

## University of Southampton Research Repository ePrints Soton

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g.

AUTHOR (year of submission) "Full thesis title", University of Southampton, name of the University School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON**

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

History

**Constructing Splendour: The Wardrobe of  
Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester (1532/3-1588), Consumption and  
Networks of Production.**

Two Volumes  
Volume One: Thesis

*by*

Tracey Leigh Wedge

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2013

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

History

Doctor of Philosophy

CONSTRUCTING SPLENDOUR: THE WARDROBE OF ROBERT DUDLEY,  
EARL OF LEICESTER (1532/3–1588), CONSUMPTION AND NETWORKS OF  
PRODUCTION

by Tracey Leigh Wedge

This thesis examines the networks involved in the production of the wardrobe of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester (1532/3-1588). It is clearly demonstrated that Leicester's dress placed him alongside his contemporaries within the nobility. A successful and well functioning wardrobe network was crucial to achieving the required standard of dress. Establishing the identity of the individual members of the network enables the further examination of each person's role within the network, and in dressing Leicester. Comprised of English masters embedded in their livery company politics and punctuated with foreign masters, the network provides an insight into business practice and social interaction in sixteenth-century London.

## List of Contents for Volume One: Thesis

	<b>Page</b>
List of Contents for Volume One: Thesis . . . . .	iii
List of Contents for Volume Two: Appendices . . . . .	iv–vii
Author’s declaration . . . . .	ix
Acknowledgements. . . . .	x
Abbreviations and Definitions . . . . .	xi
Chapter One: Introduction . . . . .	1
Part One: Consumption. . . . .	45
Chapter Two: A very practical wardrobe or excessive consumption? . . . . .	47
Part Two: Production . . . . .	81
Chapter Three: A collaboration of supply: Leicester’s wardrobe networks within England . . . . .	83
Chapter Four: Leicester’s management of his wardrobe network. . . . .	121
Chapter Five: William Whittell, Merchant Taylor, in focus. . . . .	153
Chapter Six: Maynard Buckwith, hosier, and the hosier’s role in supplying Leicester’s wardrobe . . . . .	189
Chapter Seven: Conclusion . . . . .	213
Glossary of Terms. . . . .	225
List of References and Bibliography . . . . .	229

## List of Contents for Volume Two: Appendices

	<b>Page</b>
List of Contents for Volume Two: Appendices . . . . .	ii-v
Note on Transcription . . . . .	vi
Appendix 1. . . . .	1
Appendix 1.1: Date distribution of extant bills from wardrobe suppliers found in Longleat House Archive, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. . . . .	2
Appendix 1.2: Figures One to Nine: Portraits of a selection of courtiers who were also members of the Order of the Garter. . . . .	3
Appendix 1.3: Figures Ten to Fifteen: Portraits showing Knights of the Order of the Garter in their robes with regalia . . . . .	4
Appendix 2. . . . .	5
Appendix 2.1: Transcription of The National Archives, E 154/2/39, f. 61, The goods belonging to Lord Robert Dudley that were confiscated at his attainder 1553–1554. . . . .	6
Appendix 2.2: Figure Sixteen: Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester (1532/3–1588), circa 1564. . . . .	7
Appendix 2.2: Figure Seventeen: Detail of the reverse of the extant field and tilt armour of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester (1532/3–1588). . . . .	7
Appendix 2.3: Quantities of dress elements found in John Dudley, Lord Lisle’s wardrobe inventories 1545–1550 . . . . .	8
Appendix 2.4: Summary of elements of dress identified in the extant fabric disbursement book for the year 1571–1572 for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester’s Wardrobe. . . . .	10
Appendix 2.5: Total expenditure for Leicester’s personal wardrobe found in household accounts . . . . .	11
Appendix 2.6: Summary of the expenses for apparel, with rapiers and daggers, for the Earl of Oxford for 1562-1566. . . . .	12
Appendix 2.7: Additional dress related expenses incurred by Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester shown in household accounts . . . . .	13
Appendix 2.8: Spending on jerkins, doublets and hose for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester shown in household accounts . . . . .	14

