessional ambiguity, it is perhaps surprising that Anna has been so dismissively treated throughout history. Traditionally characterised as frivolous, vain, rash, and thoughtless, it was not until the ground-breaking publications by Leeds Barroll in the 1990s that Anna's role, interests, and cultural achievements began to be re-evaluated.³ His cultural biography of the queen, published in 2001, highlights the divergence of Anna's court from that of her husband, particularly in her support of playwrights and poets that were marginalised at the court of James. Barroll, however, places a disproportionate emphasis on the centrality of the court masque and makes little mention of other areas of Anna's cultural patronage. In particular, he opts to ignore "the buildings she inhabited" as "irrelevant" to the study of Anna's court, but in doing so, he overlooks a key aspect of the queen's cultural agency and visual identity.⁴ Lucy Wood's MA report from 1981 also deserves special mention as a piece of scholarly work that has assisted in rescuing Anna from the shadows of history. Wood's thesis is the only piece of work dedicated to cataloguing Anna's body of portraiture, and she was the first scholar to highlight the significant self-confident posturing that occurs in Anna's visual persona with the completion of the Woburn portrait. This research was never published, however, and is only known to a limited number of scholars.

³ Barroll, "Court of the First Stuart Queen"; "Theatre as Text"; *Anna of Denmark*.

⁴ Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 39.

Following the pioneering work of Barroll and Wood, scholars have looked at several areas of Anna's cultural agency. Diana Scarisbrick has published articles on the contents and meaning of Anna's jewellery collection, and architectural historians such as Howard Colvin, John Bold, Gordon Higgott, and Simon Thurley have recognised Anna's importance as a patron of Inigo Jones and some of England's earliest architectural classicism.⁵ Looking to Anna's enthusiasm for garden design and mounts, Roy Strong and Luke Morgan have touched on the potential function and iconographic significance of the projects that Anna had carried out in the grounds of Denmark House and Greenwich.⁶ Further, a number of literary historians including Clare McManus, Barbara Lewalski, Sophie Tomlinson, and Barbara Ravelhofer have considered Anna's pivotal role in the introduction and popularisation of the masque in England.⁷

There may appear to be a solid body of scholarship on Anna, but these areas are consistently treated in isolation and usually without the consultation of archival material. I have developed and extended this scholarship by using previously unplumbed archival documents, and by offering a more inclusive approach to Anna's cultural agency. This thesis is multi-disciplinary in scope, encompassing areas of art history, architecture, material culture, and socio-political history. I offer original insights into the type, significance, and extent of Anna's cultural activities by consulting a wide array of manuscripts including Anna's household accounts, the accounts of her jeweller Heriot, two inventories of her wardrobe goods, the Pipe Office accounts, and the several inventories of Oatlands Palace.

⁵ Colvin, *King's Works*, 32-3, 114-15, 255-60; Bold, *Greenwich*, 44-45; Higgott, "Design and Setting," 137-38; Thurley, *Somerset House*, 31-44.

⁶ Strong, *Renaissance Garden*, 87-97; Morgan, *Nature as Model*, 53-8, 111, 120-1, 193-4, 198-200.

⁷ McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*; "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court"; Lewalski, *Writing Women*, 18-30; Tomlinson, *Women on Stage*, for example 3, 8-11, 18-50; Ravelhofer, *Early Stuart Masque*, for example 109-119, 125-34, 144-50, 174-77.

These documents have been supplemented by the previously published inventory of Denmark House from 1619, and the inventory of Anna's jewellery collection that was compiled in 1606, as well as printed primary material such as letters, ambassadorial dispatches, and diary entries. Moreover, by contextualising my analyses within the specific socio-cultural milieu of the Jacobean court, I provide new connections and a better understanding of Anna's cultural decisions and interests. I have presented an original approach by seeking connections to her Danish upbringing, and to the interests and values exhibited by her siblings. Additionally, I have examined Anna's role in factional politics and international diplomacy, and have provided a new approach to the complexities of her confessional identity.

The comparatively broad nature of my analyses has allowed me to isolate significant consistencies across Anna's agency. For example, Anna's fierce natal pride and her passion for the Italianate can be fruitfully traced through most areas of her cultural interest and activity. Both elements colour her visual representation as she chose to be depicted wearing cipher jewels relating to her mother and brother, and to mark her portraits with her personal Italian motto. The use of a single personal motto, and in Italian, seems to have been quite unusual. By comparison, it is thought that Henrietta Maria did not have a motto at all, and both James I and Elizabeth I had several mottoes, all of which were in Latin. On the other hand, Anna's determination to visually and verbally align herself with her natal court draws comparison with her successor at the Stuart court, Henrietta Maria. Like Anna before her, Henrietta Maria sought to visually signpost her lineage on her jointure palaces of Denmark House, Greenwich, and Oatlands. French Bourbon iconography in form of the fleur-de-lis appeared on the walls, doors, fireplaces, ceilings and staircases, while Henrietta

Maria also ensured that Inigo Jones worked from French designs and patterns in remodelling the interiors. Her penchant for Diana imagery can be traced to Fontainebleau, while presence of “female-centred imagery” at Greenwich finds parallels with the decorative work carried out by her mother at Luxembourg Palace.⁸ Similarly, Anna’s Danish and Italian concerns can also be seen in her building projects, for her interest in architecture followed the patronage model of her natal court, while the work that she commissioned from Jones was strongly influenced by Italian precedents. Anna’s genealogy and her Italian interest also informed her choice of artisans; Jones came to her employ from the court of her brother and, together with the painters Isaac Oliver and Paul van Somer, and the hydraulic engineer Salomon de Caus, was trained in Italy, and was familiar with the styles and trends of the country. A further Italo-Danish connection is found in my suggestion that Anna’s affinity for Italian culture was nurtured at the Danish court of her father Frederik II, which supported humanist drama and court festivities enacted by French and Italian troupes that at one stage included Zoega, the famed Italian dancer. Anna’s partiality for the Italianate also extended to her support of poets and playwrights.

While certain unifying threads can be tracked through many of Anna’s cultural pursuits, she was a complex woman and several inconsistencies are present in her agency. Interestingly, Anna’s fondness for the Italianate did not extend to her collection of paintings. Among those of Anna’s paintings that can be identified, all works are Flemish or Dutch in origin rather than Italian, despite the fact that many Jacobean elites, including Anna’s son Henry,

⁸ Sykes, “Henrietta Maria’s ‘house of delight’,” 333-35; Britland, *Drama at the Courts*, 4; Griffey, *On Display*, forthcoming. On the influence of Marie de Médici’s art patronage on Henrietta Maria, see Jessica Bell, “The Three Marys: The Virgin; Marie de Médici; and Henrietta Maria,” in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, ed. Erin Griffey (Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008).

were avidly collecting Venetian paintings and statuary at the time.⁹ More prominent, perhaps, is the conflicting question of Anna's confessional identity. As I have discussed in this thesis, Anna apparently converted to Catholicism around 1592 while in Scotland and is thought to have remained a "church papist" throughout her time in England. Knowledge of her personal beliefs was restricted to James, a handful of Catholic dignitaries, and a select number of elite Scottish and English Catholics.¹⁰ Despite her rumoured conversion, Anna continued to uphold an appearance of outward conformity. To this end, she accompanied James to quasi-public reformed services, supported Protestant preaching in her palaces, maintained Protestant chaplains in her household, and does not appear to have owned or bought any paintings, jewellery, or devotional items that could be interpreted as "popish."¹¹ If she was in fact a privately practising Catholic, Anna went to great lengths to keep her suspected Catholicism from the English public, with the result that her personal beliefs were doubted by both her Catholic and Protestant contemporaries. In 1613, for example, Cardinal Guido Bentivoglio provided an assessment of Anna's religion and temperament, asserting that any idea that Anna was Catholic "could not have been founded on anything but uncertain conjecture."¹² Throughout this thesis, I have acknowledged that a certain level of ambiguity remains and that all 'evidence' pertaining to Anna's conversion and religious

⁹ Other courtiers collecting Venetian paintings at this time included Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, and Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, and a little later, Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel. See for example, Wilks, "Art Collecting"; Timothy Wilks, "The Picture Collection of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (c.1587–1645), Reconsidered," *JHC*, 1 (1989): 167-77; Edward Chaney, "The Italianate Evolution of English Collecting," in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. Edward Chaney (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2003); David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his Circle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

¹⁰ On the possibility that Anna carried out Catholic devotions in England with the assistance of her Catholic Bedchamberers, see Chapter Two above.

¹¹ On Anna's religious conformity, see McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 167-72.

¹² As transcribed and published in Loomie, "Catholic Consort," 303, citing *Relationi fatte dall'... Cardinal Bentivoglio in tempo delle sue nunziature di Fiandra e di Francia* (Antwerp, 1629): 174-75.

position needs to be treated critically. In addition, I have suggested the possibility that Anna strategically maintained a certain equivocacy about her faith for distinct political gain.

A limitation of this study has been the state of research on the nature and processes of Jacobean court finance. As noted in the Introduction and Chapter Three, the relationship between Anna's jointure and her Privy Purse and the method that was used to supplement her income, remains inconsistent and unclear. As far as I am aware, the only sustained research that has been carried out on the revenue and expenditure of the Jacobean court is that by Frederick Dietz and John Cramsie.¹³ While Dietz does utilise a substantial amount of archival and primary source material, his focus is directed to James's relationship with parliament, the privy council, and the commissioners of the treasury – particularly in the success or failure of their efforts to reduce crown debt and implement new fiscal policies that would open new avenues for revenue or increase the yield of extant ones. Dietz's treatment of Anna is less measured, repeating many of the misconceptions about her profligate nature although he concedes that she was not "a lone participant in the extravagance which she fostered."¹⁴ More pertinently, Dietz does not discuss the intricacies and processes between Anna's personal finances and those of the crown, looking only to provide examples of her expenditure and debts. More recently, John Cramsie has approached Jacobean finance in relation to James's practice of kingship and governance. Again, though, Cramsie's attention is directed to James, providing sustained discussions on the pressures and interests that influenced key policy makers; the development of fiscal policies that looked to increase revenue and reduce expenditure; and the role of patronage

¹³ Dietz, *English Public Finances*; Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*.

¹⁴ Dietz, *ibid.*, 102-103.

and favourites in James's practice of kingship and general court finance. On the other hand, only passing mention is made of Anna's finances, and this is only in relation to Coke's plans to increase Anna's income and alleviate her mounting debts in 1616.¹⁵ In order to clarify the links and systems between Anna's Privy Purse and central crown finance, more archival research needs to be carried out on James's accounts and those of the Exchequer with specific reference to Anna's revenue as well as any papers relating to George Carew, Anna's Receiver-General. While this is beyond the scope of the present study, it is a fertile avenue for future study and one that would be of significant benefit to scholars of the Jacobean court.

There is also a paucity of specific evidence concerning the audience and reception of Anna's forms of display at her main residences. Ambassadorial dispatches confirm that Anna regularly hosted local and international elites, but frustratingly their accounts are generally devoid of any information pertaining to the décor of their audiences. An example is found in the comment by the Venetian ambassador, Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, that having "passed into the Queen's [Anna's] apartments... it would be tedious to describe her splendour."¹⁶ Similarly, the Venetian ambassador, Marc'Antonio Correr, reveals to the Doge and Senate that "some of my suite" were "in the Queen's apartments," but he is more interested in the "rumours" being discussed than any of the furnishings.¹⁷ Correr later recounts that after a "public audience, where the whole Royal family was united," he and his fellow ambassador, Francesco Contarini, had a separate audience with Anna. Again, however, the ambassadors

¹⁵ Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance*, 143; Coke's plans are discussed in Chapter Three.

¹⁶ *CSPV*, vol.10, 71-72, no.102: 30 July 1603, to the Doge and Senate. Similarly, see Contarini's dispatch of 7 September 1618, where he merely writes "Four days ago I went to Oatlands for audience of the queen," *CSPV*, vol. 15, 306, no.525.

¹⁷ *CSPV*, vol.11, 258, no.477: 15 April 1609.

are at pains to relate the manner of their reception, which is read as a sign of the favour of Venice, rather than their surroundings. Having been “most courteously received,” they are happy to report that Anna “caused us to be seated, and engaged us in conversation for some time.”¹⁸ As noted in Chapter Three, even the collector Anne Clifford merely states that she took the time to inspect “those fine delicate things” in the galleries, while she was at Denmark House.¹⁹ While the specifics of Anna’s interiors and the impressions that they gave cannot be reconstructed from eye-witness accounts, it is apparent that her politicised modes of display were effective. This can be gauged by the widespread awareness of her support of Spain, her prestigious lineage, and her alignment with the Pembroke-Southampton faction. While these aspects were palpable in Anna’s words and actions, they were equally visible in the iconography of the jewels and the colour of the clothes that she strategically chose to wear; in the portraits she selected to display; in the personal heraldry that branded her furniture and textiles; and in the considered visual persona she staged. More generally, Anna’s sumptuous appearance, rich palace interiors, and grand gardens drew commentary. Conflated with the strength and prestige of the Stuart dynasty, these elements contributed to the image and perception of James’s kingship.

This thesis does not aim to have the final word on Anna of Denmark. Rather, it looks to broaden our knowledge of the valuable - and often highly politicised - role that royal women could play in early modern England. In particular, Anna’s appreciation and patronage of music, which was perhaps unsurprisingly shared by key members of her faction - the Earls of

¹⁸ *CSPV*, vol.11, 430-32, no.801: 25 February 1610 to the Doge and Senate.

¹⁹ Acheson, *Diary of Anne Clifford*, 167.