Appendix 2.9: Projected cost for fabric and fashioning of a doublet for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester (circa 1560) . . . . .	15
Appendix 2.10: Projected cost for fabric and fashioning for a pair of hose for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester (circa 1560) . . . . .	16
Appendix 2.11: Spending on shirts for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester shown in household accounts . . . . .	17
Appendix 2.12: Spending on gowns for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester shown in household accounts . . . . .	18
Appendix 2.13: Spending on coats/cloaks for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester shown in household accounts . . . . .	19
Appendix 2.14: Spending on skins for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester’s dress shown in household accounts . . . . .	20
Appendix 2.15: Spending on goldsmiths’ work for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester’s dress shown in household accounts . . . . .	21
Appendix 2.16: Spending on knitted stockings for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester’s household shown in household accounts . . . . .	22
Appendix 2.17: Expenditure on specific types of knit stockings for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester shown in household accounts . . . . .	23
Appendix 2.18: Spending on footwear for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester and his household shown in household accounts. . . . .	26
Appendix 2.19: Spending on gloves for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester and his household shown in household accounts . . . . .	27
Appendix 2.20: Expenditure on accessories and waistcoats for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester shown in household accounts . . . . .	28
Appendix 2.21: Elements of dress confiscated and sold or given away on the attainder of John Dudley, duke of Northumberland and his son John Dudley, earl of Warwick. A transcription of The National Archives, E 154/2/39 . . . . .	29
Appendix 3. . . . .	42
Appendix 3.1: Provisional list of suppliers of goods and services to the wardrobe of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester and his household . . . . .	43
Appendix 3.2: William Whittell’s receipt for fabrics delivered by Richard Pecock 1566. A transcription of Longleat House Archive, Dudley Papers DU Box V, ff. 262–262v. . . . .	53

Appendix 3.3: List of Merchants of Divers Companies trading and occupying silks 1561. A transcription of The National Archives, State Papers 12/20, ff. 135–136 . . . . .	55
Appendix 3.4: Figure Eighteen: A Map of London and Westminster Highlighting approximate locations of a selection of suppliers to the wardrobe of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester and his household . . . . .	57
Appendix 3.5: Artificers to the Great Wardrobe of Queen Elizabeth 1 showing those who are found in Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester’s wardrobe evidence . . . . .	58
Appendix 4. . . . .	63
Appendix 4.1: Foreign commodities imported into the Kingdom, 1564. A transcription of The National Archives, State Papers, SP 12/35, ff. 81–84v. . . . .	64
Appendix 5. . . . .	70
Appendix 5.1: Types of evidence available for the examination of the lives and business practises of William Whittell and Maynard Buckwith, suppliers to Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester. . . . .	71
Appendix 5.2: Figure Nineteen: A Map of London and Westminster showing sites of known relevance to William Whittell . . . . .	72
Appendix 5.3: Figure Twenty: A Map of the precinct of St Paul’s Cathedral showing St Paul’s Churchyard. . . . .	73
Appendix 5.4: Dates that William Whittell enrolled and made his apprentices free of The Merchant Taylors’ Company, London, on completion of their apprenticeship. . . . .	74
Appendix 5.5: Time-line showing projected periods in which apprentices were indentured to William Whittell . . . . .	76
Appendix 5.6: Fabric delivered to various recipients in order to make garments for Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester and his household from 7 March 1570(1) until 25 March 1571(2). . . . .	77
Appendix 5.7: A Transcription of William Whittell’s bill for one year from 8 March 1561 to 7 March 1562. . . . .	104
Appendix 5.8: Dates that William Edney enrolled and made his apprentices free of The Merchant Taylors’ Company, London, on completion of their apprenticeship. . . . .	125

Appendix 5.9: A transcription of the names of people assessed in St Gregory Parish in Castle Baynard Ward, recording their second payment towards the subsidy granted to Queen Elizabeth 1, 1576–7 . . . . .	128
Appendix 5.10: Offices achieved by those elected to Livery in the Merchant Taylors' Company, London, on 13 March 1569(70) with William Whittell, tailor to Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester . . . . .	130
Appendix 5.11: Figure Twenty One: Queen Elizabeth 1, circa 1575. . . . .	131
Appendix 5.12: A transcription of William Whittell's accounts compiled during his tenure as The Merchant Taylors' Company warden renter for the west part of the City from the Feast of the Annunciation of Our Lady, 25 March 1584, for one year. . . . .	132
Appendix 6. . . . .	140
Appendix 6.1: Number of hosiers and tailors identified in Returns of Strangers of London and the Liberties, 1523 to 1593 . . . . .	141
Appendix 6.2: Garments supplied to Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester by Maynard Buckwith from 23 April 1565 until 15 February 1565(6) . . . . .	142
Appendix 6.3: A Transcription of the last will and testament of Maynarde Bockwaye, taylor of Our Lady in the Strand, Middlesex, proved 26 February 1593 . . . . .	146





**Academic Thesis: Declaration Of Authorship**

I, ..... [please print name]

declare that this thesis and the work presented in it are my own and  
has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

[title of thesis] .....  
.....