Pembroke and Southampton - warrants further study.²⁰ It is not addressed in the present study, but Anna's passion for music is clearly apparent in her household accounts, which abound with payments to musicians and "instrument makers," many of whom were Italian or French.²¹ Writing to Carleton on 22 February 1617, Chamberlain observes that "the Quenes French muscians (wherof she hath more than a goode many) made her a kind of maske or antique."²² Anna was also the dedicatee of two famous musical scores: John Dowland's (1563-1626) *Lachrimae* in 1604, and Salomon de Caus's *Institution Harmonique* in 1615, as well as an unknown book by the Scots musician Tobias Lynne in 1607.²³ In 1607, Anna also bought a "litle Lute," a song and music book, "a violle for the consort" and several "consort books of Musick" from the Italian John Maria Sugars.²⁴ In addition, Anna's childhood at the Oldenburg court and her period as the Scots queen are deserving of more scholarly attention. Mara Wade's research on Denmark and the courts of northern Europe, and Maureen Meikle's work on Anna's Scottish period, offer fruitful lines for further enquiry. Given the importance of cultural forms at the Danish court on Anna's later interests and patronage, it is worth considering the possibility that Anna introduced aspects of Danish theatrical tradition into England. Certainly, Henrietta Maria was to act as a cultural conduit in this respect, transporting visual, literary, and theatrical traditions of female authority and virtue from France, which moved the English masque closer to the style of the French *ballet*

²⁰ Lynn Hulse, review of *Records of English Court Music, vol. IV (1603-1625)*, by Andrew Ashbee, *Music & Letters*, 73 (1992): 101.

²¹ See multiple entries in TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1655; TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1653; TNA: PRO, AO 1/388/45.

²² McClure, *Letters of John Chamberlain*, vol. 2, 56, no.259.

²³ On Anna's music patronage see Andrew Ashbee, *Records of English Court Musicians*, vol. IV (Snodland, Kent: A. Ashbee, 1991), 196-206. See also Barroll, *Anna of Denmark*, 58; Knowles, "Anna of Denmark," 40.

²⁴ TNA: PRO, SC6/JASI/1648.

de cour.²⁵ In Anna's case, it should be remembered that theatre and dance formed a regular part of Danish court culture. Furthermore, Anglo-Danish cultural transference is evident in the figure of Inigo Jones, who entered court patronage in England via Denmark, having worked as a stage designer for Anna's brother, Christian IV, King of Denmark. Indeed, there is still much to be done on Anna's agency and patronage. It is hoped, however, that the interdisciplinary approach and deployment of previously unused archival material in this thesis goes some way to furthering our understanding and appreciation of Anna's cultural and political roles, activities, and values.

By using Anna of Denmark as a case study, it has been my intention to produce a detailed examination of the ways in which early modern royal women utilised cultural avenues to express aspects of their identity – aspects that extended beyond their husbands to encompass familial identity, factional alignment, personal values, and intellectual accomplishments. Throughout the analyses in this thesis, Anna emerges as a woman who was learned, ambitious, and culturally active. Her penchant for European styles, traditions, and fashion is repeatedly underscored, and she is shown to have supported James in securing the most prestigious matches for her children – strategically professing her Catholicism to Spanish ambassadors and reminding them of her illustrious natal lineage in order to promote the possibility and benefits of a union with the House of Oldenburg-Stuart. Furthermore, my research underlines Anna's strong sense of ownership over her properties and her visual persona, and it highlights the queen as a figure who, throughout

²⁵ Smuts, "Religion, European Politics and Henrietta Maria's Circle," 22; Britland, *Drama at the Courts*, 5-6. On the influence of French traditions on Henrietta Maria's religion and her masques in England, see also Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), and for a critical assessment of Veevers work see Britland, *ibid.*, 9-13.

her years in England, remained extremely proud of her natal lineage. It is hoped that through the lens of the queen consort, this study goes some way to providing a more nuanced view of the Jacobean court – a court that was characterised by a diversity of styles, policies, values, and factions.

Appendix I

Transcription of a section of an inventory of Anna of Denmark's wardrobe goods drawn up on 12 April 1611, and held in The National Archives, London (TNA LR2/121). Folio 1r has been omitted here as it appears to have been a draft with much text crossed out, and then the revised on Folio 2r. In the interest of space, I have only transcribed the first five folios of the inventory and I hope to publish a full transcription at a later date.

A note on the transcriptions

I have adhered as closely as possible to the original spelling, silently extending all abbreviations and contractions, which generally appear in their full form elsewhere in the manuscript. I have left alternative spelling when it occurs in the full rather than contracted form, thus "Sat" is extended to satin, but left as "Satten" when written as such.

Interchangeable letters from the period such as u and v, i and j, and y, c, and t, have been changed to modern usage. The spacing follows the original document and marginalia is noted.

FOLIO 2r

Mr Zachary Bethell is discharged of all the wardrobe Stuffe
and other things within his chardge, contayned in this booke
signed under the hand of him the said Zachary Bethell
and William Hay Clerke of her Majesties Warderobe of Robes
A veiwe [view] whereof hath beene ~~by vertue of~~ taken according unto a Comission
Directed unto the right honourable George Lord Carewe her Majesties vice Chamberlain,
Thomas Lord Knyvett her Majesties Surveyor genrall, And Sir
John Bennett knight her Majesties Chancellor, bearing date the
xijth day of April 1611 ~~taken~~ by us the Said Thomas
Lord Knevett, and Sir John Bennett knight, and
thereupon have caused a newe book to be maid by her
Majesties Auditor of all the Stuffe, ~~and other~~ furniture,
and other things Contained in the said Zachary Bethells

bookes, and delivered the same unto Thomas Marvyn
who is appointed to take
chardge thereof: And have redelivered unto him
the said Zachary Bethell this his owne booke, and
for his further dischardge have gotte our hands thus

FOLIO 2v

30 pare of Satheen [satin] whell [well] stiched sheets marked
with the crowne a sone [sun?] & with A ffor the first sorte
30 pare of duple stiched sheets marked with the Crowne
and the Letters under it & with B ffor ye second Sorte
30 pare of Single Stiched Sheets marked wth ye Crowne
& the Letters under it & with the Lter C ffor the third Sorte –
30 pare of plane semed [seamed] sheets marked with ye Crowne
& the Letters under it & with the Lter D ffor the ffourthe Sorte –
30 pare of plane Semed [seamed] sheets marked with ye Crowne
& the Letters under it & with the Ltr E ffor the ffifte Sorte
30 pare of plane semed [seamed] sheets marked wth ye Crowne
& the Letters under it & with the Lter F ffor the Sixthe Sorte
30 pare of Large pillowe beres marked with the Crowne
[this section has been severely rubbed and is illegible] Letteres
40 pare of pillowbeares marked with the Crowne
and ye Letters under it

Shirts and pillowbeares in 2 Chests

FOLIO 3r

Robes for the Order of St George
Inprimis one kirtell and a hood to the same of crimson
velvet. lined with white Damask.

Item one Mantle of cloth of Silver lined with white Satten
with sckallopped Sheells for the Order of St Michael with knotts

Item one riche Roabe of cloth of Silver with a broad border of
Sckallop shells and knotts of great wreathes of gold and flames
of fier [fire] embrodered and lined through with white Satten.

Item one Mantle of Indian making of linnen cloth full
of buttons and ilate [eyelet] holes of Silk.

Item one Garment of white linnen cloth of Indian-making
embrodered with white Silk

Item two kirtells and thre [three] hoods of Crimsen velvet &
lined with white Sarcenet.

Apparell for men.

Gownes

Item the outside of one gowne with a Square Cape of crimson velvett
and Crimson Satten all embrodered over with purles¹ of Damask
gold and Silver, fured with crimson satten, all over, embrodered
with damask gold having X peeces for the Sleeves and lined
throughout with crimson Satten.

Item one Gowne of purple Satten with a Square cape all
over embrodered with venice gold with a fayre border of
embrodery, the Cape and ventes² lined with purple Satten with
three threads of venice gold, and being set upon the Sleeves

¹ As noted in Chapter Two above, Arnold defines purles as “individual twists of silver or gold wire,” see *Unlock'd*, 370.

² Defined in the OED as “an opening or slit in a garment.” See “vent, n.1,” *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 4 October 2014.
<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/222206?rskey=IKkVM9&result=1&isAdvanced=false>

x buttons and xxviii paire of Agletts of gold, and lined throughout with purple Satten.

Marginal note on the left in the second hand: Xx April 1611 The Buttons and Agletts taken of and delivered to Sir John Spilman the K. Jeweller to bee employed for the making of gold plate for hir Majestie

FOLIO 3v

Item one gowne of black friesed velvett with a Square Cape all over embrodered with venice gold and Cordonnets³ of the same, and fringed with a narrowe fringe of venice gold, the cape and vents lined with like stuff and embrodery and the rest lined with black Satten.

Item one Gowne of purple Satten unlined garded with a brode [broad] gard of purple velvett, formed with venice gold and fringed with the same.

Item one other gowne of purple cloth of silver unlined, with worke with a cape and one garde about the same cloth of Silver having xx^{tie} [20] buttons x and Agletts x of gold being broken and brused [bruised?] and five of the same buttons lacking their uppermost garnishments upon the Sleeves.

Marginal note on the left in the second hand: the buttons and 7 Agletts

Item one Turkey gowne of Crimson velvett of a newe making embrodered with venice gold and Silver like unto cloudes with a border embrodered, the buttons and loopes of venice gold and silver lined with crimson Taffetie [taffeta] and fured with crimson Satten.

³ Cordonnet or Cordaunte, referring to a type of fringe or braid used in embroidery, see Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 362; "cordonnet, n." *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 4 October 2014. <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/41474?redirectedFrom=cordonnet>

Item one gowne of purple cloth of Tinsell with knottes like flowers garded with two gardes⁴ of purple velvett formed downe with Cordaunts [cordonnets] of venice gold lined with purple Taffeta, and faced with purple Satten.

Item one gowne of purple cloth of gold Tinsell with knotts with two small borders of purple velvett formed downe with a double knott of venice Silver lined with purple Taffety [taffeta] and faced with purple Satten.

Clokes & capes

Item one Spanish cape of white raised velvett pincked and purled with threads of venice Silver with 2 Burgonion [Burgundian?] gards of white velvett embrodered with purles of venice gold & lined with white velvett.

Item one Spanish Cape of plaine purple cloth of gold with a brode [broad] gard of purple velvett embrodered with venice gold lined with purple velvett.

FOLIO 4r

Item one Spanish Cape of Crimson Satten embrodered with venice gold tissued and lined with crimson velvett

Item one Cloke of tawney Satten with two gards embrodered with venice gold, and lined with tawney Sarcenett [Sarcenet]

Item one cloke of black taffatie [taffeta] with two gards of velvett thereon.

Coates and Cassocks

⁴ Defined by Arnold as "originally a reinforcement to keep the edges of a garment from fraying, then an ornamental border or band of decoration on a garment," see *Unlock'd*, 365.

Item one Coate of purple Cloth of Silver with knotts having a gard of purple velvett embrodered with Venice gold, lined with purple velvett and Satten.

Item one Coate of purple velvett all over embrodered with venice gold, and a border of embrodery of Venice gold, the same being cutt and pulled out with gold Sarcenett and lyned with purple velvett and purple Satten.

Item one Coate or Shamewe⁵ of purple Cloth of gold with work, garded with purple velvett, and embrodered with gold, unlined.

Item two Coats of purple velvett whereof one embrodered about the Skirtes and downe the pleats with damask and Venice gold, and the other with one broad gard of purple velvett, formed downe with one Cordannt [cordonnet] of and fringe of Venice gold.

Item one Coate of crimson velvett embrodered with gold and fringe upon every pleate and round about the skirts.

FOLIO 4v

Item one Coate of white Cloth of Silver lined with white Satten, and embrodered round about, and upon every pleate with Damask and Venice Silver.

Item one Coate of purple Silver mailed,⁶ garded with the same,

⁵ Defined in the OED as perhaps being a variant spelling of “chimer” or “chimere” which was “a loose and light gown,” see “chimer | chimere, n.1” *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 4 October 2014. <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/31706>

and fringed with gold round about the Skirtts, the gard being cut up on the pleats and lined with black Satten.

Item one Cassock of murry velvett all over embrodered with flat damask gold and purles with three borders of like embroder, having at the brest eleven round buttons of gold, and x loopes, being of litle flagons chaines of gold, the same being lined with purple taffaty [taffeta].

Marginal note on the left in the second hand referring to the underlined passage: April. 1611. all to Sir John Spilman for her Majesties use

Item one Coate of crimson velvett garded about with two passamanie⁷ laces of Venice gold, furred with Squirrells fure, the Coller hands and Skirts edged with Sables, the furr being old and rotten not worthy to be charged.

Item one Coate of Crimson velvett with v passamayn [passement] laces all embrodered over with Venice gold, The same is but a Cassock.

Item one Cassock of purple gold Tinsell with knottes lined with purple satten, and a base to the same of like stuff

Item one Cassock of purple Silver ~~Tinsell~~ Tissue lined with purple Satten.

Item one Cassock of flat cloth of Silver, raised with

⁶ Defined by Arnold and the OED as being “speckled, spotted,” see *Unlock’d*, 367; “mailed, adj.” *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 4 October 2014.

⁷ Passament or passement is defined in the OED as “a strip of braiding, usually made with gold or silver wire or with silk, used as decorative trimming,” see “passement, n.” *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 4 October 2014.

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/138465?rskey=pc25Pe&result=1&isAdvanced=false>

gold and Silver Tinsel tissue edged with Crimson velvett and lined with crimson satten.

Item one Coate of black friesed⁸ velvett ript [ripped] all over embrodered with threeds of Venice gold with a brode gard of black velvett embrodered with Venice gold and lined with black Satten.

Item one Coate of green velvett all over embrodered with pipes of gold and Silver and purles of damask gold lined with green Sarconet.

Item one Coate of cloth of Silver plaine all over & embrodered with venice and damask gold purles laid on with a great Cardannt [cordonnet] of Cloth of gold, embossed on and lined with white Sarconett.

FOLIO 5r

Item one other Coate of Silver with black knotts with a gard of black velvett, embrodered with Silver lace, and lined with Satten of Brugis [Bruges]

Item one Coate of crimson velvett to weare upon an Armor [armour?] or harnes [harness], pulled out with redd gold Sarcenett laid on with a narrowe passamame [passement] lace of gold, lined with redd Cotten.

Doubletstts and hose

Item one doublet of crimson velvett embrodered

⁸ Friezed refers to the velvet having a nap – meaning that it had a raised surface, see “friezed, adj.1” *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 4 October 2014. <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/74669?rkey=YXRw96&result=2&isAdvanced=false>

with gold, the same doublett set out with cambrick [cambric]

Item one doublet of purple velvett set out with
Cambrick [cambric].

Item one other doublett of purple velvett set out with
Cambrick [cambric].

Item one doublet of cloth of Silver embrodered with
damask silver, sett out with Cambrick [cambric].

Item one doublett of purple cloth of Silver mailed [spotted or speckled] set
out with cambrick.

Item one paire of Short hose of black silk and gold
woven together.

FOLIO 5v

Apparell for women

Item two upp [upper] bodies and a neather⁹ skirt of purple Satten
Striped with gold and garded with purple gold Tissue,
one of the bodies with long sleeves, the other with Short
Sleeves

Item one loose gowne of purple velvett embrodered
with braids of Silver unlined.

Item an Italian Gowne of purple Satten Striped with
gold garded with tinsell, raised with gold and purple velvet

⁹ Referring to the lower half of the body; perhaps a petticoat.

Marginal note on the left in the second hand: The Lre [letter] of the old Book
of charge

Kirtles and foreparts

Item one forepart of a kirtle of Crimson Satten all over
embrodered with damask purle and pearle with a paire
of sleeves of the same work, embrodered with Sundry
knotts Sett with Small pearles, and having buttons of gold
Set with pearles lacking twelve pearles from the
sleeves and wanting divers buttons and pearles
from the knotts.

Marginal note on the left in the second hand: qtr [quarter] furbether [further]
employed

Item one paire of Sleeves of Crimson velvett, all over
embrodered with damask purle and pearle and passamain [passement]
Lase [lace] of venice gold lacking divers of the pearles

Item one forepart of a kirtle of purple velvett
unlined all over embrodered with damask purle and
pearle and passamain [passement] lace, with a paire of Sleeves
of the Same work

Item one forepart of a kirtle of purple velvet
unlined purled with damask gold and trailes of
damask and venice gold and set with pearles &
wanting three pearles of the bigger Sort, having a
paire of Sleeves to the Same.

Appendix II

Transcription of a section of an inventory of Anna of Denmark's wardrobe drawn up in February 1608, and held in Cambridge University Library (CUL MS Dd.I.26).¹ In the interest of space, I have only transcribed the first five folios of the inventory here, and I hope to publish a full transcription at a later date.

A note on the transcriptions

I have adhered as closely as possible to the original spelling, silently extending all abbreviations and contractions, which generally appear in their full form elsewhere in the manuscript. I have left alternative spelling when it occurs in the full rather than contracted form, thus "Sat" is extended to satin, but left as "Satten" when written as such.

Interchangeable letters from the period such as u and v, i and j, and y, c, and t, have been changed to modern usage. Marginalia in the original document is noted.

FOLIO 1r

S.² One paire of bodies of green Satten, cutt with white taffeta with a paire of wearing sleeves of white Satten trimmed with Spangled Lace

Marginal note on the right: ex³

S. One gowne of white Satten embroyered all over the bodies, and Longe Skirtes, with Silver owes⁴ and gould & Silver plate with flambe like fier [fire], and a hand and hammer,⁵ the bodies lined with Carnation.

Marginal note on the right: ex

¹ The inventory is without a heading or introductory note. Payne states that "from February 1608, one of the queen's Gentleman Ushers was appointed by warrant to draw up an inventory of the queen's robes, to keep account and 'have a provident care of them'." See "Aristocratic Women," 65, citing *HMC Salisbury* Part 20, 92.

² The meaning of these marginal letters is unclear. There is only "S" and "X" and they appear to be in a second hand. They may relate to the goods being tracked at one time as an abbreviation for "seen" and perhaps indicating that an item had been given away, or was not present. They only occur on folios 1r-3r.

³ The meaning of these marginal letters is unclear. They are perhaps a form of stocktaking and only occur on folios 1r-3r.

⁴ This was another name for "spangles." They were small circular pieces of silver-gilt and silver that were sewn onto garments in decorative patterns, or were sewn all over. See Arnold, *Unlock'd*, 368.

⁵ For a possible explanation of the significance of this imagery, see above, 121.

S. One gowne of white taffeta; the bodies, sleeves, skirtes, wrought very thick with Silver Spangle Lace, and bound with Silver binding Lace: the wings⁶ and short skirtes⁷ lined with taffeta; the bodies & sleeves with carnation taffeta.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S: One gowne of white Satten embroyered with gould and silver, in Clowdes [clouds]: bound with Silver Lace, and Lined with Carnation.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne of Ashcouler⁸ Satten, the bodies of Ashcouler cloth of Silver bound with Silver Lace, Lined with Carnation taffeta: the winges trimmed with Spangle Lace: the Side Skirtes, bound with Silver Lace, and buttons on the brest.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One paire of Ashcouler cloth of Silver bodies, bound with Silver Lace Lined with carnation taffeta.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One paire of bodies of black striped cloth of gould, bound with gould binding lace, lined with carnation taffeta, and gould buttons on the brest.

Marginal note on the right: ex

X.⁹ One gowne of white Satten embroidered very richly all over the Skirtes: the bodies & sleeves of cloth of Silver, bound with Silver Lace, geven.¹⁰

Marginal note on the right: ex

⁶ Arnold defines wings as being “small pieces of material cut in tabs or in a continuous curved shape, usually stiffened, set over the tops of the sleeves,” see *ibid.*, 375. A clear example can be seen in the portrait of Anna of Denmark at Woburn from around 1614 (figure 1.33).

⁷ It is unclear exactly what is referred to here, but it may be a petticoat or an undergarment.

⁸ Defined by Arnold as “the colour of ashes, whitish or brownish grey,” see *Unlock’d*, 360.

⁹ See note 2 above for a possible explanation of this marginal letter.

¹⁰ The cross in the margin combined with the note “geven” may indicate that the gown had been given away.

S. One paire of bodies & sleeves of cloth of Silver, with Silver Stripes and tissued with Small workes, and carnation Silke, Lined with Carnation taffeta and bound with Silver passement¹¹ Lace, in each Seame the winges with Spangle.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One paire of bodies of cloth of Silver, Striped with gould & coulered Silke, purple: Lined with Carnation taffeta and bound in each Seame with Silver Lace, the winges trimmed with Sprigge Spangle Lace.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne, the Side Skirtes, of white Satten, cutt with orange colour taffeta and bound with Silver Lace: the bodies and sleeves of orange colour Satten, cutt & drawne out with white Spanish taffeta Stript [striped] and wrought thick with broad Silver Lace, the Sleeves, brest, & winges trimmed with Spangle Lace, and bound with binding Lace, with Silver buttons, on each short skirt.

Marginal note on the right: ex

FOLIO 1v

1. One gowne of white Satten, embroydered with Silk, and colour Silke with Leaves and Flies, all over the bodies, Sleeves and Side Skirtes, pinked and Lined with white Sarcenet and bound in each Seame with Silver passement

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: at court

S. One dublett with crimosen Satten, Laid all over thick, with purple Lace with two plates Lined with carnation taffeta with Silver buttons on the brest

Marginal note on the right: ex

¹¹ Passament or passement is defined in the OED as "a strip of braiding, usually made with gold or silver wire or with silk, used as decorative trimming," see "passement, n." *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 2 September 2014.

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/138465?rskey=pc25Pe&result=1&isAdvanced=false>

S. One paire of bodies of Ollive colour Satten with three cloud Laces, Laied [laid] in each Seame: the Sleeves of white Satten cut with carnation taffeta the winges trimmed with Spangle Lace, with Silver buttons on the brest.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One paire of bodies of white Satten cutt and drawne out, with white taffeta and wrought very thick with black silke and Silver cloud Lace, and bound with Silver Lace: the winges trimmed with Spangle Lace: Lined with carnation taffeta and Silver buttons on the brest.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne of Tawney satten imbroyered with borders on the bodies with silver and Sundry coloured Silke; the winges trimmed with Spangle Lace and bound with bindinge Lace: the bodies & sleeves Lined with carnation taffeta and cutt with a pinck coloured taffeta and Silver buttons on the brest.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne-bodies, of white Satten the bodies and Sleeves imbroyered with panes of rimming¹² work, with Silver purle plate, and owes, bound in each Seame, and the Skirtes with Silver binding Lace, Lined with carnation taffeta the winges trimmed with Spangle Lace: with buttons on the brest.

Marginal note on the right: ex

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: the Skerts delivered into the quenes chamber

S. One paire of bodies embroyered (of white Satten) all over in flowers with Silver owes, purle, & plate, Lined with Carnation taffeta with Silver binding in each Seame, the short Skirtes and winges Lined with white taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

¹² I have been unable to define this term, but I would suggest that it refers to a type of decorative trimming.

S. One Side skirt of white Satten, cutt with a bias cutt, with three broad Silver Laces about the Skirtes, bound with binding Lace.

Marginal note on the right: ex

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: Delivered to the queens Chamber

S. One paire of bodies of Ash-colour Silk grosgrain imbroyered with Silver and Silks, like flies; bound with Silver Lace, the winges trimmed with Spangled Lace, and Lined with ash-colour taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

One gowne of flamb [flame] colour taffeta the bodies and sleeves Laid in each Seame with two Silver laces, and about the short skirtes: the Long Skertes cutt and drawne out with ash-colour taffeta half yard deep: bound with Silver Lace the bodies Lined with carnation taffeta and buttons on the brest.

Marginal note in the second hand: April 17, 1608 to Dorithie [Dorothy]¹³

S. One gowne of Ollive colour philozella [filasella], wrought all over with flowers of Silver and diverse colour Silke: the bodies & sleeves trimmed in each Seame with double Spangle Lace, and Lined with carnation taffeta the winges trimmed with Spangle Lace.

Marginal note on the right: ex

One gowne of white Satten cutt and printed all over, bound in each Seame with Silver binding Lace: the bodies without Sleeves, cut and drawne out with white taffeta and Laid in each Seame with two plate Laces together, Lined with carnation taffeta and Silver buttons on the brest.

Marginal note in the second hand: May 11, Mrs Bolstrode¹⁴

¹³ There were several women named Dorothy who served Anna in the Bed and Privy Chamber. The only two "Dorothy's" mentioned by surname in this inventory are Lady Dorothy Eyre (née Bulstrode), Gentlewoman of the Bedchamber, who is mentioned below, and Dorothy Speckart, Chamberer of the Bedchamber, who as mentioned in Chapter Two above, received one gown from the queen.

FOLIO 2r

S. One gowne of white taffeta the bodies and Sleeves trimmed all over with haire colour and Silver Lace, Lined with carnation taffeta with tenne hair colour Silk and Silver Laces, about the Side Skirtes, with Silk and Silver buttons

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One gowne Skirt of white Satin, and bound with Passement Lace.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One paire of bodies of white cloth of Silver, trimmed in each Seame with Silver Passement Lace, upon the bodies, Sleeves, Skirts & wings & lined with carnation taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne of white wrought Satten, trimmed in each Seame, upon the bodies & Sleeves, with two Silver Passement Laces: and the bodies Lined with carnation taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne of white taffeta the bodies and Sleeves Laid thick all over, with Silver cloud [cloud] Lace, the side Skirte, Laid about, with Sixe of the same laces, the wings trimmed with Spangle Lace, and Lined with carnation taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One pair of bodies of white Satten, the bodies and Sleeves Lined with carnation taffeta & trimmed upon the bodies in each Seame, with two white Satten Laces.

Marginal note on the right: ex =

¹⁴ This is presumably Lady Dorothy Eyre (née Bulstrode), Gentlewoman of the Bedchamber, and it is quite possible that she is also the woman referred to as "Dorothy" throughout the inventory. On the members of Anna's Bedchamber see Payne, "Aristocratic Women," appendix.

One gowne of white taffeta, pinked all over the upper part of the bodies, and each Seame garded with Carnation taffeta, and small Silver lace upon each gard: the long Skirtes Likewise garded, with a border about, and bound with Silver Lace.

Marginal note in the second hand: May 9. 1608. to Doritie [Dorothy]

S. One gowne of white wrought Satten flowered and wrought in each Seame, with two Small white Satten: Laces, the bodies Lined with taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. The Side Skirtes for a white Satten gowne, bound with Silver Passement Lace cutt and raced¹⁵ : A paire of bodies to the Same gowne, cut & raced: trimmed with Spangle Laces upon the winges: and Lined with carnation taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex =

S. One dublett of green cloth of Silver: the upper part of the bodies wrought with gould and silver Spangle Lace, and in each Seame, one of the Same Laces, and Lined with carnation taffeta.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One other paire of green cloth of Silver, wrought in each Seame with two gould and Silver Spangle Lace, and bound with gould & Silver Passement Lace

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One dublett of Canavechia[?] Striped with gould: bound with the Same Stuff, and Lined with carnation taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex.

¹⁵ Defined by the OED as "scratched; cut, slashed," see "raced, adj." *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 20 September 2014.

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/157045?redirectedFrom=raced>

S. One gowne of white taffeta, Striped with plates of Silver, with three and one bare: and bound with a Silver Lace, with a paire of hanging Sleeves.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One gowne of white Satten, embroidered with Silver twist and Owes in knottes, trimmed with Silver Lace, the winges with Spangle Lace and Lined with taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex.

FOLIO 2v

S. One gowne of white Silk grograyne [grosgrain] Striped with gould, Lined with white taffeta trimmed with binding Lace, and gold buttons.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One gowne of white tiffany,¹⁶ striped with Silver, trimmed with carnation Silk and Silver ribon [ribbon], and bound with Silver Passement Lace, Lined with white Sarcenet.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

One paire of bodies of white taffeta ta: cut uppon an orange tabine¹⁷
taffeta and Lined with taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: caste [perhaps old or worn]

S. One Side Skirtes of orange tawney Satten raced and pincked all over.

Marginal note on the right: ex

¹⁶ According to Arnold, this is a "lightweight, silk material, perhaps also linen, almost transparent, usually white and frequently striped with silver," see *Unlock'd*, 374.

¹⁷ Defined by Arnold as a "silk of taffeta weave, given a watered or moiré effect," see *ibid.*, 374.

S. One gowne of haire colour taffeta cutt uppon red Sarcenet, with a paire of hanging Sleeves.

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne of white Satten Laid on each Seame with a white Satten Lace, and a white Satten Lace about the Skirtes.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: bodies cast [perhaps old or worn]

S. One gowne of white Striped Caffa,¹⁸ bound about, and in each Seam with two Silk galloun [galloon]¹⁹ Laces: and Lined with white Sarcenet.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One gowne of white Satten Striped with Silver and bound & Laid in each Seame with Silver Passement Lace, & Lined with changeable Sarcenet.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One gowne of Ash-colour Satten, cutt with a crosse cutt [bias cut], the bodies Laid thick all over with Silver cloud Lace, the Long Skirts with a faire border above and belowe, of the Same cloud Lace.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One gowne of white Satten pinked all over the bodies, Laid in each Seame with two carnation and wachod [watchet] Silk & Silver Lace with eight of them about the Side Skirts.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

¹⁸ A type of coarse taffeta, which may have been woven in Caffa, *ibid.*, 361.

¹⁹ Galloon is defined in the OED as "narrow, close-woven ribbon or braid, of gold, silver, or silk thread, used for trimming articles of apparel," see "galloon, n." *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 2 September 2014, <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/76344?redirectedFrom=galloon>

One gown of white taffeta the bodies embroidered all over, with
revelled²⁰ taffeta Laied on with a Silver chaine Lace, with a cheveun [chevron?]
worke, the Side Skirtes cutt with a bias cutt, with a border of
the like revelled taffeta and chaine Lace.

Marginal note on the right: ex

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: skirt at corte [court]

S. One payre of bodies of Ashcolour taffeta cutt uppon yellow Sarcenet
and made upp plaine

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One payre of bodies of white Striped Satin bound in each Seame
with a Silke galloune [galloon]

Marginal note on the right: ex

S. One gowne of white taffeta cutt with a crosse cutt uppon carnation
Sarcenet, and bound in each Seame, with two Silk galloun Laces

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One paire of white cloth of Silver bodies, trimmed in each Seame
with Spangle Laces, and Lined with red taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex

FOLIO 3r

S. One gowne of white Satin, cutt Mounsieur[?] Snippe, the bodies
Laid round all over with a Small Silver plate Lace, and a
paire of hanginge Sleeves wrought with the Same Lace; the
Sides with xvii of the Same Laces about.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

²⁰ Defined by Arnold as "threads pulled loose at the edges of a cut for a decorative finish," see *Unlock'd*, 370.

S. One gowne: the bodies of white Satin cutt bias uppon white Sarcenet wrought all over with Silver chaine Lace in waves, three and three together: the Side Skirtes with a faire border of the Same chaine Lace about: and bound with Silver Passement Lace.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One paire of bodies of white cloth of Silver, Laid in each Seame with two green & silver Laces: and Lined with Sarcenet.

Marginal note on the right: ex.

S. One payre of white Satin bodies Striped with carnation Silk and bound in each Seame with Silver passement and Lined with taffeta

Marginal note on the right: ex.

FOLIO 3v - BLANK

FOLIO 4r

One Side Skirtes of white Satin embroyered all over with Silver Owes purle and plate, in curious worke.

One gowne of dove colour taffeta the bodies and sleeves embroyered with gould owes, plate & pearle: the Side Skirtes cutt with orange colour taffeta bound with binding Lace, with 9 goulde open Laces about Lined with carnation taffeta

One gowne of white Striped grograne [grosgrain], embroyered with black silke and Silver, bound with Silver Lace: the winges trimmed with Spangle Lace, Lined with carnation taffeta and Silver buttons on the brest.

One gowne of white Satin pincked and bound with black & Silver Lace, the bodies and sleeves trimmed all over with black & silver

compast [compass]²¹ cloud Lace, the Side Skirtes, Laid with black & silver open Lace about: the bodies Lined with carnation taffeta and black & Silver buttons on the brest.

One paire of bodies of Silver chamblett [camlet] with a Silver Passement Lace in each Seame, Lined with carnation taffeta and silver buttons on the brest: and the winges with Spangle Lace.

One Saveguard of Crimosen Satin wrought up to the toppe in xii Severall Spaces, with three and three Silver purled heart Lace together: and bound with passement Lace.

One Saveguard²² of grase [grass] green Satten wrought all over with Silver diamond Lace and bound with Silver passement Lace.

One Jerken²³ of white Satin embroyered all over with goulde, and Lined with carnation taffeta and bound in each Seame with a gould Lace. One Saveguard of orange colour satin trimmed all over with Silver Spangle open lace, and bound with silver passement lace

One Saveguard of Strawe coloured satin garded all over with carnation taffeta with a Silver heart Lace uppon each garde and bound about with Silver Passement Lace.

A white Satin Lace Jerken laid all over, with white Satten Lace.

²¹ A circular pattern. See *ibid.*, 362.

²² Safeguard: defined by Arnold as "an outer skirt or petticoat worn by women to protect their dress when riding," *ibid.*, 371.

²³ Arnold uses the term "jerkin" interchangeably with "doublet," as a sleeveless close-fitting garment, see *ibid.*, 128-29, 142-44.

FOLIO 4v

One Side Skirtes of white satin trimmed with 9 white Satten Laces, about and upp before:

One gowne of Dust colour Satin trimmed with Dust colour and Silver lace and lained with carnation taffeta and cloud Lace about, shaddowed²⁴ with Silk, with xii of the Same Laces about.

One Jerken of Dust colour satin trimmed all over with cloud Lace Shadowed with Silver.

One gowne, the Jerken and Longe Skirtes of tawney Satin, embroidered with guardes and paanes with Venice Silver, purle, and plate.

One white Satin Dublett pincked all over, with a tawney Silk and Silver Lace in each Seame, Lined with carnation taffeta

One Jerken of tawney Silk and Silver Lace, the Skirtes of tawney Satt: Laid with xii of the like tawney and Silver Lace about.

One gowne of white grograne [grograin], trimmed with a gould and Silver=frized²⁵ Lace, twoe and twoe together:²⁶ and about the Skirtes, v Spare twoe and twoe together.

One kirtell and dublett: the Dublett of orange colour satin cutt uppon black taffeta the Skirtes of black Satin cutt uppon orange colour taffeta with

²⁴ Perhaps meaning a light covering of silk as in a form of protection or covering, see "shadow, v." *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 20 September 2014

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/177213?rskey=R8SFRC&result=1&isAdvanced=false>

²⁵ Defined in the OED as "to embroider with gold; to work (gold) into arabesques, see "frieze, v.2" *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 21 September 2014.

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/74668?rskey=au2B58&result=4&isAdvanced=false>

²⁶ Perhaps meaning that the laces were applied in paired segments/strips.

a black Satin Lace in each Seame.

One white Satin Dublett cut with a crose cut with a green taffeta with a green and Silver Lace in each seame

One white satin Dublett pincked with a green gall: [galloon lace] wrought in each seame and Lined with taffeta Sarcenet.

One Savegard of green Satin flowered with green Silke, bound wth green gallowne [galloon], with buttons and Loopes of green Silk

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: delivered into the queens chamber the 16th of aprill 1611: at Greenwich

One dublett of white Satt, cut and raced uppon red taffeta bound with a white & red galloun Lace: the Skirte of red & white tuft²⁷ taffeta bound with a red and white galloun [galloon].

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: Skerts delivered the 14 december 1608 to Mrs doratye [Dorothy].

One dublett of white satin, cutt with an orange colour uppon white; with a plaine bias cutt, and pincked: bound in each Seame with orange and willowe colour Silk galloun: the Side Skirtes of willowe colour Chamblett flowered with orange colour Silke, with long buttons and Lowpes [loops] of orange colour and green: and bound with binding Lace.

One paire of bodies of white taffeta cut uppon Crimson, and bound with a Crimson & white Silke galloun.

²⁷ Defined by Arnold as "taffeta woven with tufts of velvet," see *Unlock'd*, 375.

FOLIO 5r

One Saveguard of Crimson and w^t Damaske, with buttons & lowpes [loops] of the same colour, and bound with the like galloun.

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: Delivered into the queens Chamber the 6th of december 1610 to M^{rs} Doratye [Dorothy]

One payre of bodies of white Satin, cutt with a bias cutt vppon white taffetay [taffeta], with a deere colour Silver Lace, in each Seame, and Lined with taffeta

One Saveguard of deer colour and white Chamblet, with deer colour & Silver buttons and Lowpes [loops], and bound with a Lace Suteable

One paire of white taffeta bodies, cut uppon green Sarcenet, and bound with a green and white galloun: and Lined with taffeta

One Saveguard of willowe colour and white damaske, with willowe colour and white buttons and Lowpes [loops]: and bound with the like galloun

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: Delivered into the queens Chamber to Mrs doraty [Dorothy] the 1&2[?] of december 1610

One dublett of Carnation cloth of Silver, trimmed in each Seame with a black Satten Lace: and lined with taffeta

One side skirt of black Satin cut with a carnation taffeta with a bias cut jagged,²⁸ with a black Sat Lace about

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: Given by Her Majesty to Mrs bridgett fenflowe the 23: of March 1610.²⁹

²⁸ According to Arnold, "a term describing strips of satin clipped at regular intervals, giving a tabbed effect, used to trim collar and wings. Later used as a term to for wings, and also to describe decoratively cut edges for hems and hanging sleeves. Also used as an alternative word for 'slash'." See, *Unlock'd*, 366.

²⁹ I have been unable to identify Bridget Fenslowe, see above, 170.

One paire of bodies of Crimson Satin pincked, with a black Satin Lace in each Seame, and Lined with taffeta

One side Skirt of black Satin pincked with a bordering of Crimson Satin above and belowe: Laid bias with a black Satin Lace.

One dublett of white Satin Laid in each Seame with a black Satten Lace, and pincked with a Jerken to it, made of black Satin Lace

Marginal note on the right in the second hand bracketed with the entry below: Given by her Majesty to Mrs Elizabeth Shawe the 6th october 1609.³⁰

One Skirt of black Satin pincked with 8 black Satin Laces about

Marginal note on the right in the second hand bracketed with the entry above: Given by her Majesty to Mrs Elizabeth Shawe the 6th october 1609.

One dublett of Seagreen Satin cut with a genialeen [gingerline]³¹ colour taffeta with a crose cut, Laid over the bodies and Sleeves, with a Silver bone Lace Spangled

One side skirt of black Satin cut with a genialeen colour taffeta uppon white Sarcenet, with a black Sat Lace about the Skirt.

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: Given by her Majesty to Mrs bridgett fenslowe the 23: marche 1610.

One payre of bodies of white cloth of Silver Striped with gould and worke of gould tissued with a gould and Silver purle Lace in each Seame

³⁰ Elizabeth Shaw was a Scottish woman of the Bedchamber to whom Anna gifted five gowns, one doublet, and one skirt as listed in this inventory, see above, 171, and Payne, "Aristocratic Women," appendix.

³¹ The colour of ginger, see "† 'gingerline, n." *OED Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press, accessed 10 October 2014. <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/Entry/78380?redirectedFrom=gingerline>

One Side Skirt of white Satin cut with a bias cutt, with a border above and belowe, of the like gold & Silver purple Lace.

One gowne of white taffeta with a plaine bias cut, uppon wachod [watchet] Sarcenet and bound with white galloun [galloon lace].

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: May 12.

FOLIO 5v

One gowne of white Satin: the bodies cut bias and raced between with small workes: the Side Skirt pincked & raced with a border about, & bound and Laid in each Seame with a Silk galloun.

One paier of bodies of white Satin, pincked; with a white Satin Lace in each Seame: and Lined with Sarcenet

One gowne of Ashcolour taffeta with a plaine bias cut uppon = orange colour taffeta Sarcenet, and bound in each Seame, with 2 Ashcolour galloun Laces.

Marginal note on the right in the second hand: May 12

One paire of bodies of Cloth of Silver, bound with a Silver Passement: and Lined with Sarcenet.

One gowne of white Satin, pincked: the uppermost part of the bodies and sleeves cut with carnation taffeta and raced between each Cutt.

One Side skirt cut with a border above and belowe, with the Same taffeta and raced between each cutt like the bodies: and bound with a Silk galloun.

One paier of bodies of white cloth of Silver Striped with gould in worke of carnation Silke: bound with a gould & Silver

Passement Lace, and Lined with Sarcenet.

One payer of bodies of white Satin, Striped with red silke and Silver, with a green taffeta uppon a white: and bound with Silver Passement: and Lined with green taffeta

One Skirt of black Satin cut with a bias jagge, with a green taffeta: with a black Satin Lace round about

One paire of bodies of Camerick [Cambric], with needle worke all over: with gould Slyer and Colour Silk, and Laid in each Seame, with a guard of white taffeta with gould & Silver bone Lace uppon it.

One Skirt of white Satin, pincked with 5 of the like gardes and bone Lace about, and Lined with white Sarcenet.

One paire of bodies of Silver Chamblett, with gould purple, Carnation and green flowers: and bound with a gold and Silver passement

One paire of bodies of Camerick [Cambric] embroydered with gold Silver and colour Silk: with a guard of Carnation Satin: and gould & Silver bone Lace in each Seame.

One Skirt of white Satin, cut with a bias jagge with a green upper orange taffeta Sarcenet, and one guard of the Same Satin & bone Lace.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

British Library, London

- Add MS 7082 Sir Edward Herbert's Book of Despatches, 1619
- Add MS 12501 Inventory of the Royal Jewelhouse, 1611
- Add MS 12498 Volume of the Collections made by Sir Julius Caesar: Covering Dates: 1603-1625
- Add MS 27404 Account of Sir George Carew, Receiver-General to Queen Anna, Michaelmas 1605 – Michaelmas 1606
- Harley MS 157 Household book for Queen Anna compiled in 1613/14
- Harley MS 5176 Creation of Charles as Prince of Wales: October 1616; Funeral Procession List of Queen Anna of Denmark: 1619
- King's MS 136 Household Wages and Costs: Anna of Denmark
- Lansdowne 165/31 Queen Anne of Denmark's Debts owing to Diverse Creditors and Artificers of London, 1611
- Royal App 68 Inventory of Jewels delivered to the Charge and Custody of Mary Radcliffe, Gentlewoman of the Queen's Privy Chamber: July 1587
- RP MS 8877 Inventory of Clothing and Apparel with recipients, given by Anna of Denmark to the mourners in her Household for the funeral of Henry, Prince of Wales
- RP MS 9392 Accounts Sheet of Expenditure for Sandsfoot Castle including order for payment for work on Anna of Denmark's new Garden at Greenwich: Covering Dates: July 1610
- Stowe MS 547 Structure of the Household and Oath: Anna of Denmark
- Stowe MS 557 Book of garments, jewels, silks and other stuff remaining in the office of the Garderobe of Robes, 1600
- Stowe MS 560 Inventory of the Jewels, Plate, and other Goods of the Late Mary, Queen of Scots, 1587

Cambridge University Library, Cambridge

Dd.I.26 Wardrobe Inventory of Anna of Denmark

East Sussex Record Office, Lewes

Glynde MS 314 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: Undated

Glynde MS 315 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: October 1616

Glynde MS 316 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: 7 October 1617

Glynde MS 317 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: 7 October 1617

Glynde MS 319 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: 7 October 1617

Glynde MS 320 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: 7 October 1617

Glynde MS 321 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: Undated

Glynde MS 322 Inventory of Oatlands Palace: 7 October 1618

The National Archives, London

AO 1/2487/356 Auditors of the Imprest: Declared Accounts: Roll 356 I. Accounts of Jones, Surveyor at Greenwich and Oatlands: 8 October 1616 – 30 April 1618

AO 1/2485/344 Auditors of the Imprest: Declared Accounts: Roll 344: Sir J. Trevor. Works and Repairs at Oatlands Park: 10 August 1616 – September 1618

AO 1/388/45 Auditors of the Imprest: Declared Accounts: Roll 45: J. Lord Stanhope: 29 September 1607 – 29 September 1608

E 351/3389 Works and Buildings: Jones, Surveyor at Greenwich and Oatlands: 8 October 1616 – 30 April 1618

E 101/434/10 Wardrobe and Household: Account of Lord Knyvett of Expenses on Behalf of the Queen

E101/437/8 King's Remembrancer: Wardrobe and Household: Part of an Account of the Queen's Household: 1603-1625

E101/433/8 King's Remembrancer: Wardrobe and Household: Account Book of the Privy Purse and Robes of Prince Henry: March 1608 - March 1610

E351/3145 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Great Wardrobe: March 1603 – March 1604

E351/3238 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1602 – September 1603

E351/3239 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1603 – September 1604

E351/3240 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1604 – September 1605

E351/3241 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1605 – September 1606

E351/3242 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1606 – September 1607

E351/3243 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1607 – March 1609

E351/3244 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: April 1609 – September 1610

E351/3245 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1610 – September 1611

E351/3246 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1611 – September 1612

E351/3247 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1612 – September 1613

E351/3248 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1613 – September 1614

E351/3249 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1614 – September 1615

E351/3250 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1615 – September 1616

E351/3251 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1616 – September 1617

E351/3252 Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1617 – September 1618

E351/3253	Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: October 1619 – September 1620
E351/3389	Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts: Works and Buildings: Inigo Jones at Greenwich and Oatlands: October 1616 – April 1618
LC9/94	Lord Chamberlain's Department: Great Wardrobe: Yearly Accounts: 1605 - 1606
LC9/95	Lord Chamberlain's Department: Great Wardrobe: Yearly Accounts: 1606 - 1607
LC9/96	Lord Chamberlain's Department: Great Wardrobe: Yearly Accounts: 1613 - 1614
LC9/97	Lord Chamberlain's Department: Great Wardrobe: Yearly Accounts: 1614 – 1615
LR2/121	Office of the Auditors of Land Revenue: Inventory of Wardrobe of Queen Anna taken by George Carew by her Commission: 13 April 1611
LR2/122	Accounts and Vouchers of George Heriot, taken by Auditor Povey as ordered by warrant of Lord Chief Justice Coke, 16 February 1616. Covering dates 1605-1615
LR6/154/9	Office of the Auditors of Land Revenue: Receivers' Accounts: Miscellaneous. Queen Anna's Jointure: Declaration of Receiver-General's Account. Covering Dates: June 1603 – September 1605
LS13/280	Lord Steward's Department: Household: Original Papers of Sir Julius Caesar: March 1603- March 1625
SC6/JASI/1646	Possessions of Queen Anna. Declaration of Receiver-General's Account. Covering Dates: 1605
SC6/JASI/1648	Possessions of Queen Anna. Declaration of Receiver-General's Account. Covering Dates: 1607
SC6/JASI/1650	Possessions of Queen Anna. Declaration of Receiver-General's Account. Covering Dates: 1615
SC6/JASI/1653	Possessions of Queen Anna. Declaration of Receiver-General's Account. Covering Dates: 1617

SC6/JASI/1655	Possessions of Queen Anna. Declaration of Receiver-General's Account. Covering Dates: 1618
SP14/1	Warrant to Sir John Fortescue, Master of the Wardrobe... for the Service of the Queen in the Closet: May? 1603
SP14/2	Order of Proceeding at the Coronation of King James: July? 1603
SP14/12	Copy of the King to the Council: 9 January 1605
SP14/14	Account of Privy Seals, paid and unpaid, issued for the Queen: 29 June 1605; Note of the Total Expenditure of the Queen: June? 1605
SP14/36	Note of Charges of Buildings and repairs done at Somerset House since 1 October 1607: September 1608
SP14/36	John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton: 27 September 1608.
SP14/38	Note of the Expenses of the Repairs at Somerset House since 1 May 1607: 31 December 1608
SP14/40	The Lord Treasurer to the Officers of Customs of the Port of London: Undated, 1608?
SP14/44	Memorandum of Charges of the Works at Somerset House for the Last Year: 16 March 1609
SP14/45	Particulars of Works and Repairs at Somerset House: 1 May 1606
SP14/48	Charges of Works on Somerset House since 1 October 1608: 30 September 1609
SP14/53	Warrant to George Heriot for a Jewel for Jane Mewtas
SP14/54	Charge of the Works at Somerset House, since March 1609: 31 May 1610
SP14/55	Charges of the Works, &c., done at Somerset House from 1 May 1609, to 31 May 1610: 19 June 1610
SP14/62	Estimate of the Charges of Works intended to be done at Somerset House: 16 March 1611
SP14/62	Charges of Reparations at Somerset House, from May 1609 to February 1610: 16 March 1611

- SP14/64 Charges of the Day Wages, Provisions and Materials for the Works at Somerset House for the month of June: June 1611
- SP14/65 Charges of the Day Wages and Provisions for the Works at Somerset House for July: July 1611
- SP14/63 Note of Jewels of the Secret Jewel House in the Tower remaining with the Queen: 8 May 1611
- SP14/67 Jane Drummond to Salisbury: November 1611
- SP14/75 Statement of Grants of Offices and Lands made to Thomas Sheffield and Lord [Northampton?] in Greenwich: Dec? 1613
- SP14/75 Earl of Northampton to Thomas Lake: 9 December 1613
- SP14/75 Earl of Northampton to Thomas Lake: 11 December 1613
- SP14/77 Chamberlain to Carleton: 30 June 1614
- SP14/77 Archbishop Abbot to Carleton: 28 July 1614
- SP14/80 The Queen [Anna] to Sir John Spilman: February 1615
- SP14/86 Analysis of the Queen's Revenue and Proposed Expenditure, leaving £9,000 a year for discharge of her debts: 24 March 1616
- SP14/86 Orders by the Queen for her Receiver to give an Account of the Money in his hands, and gather in her debts and the £2,000 fines for the copyholds of Spalding and Gedney, &c.: 24 March 1616
- SP14/86 Plan devised by Sir Edward Coke for payment of the Queen's Debts, by raising her revenues on copyholds, &c.: March? 1616
- SP14/107 Chamberlain to Carleton: 6 March 1619; Edmondess to Carleton: 17 March 1619
- SP14/109 Chamberlain to Carleton: 14 May 1619
- SP14/139 Warrant to Sir Thomas Edmondess: 11 March 1623
- SP14/141 Confirmation to Earl of Northampton of the Office of Keeper of Greenwich Park, and the Herbage and Pannage of the Same: 20 December 1613

The Royal College of Physicians, London

MS 444

Original Book of Cases and Consultations of Sir Théodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573-1655)

Printed Primary Sources

Aristotle, *The Nichomachean Ethics*. Edited by Hugh Tredennick, translated by J. A. K. Thomson. Revised ed., London: Penguin, 2004.

Calendar[s] of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reigns of... James I, preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. Vols.8-10 (1603-1619). Edited by Mary Everett Green, London: HMSO, 1857-1858.

Calendar[s] of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English Affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy. Vol. 10 (1603-1607); Vol. 11 (1607-1610); and Vol. 12 (1610-1613). Edited by Horatio F. Brown. London: HMSO, 1900, 1904, 1905; Vols. 12-15 (1613-1619). Edited by Allen B. Hinds. London: HMSO, 1907-1909.

Calendar[s] of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603. Vol. 10 (1589-1593). Edited by William Kenneth Boyd and Henry W. Meikle. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1936.

Calendar[s] of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs, Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas. Vol. 3 (1580-1586). Edited by Martin A. S. Hume. London: HMSO, 1896.

Acheson, Katherine. *The Diary of Anne Clifford, 1616-1619: A Critical Edition*. New York: Garland, 1995.

Akrigg, G. P. V. ed. *Letters of King James VI and I*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Birch, Thomas. *The Court and Times of James I*. 2 vols. London, 1849, reprint, 1973.

Collins, Arthur (ed.). *Letters and Memorials of State in the reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James ... Written and collected by Sir Henry Sydney*. 2 vols, London, 1746; facsimile edition, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1978.

Devon, Frederick. *Issues of the Exchequer, Being Payments Made out of His Majesty's Revenues During the Reign of King James I*. London: J. Rodwell, 1836.

Dietz, Frederick C. *English Public Finances 1558-1641*. 2 edn., vol. 2, London: Frank Cass, 1964.

Ellis, Henry, ed. *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*. 3 vols, 1824, repr., London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1969.

- John Finet, *Finetti Philoxenis: som choice observations of Sr. John Finett knight, and master of the ceremonies to the two last Kings touching the reception, and precedence, the treatment and audience, the puntillios and contests of forren ambassadors in England*. London: Printed by T.R. for H. Twyford and G. Bedell, 1656, online edition, *Early English Books Online*, STC T202:E.1602[1]
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, ed. *Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty*, Camden Society, vol. 101: Printed for the Camden Society, 1869.
- . *The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War*. 10 vols., London, 1883-84.
- Hone, W. *The Every Day Book*. London, 1830.
- James VI and I. *Basilikon dōron. Or His Maiesties instructions to his dearest sonne, Henrie the prince*. London: Imprinted by Richard Field, for John Norton, according to the copie printed at Edenburgh, 1603, online edition, *Early English Books Online*.
- Jonson, Ben. *A Challenge at Tilt* [in, the *Workes of Beniamin Jonson*]. London: Imprinted ... by Will Stansby, 1616, online edition, *Literature Online* (Proquest). STC (2nd ed.) 14752
- Lee, Maurice Jr., ed. *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1972.
- Lemon, R. "Warrant of Indemnity and Discharge to Lionel Earl of Middlesex, Lord High Treasurer, and to Other Commissioners of the Jewels... Dated July 7, 1623." *Archaeologia XXI* (1827): 148-57.
- Lodge, Edmund. *Illustrations of British History, Biography and Manner... &c*. Vol. 3. London: sold by G. Nicol, Bookseller to his Majesty, Pall-Mall, 1791, online edition, *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* (Gale CENGAGE Learning). STC T148778.
- Maclean, John (ed.). *Letters from George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, Ambassador to the Court of the Great Mogul, 1615-1617*. Vol.78, Camden Society, Old Series, 1860, Reprint 1968.
- McIlwain, Charles Howard (ed.). *The Political Works of James I*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- Madden, Frederic. *Privy Purse Expenses of the Princess Mary, Daughter of King Henry the Eighth Etc*. London: W. Pickering, 1831, online edition, *The Making of the Modern World* (Gale CENGAGE Learning).
- Milles, Thomas. *The Catalogue of Honour or Tresury of True Nobility. Peculiar and Proper to the Isle of Great Britaine*. London: Printed by William Iaggard, 1610, online edition, *Early English Books Online*. STC (2nd ed.) 17926
- McClure, Norman Egbert, ed. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939.

- Nichols, J. *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*. 4 vols., London J. B. Nichols, 1828.
- Owen, G. Dyfnallt, ed. *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury*. vol. XXIV, Historical Manuscripts Commission. London: HMSO, 1976.
- Palgrave, Sir Francis. *Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of the Exchequer*. 2 vols. London, 1836.
- Paton, Henry, ed. *Supplementary Report on the Manuscripts of Mar and Kellie, preserved at Alloa house, Clackmannanshire*. London: HMSO, 1930.
- Petti, Anthony, ed. *The Letters of Richard Verstegan*. Vol. 52. Catholic Record Society, 1959.
- Pitcher, John, ed. *Hymen's Triumph*. Oxford: Published for the Malone Society by Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Row, John. *The History of the Kirk of Scotland, from the Year 1558 to August 1637*. Edinburgh: Printed for the Wodrow Society, 1842.
- Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State...etc*. Vol. 1. London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb for George Thompson, 1721, online edition, *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* (Gale CENGAGE Learning). STC N033525.
- Rye, William Brenchley. *England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First*. London: J. R. Smith, 1865.
- Sawyer, Edmund. *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James...&c*. 3 vols., London: printed by W. B. for T. Ward, 1725, online edition, *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, (Gale CENGAGE Learning). STC T149866.
- Steen, Sara Jayne, ed. *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart. Women Writers in English 1350-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Stow, John, George Buck, and Edmund Howes. *The Annales, or a Generall Chronicle of England...&c*. Londini: Printed by Thomas Dawson impensis Thomæ Adams, 1615, online edition, *Early English Books Online*. STC 23338.
- Walker, P. and A. Macdonald (eds.). *Letters to King James the Sixth from the Queen, Prince Henry, Prince Charles, the Princess Elizabeth and her Husband*. Vol. 35, Edinburgh: The Maitland Club, 1835.
- Williams Jr., Franklin. B. *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1962. STC 11099.
- Wilson, Arthur. *The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of King James I, Relating to What Passed From His First Access to the Crown, to His Death*. London: Printed for Richard Lownds, 1653, online edition, *Early English Books Online*. STC Wing W2888.

Wither, George. *A Collection of Emblemes, 1635*. English Emblem Books, No 12. Menston: Scolar P., 1968.

Whitney, Geoffrey. *A Choice of Emblemes, and Other Deuises*. Imprinted at Leyden: In the house of Christopher Plantyn, by Francis Raphelengius, 1586, online edition, *Early English Books Online*. STC (2nd ed.) 25438.

Secondary Sources

Aasand, Hardin. "‘To Blanch an Ethiop, and Revive a Corse’: Queen Anne and The Masque of Blackness." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 32 (1992): 271-85.

Akerman, Susanna. *Queen Christina of Sweden and Her Circle: The Transformation of a Seventeenth-Century Philosophical Libertine*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991.

Akkerman, Nadine. "The Goddess of the Household: The Masquing Politics of Lucy Harington-Russell, Countess of Bedford." In *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe*, edited by Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, 287-309. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Akrigg, G. P. V. "England in 1609." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 14 (1950): 75-94.

Anderson, Michael, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen, and Hugo Johannsen, eds. *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective*. vol. 16, Publications from the National Museum Studies in Archaeology & History. Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark, 2011.

Arnold, Janet. "Lost from Her Majesties Back." *Costume Society* 7 (1980): 9-91.

———. *Queen Elizabeth’s Wardrobe Unlock’d: The Inventories of the Wardrobe of Robes Prepared in July 1600*. Leeds: Maney, 1988.

Ashbee, Andrew. *Records of English Court Musicians*. Vol. IV (1603-1625). Snodland, Kent: A. Ashbee, 1991.

Ashley, Maurice. *The House of Stuart: Its Rise and Fall*. London: J M Dent & Sons Ltd., 1981.

Auerbach, Erna. *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth*. London: The Athlone Press, 1954.

———. *Nicholas Hilliard*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

Barkan, Leonard. "Diana and Actaeon: The Myth as Synthesis." *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 317-59.

Barroll, J. Leeds. "The Court of the First Stuart Queen." In *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, edited by Linda Levy Peck, 191-208. Cambridge: University Press, 1991.

- . "Theatre as Text: The Case of Queen Anna and the Jacobean Court Masque." *Elizabethan Theatre* 14 (1996): 175-93.
- . "Inventing the Stuart Masque." In *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, edited by David Bevington and Peter Holbrook, 121-43. Cambridge: University Press, 1998.
- . *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography*. Philadelphia: University Press, 2001.
- Barton, Anne. "Harking Back to Elizabeth: Ben Jonson and Caroline Nostalgia," *English Literary History* 48 (1981): 706-31.
- Bartram, Graham. "The Story of Scotland's Flags," *Proceedings of the XIX International Congress of Vexillology*. York, 2001.
- . *British Flags and Emblems*. Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press, 2004.
- Beard, Geoffrey W. *Upholsterers and Interior Furnishing in England, 1530-1840*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Bell, Jessica. "The Three Marys: The Virgin; Marie de Médicis; and Henrietta Maria." In *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, edited by Erin Griffey, 89-114. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.
- Bellamy, Alastair. *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News, Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellesheim, Canon Alphons. *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland, from the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Day*, IV vols. Vol. III, Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1889.
- Bencard, Mogens. "Ebony and Silver Furniture at Frederiksborg Castle." In *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective*, edited by Michael Anderson, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen and Hugo Johannsen, 325-335. Copenhagen: National Museum, 2011.
- Bergeron, David. *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991.
- . "Masculine Interpretation of Queen Anna, Wife of James I." In *Practicing Renaissance Scholarship: Plays and Pageants, Patrons and Politics*, edited by David Bergeron, 87-100. Pittsburgh: University Press, 2000.
- Birrell, T. A. *English Monarchs and their Books: from Henry VII to Charles II*. London: British Library, 1987.
- Blain, Virginia, Patricia Clements, and Isobel Grundy, eds. *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English: Women Writers from the Middle Ages to the Present*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1990.
- Blakiston, Noel. "Nicholas Hilliard: Some Unpublished Documents." *BMC* 89 (1947): 187-189.

- Bliss, W. "The Religious Belief of Anne of Denmark." *EHR* 4 (1889): 110.
- Bold, John. *Greenwich: An Architectural History of the Royal Hospital for Seamen and the Queen's House*. London: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Bracken, Susan. "'Chyna' in England before 1614." *Oriental Art* 47 (2001): 8-10.
- Britland, Karen. *Drama at the Courts of Henrietta Maria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Butler, Martin. *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Calderwood, David. *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*. Edited by Thomas Thomson. Edinburgh: Woodrow Society, 1844.
- Campbell, Lorne. *The Early Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Carter, Alison. "Mary Tudor's Wardrobe." *Costume* 17 (1984): 9-28.
- Cerasano S. P. and Marion Wynne-Davies. *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
- Chadwick, Hubert. "Crypto-Catholicism, English and Scottish." *The Month* 178 (1942): 388-401.
- Chambers, Edmund Kerchever. *The Elizabethan Stage*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- . *Sir Henry Lee: An Elizabethan Portrait*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.
- Chettle, George H. *The Queen's House, Greenwich*. London: National Maritime Museum, 1937.
- Chew, Elizabeth. "The Countess of Arundel and Tart Hall." In *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, edited by Edward Chaney. Studies in British Art, 285-315. New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Claxton, Juliet. "The Countess of Arundel's Dutch Pranketing Room: 'An Inventory of All the Parcels or Purselin, Glasses and Other Goods Now Remayning in the Pranketing Roome at Tart Hall, 8th Sept 1641'." *JHC* 22 (2010): 187-96.
- Cocks, Anne Somers. "The Status and Making of Jewellery, 1500-1630." In *Princely Magnificence: Court Jewels of the Renaissance 1500-1630*, edited by Anne Somers Cocks, 3-7. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1980.
- Collins, A. Jefferies. *Jewels and Plate of Queen Elizabeth I: The Inventory of 1574*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955.

- Colvin, Howard M. *The History of the King's Works*. Vol. IV (1485-1660). London: H.M.S.O, 1982.
- Coombs, Katherine. *The Portrait Miniature in England*. London: Victoria and Albert Publications, 1998.
- Cooper, Tarnya. *Citizen Portrait: Portrait Painting and the Urban Elite of Tudor and Jacobean England and Wales*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- . "Elizabethan Portraiture: Taste, Style and Patronage." In *Elizabeth I and her People*, exhibition catalogue, edited by Sarah Ruddick, 10-20. London: National Portrait Gallery, 2013.
- Considine, John. "Grey, Elizabeth, Countess of Kent (1582–1651)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, October 2006.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/11530>.
- Cogswell, Thomas. "England and the Spanish Match." In *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, edited by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, 107-33. London and New York: Longman, 1989.
- Coward, Barry. *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714*, 3rd edn., Harlow and London: Longman, 2003.
- Cramsie, John. *Kingship and Crown Finance under James VI and I, 1603-1625*. Woodbridge, U.K.; Rochester, NY: The Boydell Press for The Royal Historical Society, 2002.
- Cressy, David. "Private Lives, Public Performance and Rites of Passages." In *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, edited by Betty Travitsky and Adele Seeff, 187-98. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1994.
- Croft, J. Pauline. "Robert Cecil and the Early Jacobean Court." In *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, edited by Linda Levy Peck, 134-48. Cambridge: University Press, 1991.
- . "Introduction." In *Patronage, Culture, and Power: The Early Cecils*, edited by Pauline Croft, ix-xxi. New Haven and London: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art; the Yale Center for British Art by Yale University Press, 2002.
- . *King James*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- . "Howard, Thomas, 1st earl of Suffolk (1561–1626)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/13942>
- . "Somerset, Edward, fourth earl of Worcester (c.1550–1628)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2007.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/26005>

- . “*Rex Pacificus*, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain.” In *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, edited by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence, 140-155. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Croft-Murray, Edward. *Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837*. London: Country Life, 1962.
- Cuddy, Neil. “The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of James I, 1603–1625.” In *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, edited by David Starkey, 173-225. London: Longman, 1987.
- Cumming, Valerie. “The Trousseau of Princess Elizabeth Stuart.” In *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies in London Archaeology and History Presented to Ralph Merrifield*, edited by Joanna Bird, Hugh Chapman and John Clark, 315-28. London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1978.
- . *A Visual History of Costume: The Seventeenth Century*. New York: Drama Book Publishers, 1984.
- . “‘Great Vanity and Excesse in Apparell.’ Some Clothing and Furs of Tudor and Stuart Royalty.” In *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, edited by Arthur MacGregor, 322-50. London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Cust, Richard. *Charles I: A Political Life*. Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Longman, 2005.
- Davidson, Peter, and Thomas M. McCoog. “Father Robert’s Convert: The Private Catholicism of Anne of Denmark.” *Times Literary Supplement* 5095 (2000): 16-17.
- Davies, C. S. L. and John Edwards. “Katherine (1485–1536).” In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2011.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/4891>
- Davies, Godfrey. *The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- Dobson, Michael and Nicola J. Watson. *England’s Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy*. Oxford: University Press, 2002.
- Doran, Susan. “James VI and the English Succession.” In *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, edited by Ralph Houlbrooke, 25-43. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.
- ., and Thomas S. Freeman. “Introduction.” In *The Myth of Elizabeth*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, 1-27. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

- Edgcumbe, Richard. "O, Those Jewels! The Pride and Glory of This Kingdom!." In *Tudors, Stuarts and the Russian Tsars*, edited by Olga Dmitrieva and Tessa Murdoch, 144-57. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2013.
- Edmond, Mary. "New Light on Jacobean Painters." *BM* 118 (1976): 74-7.
- . *Hilliard and Oliver: the Lives and Works of Two Great Miniaturists*. London: R. Hale, 1983.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Court Society*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. New York: Pantheon Books, 1983.
- ffolliott, Sheila. "Casting a Rival into the Shade: Catherine De' Medici and Diane De Poitiers." *Art Journal* 48 (1989): 138-43.
- Filipczak, Zirka Zaremba. "Portraits of Women Who 'Do Not Keep Strictly to the Masculine and Feminine Genders, as They Call Them'." In *Pokerfaced: Flemish and Dutch Baroque Faces Unveiled*, edited by Katlijne Van der Stighelen, Hannelore Magnus and Bert Watteeuw, 229-49. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2010.
- Fincham, Kenneth. "Abbot, George (1562–1633)." In *ODNB*, edited H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2011. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/4>
- ., and Peter Lake. "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I." *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985): 169-207.
- Finsten, Jill. *Isaac Oliver: Art at the Courts of Elizabeth I and James I*. 2 vols, New York: AMS, 1981.
- Fisher, N. R. R. "The Queenes Courte in her Councill Chamber at Westminster." *EHR* 108 (1993): 314-37.
- Forsyth, Hazel. *The Cheapside Horde: London's Lost Jewels*. London: Museum of London, 2013.
- Fradenburg, Louise Olga. *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Fraser, Antonia. *Faith and Treason: The Story of the Gunpowder Plot*. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Friedman, Alice T. "Architecture, Authority, and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Country House." *Assemblage* 18 (1992): 40-61.
- Fry, Cynthia. "Perceptions of Influence: The Catholic Diplomacy of Queen Anna and Her Ladies, 1601-1604." In *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe*, edited by Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, 267-86. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

- Frye, Susan. "Anne of Denmark and the Historical Contextualisation of Shakespeare and Fletcher's Henry VIII." In *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700*, edited by James Daybell, 181-93. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.
- Furdell, Elizabeth. *The Royal Doctors, 1485-1714: Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2001.
- Furgol, Edward. "Montgomery, Alexander, sixth Earl of Eglinton (1588–1661)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, October 2009.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/19053>
- Gerard, Robert A., and Antony Griffiths. *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689*. London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Press, 1998.
- Gibson, A., and T. C. Smout. *Prices, Food, and Wages in Scotland, 1550-1780*. Cambridge: University Press, 1995.
- Glanville, Philippa. *Silver in Tudor and Early Stuart England*. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1990.
- Girouard, Mark. "The Smythson Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects." *Architectural History* 5 (1962): 21-184.
- . *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- . *Elizabethan Architecture: Its Rise and Fall 1540-1640*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press for The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2009.
- Goodare, Julian. "Livingstone, Alexander, first Earl of Linlithgow (d. 1621)." In *ODNB*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/16801>
- . "The Attempted Scottish Coup of 1596." In *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, edited by Julian Goodare and Alasdair MacDonald, 311-37. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Griffey, Erin. "Introduction." In *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, edited by Erin Griffey, 1-11. Aldershot, Eng., Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- . "Devotional Jewellery in Portraits of Henrietta Maria." In *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, edited by Erin Griffey, 165-94. Aldershot, Eng., Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- . "A Brief Description: the Language of Stuart Inventories," Florence: *Studi di Memofonte* 12 (2014), online publication.
- . *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Majesty at the Stuart Court*. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, forthcoming.

- Hackenbroch, Yvonne. *Renaissance Jewellery*. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1979.
- Hall, Kim. F. "Sexual Politics and Cultural Identity in The Masque of Blackness." In *The Performance of Power: Theatrical Discourse and Politics*, edited by Sue-Ellen Case and Janelle Reinelt, 3-18. Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1991.
- . *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Hamling, Tara. *Decorating the 'Godly' Household: Religious Art in Post-Reformation Britain*. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2010.
- Harris, Barbara J. "Women and Politics in Early Tudor England." *The Historical Journal* 33 (1990): 259-81.
- . *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers*. Oxford: University Press, 2002.
- Harris, John. "Inigo Jones and His French Sources." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 19 (1961): 253-64.
- . "Inigo Jones and the Courtier Style." *Architectural Review* 154 (1973): 17-24.
- ., Stephen Orgel, and Roy Strong. *The King's Arcadia. Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court: A Quatercentenary Exhibition Held at the Banqueting House, Whitehall, from July 12th to September 2nd, 1973*. London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1973.
- . "Disneyland in Greenwich: The Restoration of the Queen's House." *Apollo* 122 (1990): 256-60.
- ., and Gordon Higgott. *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings*. London; New York: Harper & Row, 1989.
- Hawkins, E., A. W. Franks, and H. A. Grueber, eds. *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*. 4 vols. Vol. 1. London: British Museum, 1885.
- Haynes, Alan. *The Gunpowder Plot: Faith in Rebellion*. Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1994.
- Hayward, John. "The Arnold Lulls Book of Jewels and the Court Jewellers of Anne of Denmark." *Archaeologia* (Second Series), 108 (1986): 227-37.
- Hayward, Maria. "Crimson, Scarlet, Murrey and Carnation: Red at the Court of Henry VIII." *Textile History* 38 (2007): 135-50.
- . *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*. Leeds, U.K.: Maney Pub., 2007.
- Hearn, Karen, ed. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530–1630*. London: Tate Britain, 1995.
- . *Marcus Gheeraerts II: Elizabethan Artist*. London: Tate Publishing, 2002.

- ., and Lynn Hulse. *Lady Anne Clifford: Culture, Patronage and Gender in Seventeenth-Century Britain*. Yorkshire: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 2009.
- Heiberg, Steffen, ed. *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe, Denmark*. Herning: Paul Kristensen Grafisk Virksomhed, 1988.
- Henderson, Paula. "Secret Houses and Garden Lodges: The Queen's House, Greenwich, in Context." *Apollo* 148 (1997): 29-35.
- . *The Tudor House and Garden: Architecture and Landscape in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries*. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2005.
- Hibbard, Caroline. "The Role of a Queen Consort: The Household and Court of Henrietta Maria, 1625–1642." In *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility*, edited by Ronald Asch and Adolf Birke, 393-414. Oxford: University Press, 1991.
- . "Translating Royalty: Henrietta Maria and the Transition from Princess to Queen." *The Court Historian* 5 (2000): 15-28.
- . "Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in 'Ancien Regime' Courts." In *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, edited by Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, 92-110. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- . "'By Our Direction and for Our Use': The Queen's Patronage of Artists and Artisans Seen through Her Household Accounts." In *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, edited by Erin Griffey, 115-39. Aldershot, Eng., Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- Hicks, Friar Leo. "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part I." *Recusant History* 5 (1961): 91-127.
- . "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part II." *Recusant History* 5 (1961): 184-222.
- . "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part III." *Recusant History* 6 (1962): 163-95.
- . "The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603, Part IV." *Recusant History* 7 (1963): 50-81.
- Higgott, Gordon. "The Design and Setting of Inigo Jones's Queen's House, 1616-40." *The Court Historian* 11 (2006): 135-49.
- Hind, Arthur Mayger. *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: The Reign of James I*. 3 vols. Vol. 2, Cambridge: University Press, 1955.
- . *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: The Tudor Period, 1552-64*. 3 vols. Vol. 1, Cambridge: University Press, 1952.

- Honan, Park. "Wriothesley, Henry, third Earl of Southampton (1573-1624)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, September 2012.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/30073>
- Howard, Deborah. *The Architectural History of Scotland: Scottish Architecture from the Reformation to the Restoration, 1560-1660*. Edinburgh: University Press, 1995.
- Howarth, David. *Lord Arundel and His Circle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Hufton, Olwen. "Reflections of the Role of Women in the Early Modern Court." *The Court Historian* 5 (2000): 1-13.
- Hull, Suzanne. *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475-1640*. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982.
- Hulse, Lynn. Review of *Records of English Court Music, vol. IV (1603-1625)*, by Andrew Ashbee, *Music & Letters* 73 (1992): 101-103.
- Jardine, Lisa, and Alan Stewart. *Hostage to Fortune: The Troubled Life of Francis Bacon, 1561-1626*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1998.
- Jervis, Simon. "'Shadows, Not Substantial Things.' Furniture in the Commonwealth Inventories." In *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, edited by Arthur MacGregor, 277-306. London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. Cambridge: University Press, 2000.
- Jourdain, M. "Laces as Worn in England until the Accession of James I." *BMC* 10 (1906): 162-63+166-68.
- Kauffman, Thomas DaCosta. "Review of 'Christian IV and Europe'," *Konsthistorisk tidskrift*, Stockholm (1989).
- Keith, W. G. "The Palace of Oatlands." *Architectural Review* XXXIX (1916): 76-77.
- Kelly, F. M. "Shakespearian Dress Notes-Farthingales." *BMC* 29 (1916): 357-63.
- Kettering, Sharon. "Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France." *French History* 2 (1988): 131-151.
- King, Donald. "Textile Furnishings." In *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, edited by Arthur MacGregor, 307-21. London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Knowles, James. "'To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise': Anna of Denmark, Elizabeth I and the Images of Royalty." In *Women and Culture at the Courts*

- of the Stuart Queens*, edited by Clare McManus, 21-49. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Kraatz, Anne. *Lace: History and Fashion*. New York: Rizzoli, 1989.
- Lawrence, Cynthia, ed. *Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors, and Connoisseurs*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.
- Lawson, Jane. "This Remembrance of the New Year: Books Given to Queen Elizabeth as New Year's Gifts." In *Elizabeth I and the Culture of Writing*, edited by Peter Beal and Grace Ioppolo, 133-73. London: British Library, 2007.
- Lazzaro-Bruno, Claudia. "The Villa Lante at Bagnaia: An Allegory of Art and Nature." *Art Bulletin* (1977): 553-60.
- Lee, Maurice Jr. *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- . "Home, George, Earl of Dunbar (d.1611)." In *ODNB*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/13642>
- Legg, John Wickham, ed. *The Coronation Order of King James I*. London, 1902.
- Levey, Santina M. *Lace: A History*. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2001.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. "Lucy, Countess of Bedford: Images of a Jacobean Courtier and Patroness." In *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, 52-77. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- . *Writing Women in Jacobean England*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- . "Anne of Denmark and the Subversion of Masquing." *Criticism* 35 (1993): 341-55.
- Limon, Jerzy. *The Masque of Stuart Culture*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990.
- Lindley, David. "Embarrassing Ben: The Masques for Frances Howard." *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 343-59.
- Linthicum, Marie Channing. *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1972.
- Liungman, Carl. *Symbols: Encyclopaedia of Western Signs and Ideograms*. Stockholm: Ionfox AB, 2004.
- Lockhart, Paul Douglas. *Denmark, 1513-1660: The Rise and Decline of a Renaissance Monarchy*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause: Denmark's Role in the Wars of Religion, 1559-1596*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

- Lockyer, Roger. *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628*. London; New York: Longman, 1981.
- . *James VI and I*. London and New York: Longman, 1998.
- . *The Early Stuarts: A Political History of England 1603–1642*. 2nd ed., London and New York: Longman Publishers, 1999.
- . “Villiers, George, first Duke of Buckingham (1592–1628).” In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2011.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/28293>
- Loomie, Albert Joseph. “Toleration and Diplomacy: The Religious Issue in Anglo-Spanish Relations, 1603-1605.” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 53, New Series (1963): 1-60.
- . “King James I’s Catholic Consort.” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 34 (1971): 303-16.
- . *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics, 1603-1612*. Vol. I: Catholic Record Society, 1973.
- López, Ignacio and Iván Notario. *The Spanish Tercios, 1536-1704*. Oxford: Osprey, 2012.
- Lotz-Heumann, Ute. “Carew, George, earl of Totnes (1555–1629).” In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/4628>
- Lundkvist, Sven. “The Experience of Empire: Sweden as a Great Power.” In *Sweden’s Age of Greatness, 1632-1718*, edited by Michael Roberts, 20-58. London: Macmillan, 1973.
- Lynch, Michael. *Scotland: a New History*. London: Century, 1991.
- . “Court Ceremony and Ritual.” In *The Reign of James VI*, edited by Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch, 71-92. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
- MacGregor, Arthur. “The King’s Goods and the Commonwealth Sale: Materials and Context.” In *The Late King’s Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, edited by Arthur MacGregor, 13-52. London and Oxford: Alistair McAlpine in association with Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Mackenny, Richard. “‘A Plot Discover’d?’ Myth, Legend, and the ‘Spanish’ Conspiracy Against Venice in 1618.” In *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilisation of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*, edited by John Martin and Dennis Romano, 185-216. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Mackie, John Duncan. “The Secret Diplomacy of King James VI in Italy Prior to His Accession to the English Throne.” *SHR* 21 (1924): 267-82.

- . *Negotiations between James VI and I and Ferdinand, Duke of Tuscany*. Published for St. Andrews University by Oxford University Press, 1927.
- MacLeod, Catharine, Timothy Wilks, R. Malcolm Smuts, and Rab MacGibbon. *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012.
- Marshall, Rosalind, and George Dalglish, eds. *The Art of Jewellery in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1991.
- McCullough, Peter E. "Preaching to a Court Papist? Donne's Sermon before Queen Anne, December 1617." *John Donne Journal* 14 (1995): 59-81.
- . *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- McManus, Clare. *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court (1590-1619)*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- . "Memorialising Anna of Denmark's Court: Cupid's Banishment at Greenwich Palace." In *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, edited by Clare McManus, 81-101. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Meikle, Maureen. M. "'Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule of the House': Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Finances, 1589–1603." In *Women in Scotland, c.1100–c.1750*, edited by Elizabeth Ewan and Maureen M. Meikle, 105-11. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1999.
- . "A Meddlesome Princess: Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Politics, 1589-1603." In *The Reign of James VI*, edited by Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch, 126-40. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
- . "Anna of Denmark's Coronation and Entry into Edinburgh, 1590: Cultural, Religious and Diplomatic Perspectives." In *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, edited by Julian Goodare and Alasdair MacDonald, 277-94. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- ., and Helen Payne. "Anne (1574–1619)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/559>
- ., and Helen Payne. "From Lutheranism to Catholicism: The Faith of Anna of Denmark (1574–1619)." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 64 (2013): 45-69.
- Mercer, Eric. "The Decoration of the Royal Palaces from 1553-1625," *Archaeological Journal* 110 (1954): 150-163.
- Millar, Oliver. "A Little Known Portrait by Paul Van Somer." *BM* 92 (1950): 294-96.

- . "Abraham Van Der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I." *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 37 (1958): iii-256.
- . *The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. 2 vols. Vol. 1, London: Phaidon Press, 1963.
- . "Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger: A Sequel through Inscriptions." *BM* 105 (1963): 533-41.
- Montgomerie, A. "King James VI's Tocher Gude and a Local Authorities Loan of 1590." *SHR* 37 (1958): 11-16.
- Morgan, Luke. *Nature as Model: Salomon De Caus and Early Seventeenth-Century Landscape Design*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Neill, Michael. "'What Strange Riddle's This?': Deciphering 'Tis Pity She's a Whore.'" In *John Ford: Critical Re-Visions*, edited by Michael Neill, 153-81. Cambridge: University Press, 1988.
- Nelson, Jonathan, and Richard Zeckhauser. *The Patron's Payoff: Conspicuous Commissions in Italian Renaissance Art*. Princeton: University Press, 2008.
- Neville, Kristoffer. "Christian IV's Italianates: Sculpture at the Danish Court." In *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective*, edited by Michael Anderson, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen and Hugo Johannsen, 335-45. Copenhagen: National Museum, 2011.
- O'Connor, Desmond. "Florio, John (1553–1625)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/9758>
- Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Edited by Fiona McPherson. Oxford University Press, June 2014.
- Oman, Charles. *British Rings, 800-1914*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1974.
- Orgel, Stephen. *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge, England; New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Orr, Clarissa Campbell, ed. *Queenship in Europe, 1600–1815: the Role of the Consort*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Orrell, John. "The Agent of Savoy at the Somerset Masque." *The Review of English Studies* 28 (1977): 301-304.
- . "The London Stage in the Florentine Correspondence, 1604–1618." *Theatre Research International (New Series)*, 3 (1978): 157-76.
- . "The London Court Stage in the Savoy Correspondence, 1613–1675." *Theatre Research International (New Series)*, 4 (1979): 79-94.

- Parker, Geoffrey. *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659: the Logistics of Spanish Victory and Defeat in the Low Countries' Wars*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 2004.
- Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1981.
- Patterson, William. *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Payne, M. T. W. "An Inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark's 'Ornaments, Furniture, Householde Stuffe, and Other Parcell's' at Denmark House, 1619." *JHC* 13 (2001): 23-44.
- Peacock, John. "The Politics of Portraiture." In *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Stephen Zwicker, 215-26. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Pearson, Andrea, ed. *Women and Portraits in Early Modern Europe: Gender, Agency, Identity*. Aldershot, 2008.
- Peck, Linda Levy. "Court Patronage and Government Policy: The Jacobean Dilemma." In *Patronage in the Renaissance*, edited by Guy Lytle and Stephen Orgel, 27-46. Princeton: University Press, 1981.
- . *Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I*. London; Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1982.
- . "'For a King not to be bountiful were a fault': Perspectives on Court Patronage in Early Stuart England." *Journal for British Studies* 25 (1986): 31-61.
- . *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990.
- , ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: University Press, 2005.
- Perry, Curtis. *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice*. Cambridge: University Press, 1997.
- . "1603 and the Discourse of Favouritism." In *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, edited by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence, 155-177. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Pine, L. G. *A Dictionary of Mottoes*. London; Boston: Routledge and K. Paul, 1983.

- Plenkers, W. "Er Frederik II's datter Anna, Dronning af Storbritannien, gaaet over til Katholicismen?" ("Was Frederick II's Daughter Anna, Queen of Great Britain, a Convert to Catholicism?"), *Historisk Tidsskrift* vi/1 (1887–8): 403–25
- Pollnitz, Aysha. "Humanism and the Education of Henry, Prince of Wales." In *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, edited by Timothy Wilks, 22-64. London: Southampton University in Association with Paul Holberton Solent Publishing, 2007.
- Raatschen, Gudrun. "Merely Ornamental? Van Dyck's Portraits of Henrietta Maria." In *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, edited by Erin Griffey, 139-63. Aldershot, Eng., Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- Ravelhofer, Barbara. *The Early Stuart Masque: Dance, Costume and Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Reiss, Sheryl E., and David G. Wilkins, eds. *Beyond Isabella: Secular Women Patrons of Art in Renaissance Italy*. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2001.
- Reynolds, Anna. *In Fine Style: The Art of Tudor and Stuart Fashion*. London: Royal Collection Trust, 2013.
- Reynolds, Graham. *Costume of the Western World: Elizabethan and Jacobean, 1558-1625*. Edited by James Laver. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1951.
- . *British Portrait Miniatures*. Fitzwilliam Museum Handbooks. Cambridge: University Press, 1998.
- . *The Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Miniatures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. London: Royal Collection, 1999.
- Ribeiro, Aileen. *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Richards, Judith M. "The English Succession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England." *EHR* 117, no.472 (2002): 513-535.
- Rickard, Jane. *Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James VI and I*. Manchester: University Press, 2007.
- Riis, Thomas. *Should Auld Acquaintance Be Forgot...Scottish-Danish Relations c.1450-1707*. 2 vols. Odense: University Press, 1988.
- Roberts, Michael. *Gustavus Adolphus: A History of Sweden, 1611-1632*. 2 vols., vol. 1. London: Longmans, Green and co., 1958.
- Roper, Louis H. "Unmasquing the Connections between Jacobean Politics and Policy: The Circle of Anna of Denmark and the Beginning of the English Empire, 1614-18." In *'High and Mighty Queens' of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney and Debra Barrett-Graves, 45-59. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

- Rothenburg, Gunther. "Venice and the Uskoks of Senj: 1537-1618." *The Journal of Modern History* 33, no.2 (1961): 148-56.
- Rowse, A. L. *Shakespeare's Southampton: Patron of Virginia*. London: Macmillan, 1965.
- Russell, Conrad. "1603: The End of English National Sovereignty." In *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, edited by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence, 1-15. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Scarbrick, Diana. "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery: The Old and the New." *Apollo* 122 (1986): 228-36.
- . "Symbols of Rank and Riches, Jewellery in the Portraits at Woburn." *Country Life* 179 (1986): 254-56.
- . "Jewellery in Tudor and Jacobean Portraits at Newhaven." *Apollo* 127 (1987): 323-33.
- . *Jewellery: Makers, Motifs, History, Techniques*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1989.
- . "Anne of Denmark's Jewellery Inventory." *Archaeologia* 109 (1991): 193-238.
- . *Rings: Symbols of Wealth, Power, and Affection*. New York: Abrams, 1993.
- . *Jewellery in Britain, 1066-1837: A Documentary, Social, Literary and Artistic Survey*. Norwich: Michael Russell Publishing Ltd., 1994.
- . *Tudor and Jacobean Jewellery*. London: Tate Gallery Publication, 1995.
- . *Rings: Jewellery of Power, Love and Loyalty*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2007.
- . *Portrait Jewels: Opulence and Intimacy from the Medici to the Romanovs*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2011.
- Scott, Alison. *Selfish Gifts: The Politics of Exchange and English Courtly Literature, 1580-1628*. Madison N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006.
- Seymour, Reverend William Wood. *The Cross in Tradition, History, and Art*. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1898.
- Sharpe, Kevin, ed. *Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History*. London and New York: Methuen, 1978.
- . "Faction at the Early Stuart Court." *History Today* 33 (1983): 39-46.
- . *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies*. London and New York: Pinter, 1989.
- , and Peter Lake, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994.
- . *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England*. New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 2009.

- . *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Skovgaard, Joakim. *A King's Architecture: Christian IV and his Buildings*. London: H. Evelyn, 1973.
- Slater, Victor. "Herbert, William, third Earl of Pembroke (1580–1630)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/13058>
- Smith, David L. "Digby, John, first Earl of Bristol (1580–1653)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/7628>
- Smuts, R. Malcolm. "The Political Failure of Stuart Cultural Patronage." In *Patronage in the Renaissance*, edited by Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel, 165-87: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- . *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.
- . "Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: the English Royal Entry in London, 1485-1642." In *The First Modern Society: Essays in Honour of Lawrence Stone*, edited by A. L. Beier, David Cannadine, and James M. Rosenheim, 65-93. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I." In *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, edited by Linda Levy Peck, 99-112. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . "Art and the Material Culture of Majesty in Early Stuart England." In *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, edited by R. Malcolm Smuts, 86-112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- . "Material Culture, Metropolitan Influences and Moral Authority in Early Modern England." In *Material Culture and Cultural Materialisms in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, edited by Curtis Perry, 203-24. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.
- . "The Structure of the Court and the Roles of the Artist and Poet under Charles I." *The Court Historian* 9 (2004): 103-17.
- , and Melinda J. Gough. "Queens and the International Transmission of Political Culture." *The Court Historian* 10 (2005): 1-13.

- . "Religion, European Politics and Henrietta Maria's Circle, 1625-41." In *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, edited by Erin Griffey, 13-39. Aldershot, Eng., Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- Snook, Edith. *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England: a Feminist Literary History*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Spicer, Joaneath. "The Renaissance Elbow." In *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, edited by Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg, 84-128. London: Polity Press, 1991.
- Stafford, Helen Georgia. *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England*. New York: Appleton, 1940.
- Starkey, David. *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*. London; New York: Longman, 1987.
- , and Susan Doran. *Elizabeth: The Exhibition at the National Maritime Museum*. London: Chatto & Windus in association with the National Maritime Museum, 2003.
- Stegman, J. "Two Unpublished Paintings from the Collection of Charles I." *BM XCIX* (1957): 378-80.
- Stevenson, Father Joseph. "Gleanings among Old Records: III. Anne of Denmark, Queen of Great Britain." *The Month LXVI* (1879): 256-65.
- Stevenson, David. *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James IV and Anne of Denmark*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1997.
- Stewart, Alan. "The Early Modern Closet Discovered." *Representations* 50 (1995): 76-100.
- Stewart, Laura. "Politics and Government in the Scottish Burghs, 1603-1638." In *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, edited by Julian Goodare and Alasdair MacDonald, 427-50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Strickland, Agnes. *Lives of the Queens of England, from the Norman Conquest*. Bohn's Historical Library. New ed. 6 vols. Vol. 4, London: G. Bell, 1875.
- Strong, Roy. *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture*. London, New York: Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art, 1969.
- . *The Elizabethan Image: Painting in England, 1540-1620*. London: Tate Gallery, 1969.
- . *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*. 2 vols. Vol. 1, London: H.M.S.O., 1969.
- . *The Renaissance Garden in England*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1979.
- . *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered, 1520-1620*. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983.
- . *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. New York, N.Y.: Thames & Hudson, 1987.

- . *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography*. 3 vols. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK; Rochester, NY, USA: Boydell Press, 1995.
- . *The Artist and the Garden*. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2000.
- Sullivan, Mary Agnes. *Court Masques of James I: Their Influence on Shakespeare and the Public Theatres*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1973.
- Sykes, Susan Alexander. "Henrietta Maria's 'house of delight': French Influence and Iconography in the Queen's House, Greenwich." *Apollo* 133 (1991): 312-36.
- Tait, Hugh. *Catalogue of the Waddesdon Bequest in the British Museum*. London: British Museum Press, 1986.
- Thompson, Colin, and Lorne Campbell. *Hugo Van Der Goes and the Trinity Panels in Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: Trustees of the National Galleries of Scotland, 1974.
- Thomson, Duncan. *Painting in Scotland 1570-1650*. Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1975.
- Thornton, Peter. *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France and Holland*. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1978.
- Thurley, Simon. "Architecture and Diplomacy: Greenwich Palace under the Stuarts." *The Court Historian* 11 (2006): 125-35.
- . *Somerset House: The Palace of England's Queens, 1551-1692*. London: London Topographical Society Publication, 2009.
- Tomlinson, Sophie. *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama*. Cambridge: University Press, 2005.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "Spain and Europe, 1598-1621." In *The New Cambridge Modern History Volume 4: The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years War, 1609-1648/49*, edited by John Phillips Cooper, 260-82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Ungerer, Gustav. "Juan Pantoja De La Cruz and the Circulation of Gifts between the English and Spanish Courts, 1604-5." *Shakespearean Studies* 26 (1998): 145-86.
- Veevers, Erica. *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Vincent, Susan. "To Fashion a Self: Dressing in Seventeenth-Century England." *Fashion Theory* 3 (1999): 197-218.
- . *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England*. Oxford, UK; New York: Berg, 2003.
- Wade, Mara. *Triumphus Nupitalis Danicus. German Court Culture and Denmark: The Great Wedding of 1634*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.

- . “The Queen’s Courts: Anna of Denmark and Her Royal Sisters – Cultural Agency at Four Northern European Courts in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.” In *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, edited by Clare McManus, 49-81. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- , ed. *Pomp, Power and Politics: Essays on German and Scandinavian Court Culture and Their Contexts*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004.
- . “Duke Ulrik as Agent, Patron, Artist: Reframing Danish Court Culture in the International Perspective c.1600.” In *Reframing the Danish Renaissance: Problems and Prospects in a European Perspective*, edited by Michael Anderson, Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen and Hugo Johannsen, 243-63. Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark, 2011.
- . “Dynasty at Work: Danish Cultural Exchange with England and Germany at the time of the Palatine Wedding.” In *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival*, edited by Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, 479-514. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1993.
- Ward, Adolphus William. “James VI and the Papacy.” *SHR* 2 (1905): 249-52.
- . “Review of W. Plenkers, ‘Er Frederick II's Datter Anna, Dronning of Storbritannien, Gaaet over Til Katholicismen?’.” *EHR* 3 (1888): 795-98.
- Wardle, Patricia. “‘Divers Necessaries for His Majesty's Use and Service’: Seamstresses to the Stuart Kings.” *Costume* 31 (1997): 16-27.
- . “John Shepley (1575-1631), Embroiderer to the High and Mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales.” *Textile History* 32 (2001): 133-55.
- Warner, George. “James VI and Rome.” *EHR* 20 (1905): 124-27.
- White, Christopher. *The Later Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. London: Royal Collection Publications, 2007.
- Wilks, Timothy. “Art Collecting at the English Court from the Death of Henry, Prince of Wales to the Death of Anne of Denmark (November 1612– March 1619).” *JHC* 9 (1997): 31-48.
- Williams, E. Carleton. *Anne of Denmark*. London: Longman, 1971.
- Wolfson, Sara J. “The Female Bedchamber of Queen Henrietta Maria: Politics, Familial Networks and Policy, 1626-40.” In *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe*, edited by Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, 311-41. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Woodall, Joanna, ed. *Portraiture: Facing the Subject, Critical Introductions to Art*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Woolf, D. R. "Two Elizabeth's? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory." *Canadian Journal of History* 20 (1985): 167-91.

Wormald, Jenny. "James VI and I: Two Kings or One?" *History* 68 (1983): 187-209.

———. "James VI and I (1566–1625)." In *ODNB*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2011. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/article/14592>

Unpublished Theses and Papers

Chew, Elizabeth. "Female Art Patronage and Collecting in Seventeenth-Century Britain." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2000.

Doda, Hilary. "Of Crymsen Tissue: The Construction of a Queen. Identity, Legitimacy and the Wardrobe of Mary Tudor." MA diss., Dalhousie University, 2011.

Field, Jemma. "Anna of Denmark and the Politics of Religious Identity at the Jacobean Court (1603-1619)." Unpublished paper, 2014.

Fink, Mary. "Anne of Denmark: The Character and Influence of James I's Queen Consort." MA diss., The University of Mississippi, 1977.

Goldsmith, Joan Barbara. "All the Queen's Women: The Changing Place and Perception of Aristocratic Women in Elizabethan England, 1558-1620." PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1987.

Hallam, Jennifer L. "Re-Presenting Women in Early Stuart England: Gender Ideology, Personal Politics and the Portrait Arts." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2004.

Hearn, Karen. "Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford as Art Patron and Collector." MA Report, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1990.

Juhala, Amy L. "The Household and Court of King James VI of Scotland, 1567–1603." PhD diss., The University of Edinburgh, 2000.

Middaugh, Karen Lee. "'The Golden Tree': The Court Masques of Queen Anna of Denmark." PhD diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1994.

Payne, Helen. "Aristocratic Women and the Jacobean Court, 1603–1625." PhD diss., University of London, 2001.

Smuts, R. Malcolm. "England, Scotland and the Battle over Erastian Episcopacy." Unpublished paper, 2014.

Shifrin, Susan. "'A Copy of My Countenance': Biography, Iconography, and Likeness in the Portraits of the Duchess Mazarin and Her Circle." PhD diss., Bryn Mawr College, 1998.

Thomas, Courtney Erin. "Queen Anna of Denmark: Social Roles, Political Agency and Gender Expectations at the Jacobean Court, 1603-1619." MA thesis, University of Alberta, 2005.

Wilks, Timothy. "The Court Culture of Prince Henry and his Circle, 1603-1613." PhD diss., The University of Oxford, 1987.

Wood, Lucy. "The Portraits of Anne of Denmark." MA report, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1981.