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
7. Either none of this work has been published before submission, or parts of this work have been published as:  
[please list references below]:

Signed: .....

Date:.....

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank the following people for their support;

Professor Maria Hayward for her constant encouragement and fabulous mentoring as my supervisor for this project; Stephen Davies and Daisy McWedge for feigning interest in all things related to my research and enduring hours of enthusiastic discussion on various aspects of sixteenth century history; The Pasold Research Fund for financial assistance to access the Dudley Papers; Curator of Longleat Historic Collections Dr Kate Harris for allowing me access to the Dudley Papers; Merchant Taylors' Company archivist Stephen Freeth for his time and helpful advice on the Company archives; Goldsmiths' Company Librarian David Beasley for facilitating access to the Goldsmiths' Company archives; Drapers' Company archivist Penny Fussell for her time and assistance in accessing the Drapers' Company; Mercers' Company archivist Jane Ruddell and Leathersellers' Company archivist Jerome Farrell who both gave me access to their collections. Thank you all!

## **Abbreviations and Definitions**

### **Abbreviations**

Bod.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
BL	British Library, London
CKS	Centre for Kentish Studies
CRO	Cornwall Record Office
DC	Drapers' Company, London
FSL	Folger Shakespeare Library
GC	Grocers' Company, London
GCL	Goldsmiths' Company Library, London
GL	Guildhall Library, London
HC	Haberdashers' Company, London
HRO	Hampshire Record Office, Winchester, Hampshire
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
TNA	The National Archives, Kew, Richmond
LA	Lincolnshire Archives
LMA	London Metropolitan Archive, London
LHA	Longleat House Archive, Wiltshire
MC	Mercers' Company, London
MTC	Merchant Taylors' Company, London
SC	Skinners' Company, London
SRO	Staffordshire Record Office
WCA	Westminster City Archives, London



## Chapter One: Introduction

Throughout the Tudor and Stuart period constructing the visual splendour of the early modern English court called upon vast networks of merchants, artificers and administrators guided by the all-important patrons. These networks connected the court to the City of London, its environs, and the kingdom itself to the rest of the known world. It traversed the spaces of the City drawing together communities through business and the social networks developed as a direct result of a shared patron. Less immediately obvious was the impact of long-term courtly patronage on the perpetuation of craft and career through apprenticeship, and the ability of suppliers to engage in Livery Company activities. Equally as hidden were the role women and strangers played in the supply network. Yet the generation of the material culture that supported the magnificence of the monarch, and his or her courtiers, fundamentally rested with those outside of the court and included a cross-section of the population.

Visual splendour took many forms, from courtly entertainments to buildings and their furnishings. Central to the spectacle were the participants, all of whom were required to be suitably dressed. Courtiers dressed to accentuate the magnificence of the monarch and reinforce the grandeur of the court. The courtiers' wardrobe embodied their position and ancestral lineage – demonstrating an inherent understanding of the symbology of dress. For each person who participated in the courtly rituals there were a group of suppliers who brought to the network their skills in business, the mastery of their craft and an understanding of the needs of courtier dress. This dissertation explores the consumption and production of material culture through a focus on dress, a fundamental component of the splendour at court.

The study of the production of a leading courtier's wardrobe becomes an exemplar for the networks involved in creating the visual splendour found within the English court.<sup>1</sup> The wardrobe becomes the mechanism to demonstrate the complexity of the negotiations required to create apparently straightforward elements of splendid display. It also affords the opportunity to examine networks of seemingly disparate individuals as they were drawn into a team whose focus was to satisfy their patron's dress requirements. It additionally becomes a tool to begin unravelling one aspect of material culture consumption by courtiers in the early modern court. Furthermore it becomes a study that highlights the importance of the comprehensive analysis of an important group of documents hitherto overlooked by scholars.

The wardrobe of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester offers an excellent model for such a

---

1       Wardrobe in the context of this research is used to refer to a collection of items of dress that include garments constructed from fabric, jewellery and accessories such as hats, gloves, stockings, shoes, girdles and hangers.

study. Leicester was a central figure in the Elizabethan court.<sup>2</sup> Holding the Household office of Master of the Horse from the beginning of the reign, he was engaged in the production of splendid displays about the Queen whenever she travelled by horse.<sup>3</sup> As a Knight of the Order of the Garter Leicester was one of an elite group of knights, personally selected by the Queen, for whom display of membership to the Order was expected.<sup>4</sup> His role as a Privy Councillor saw him engaged in governance of the kingdom.<sup>5</sup> Simon Adams has suggested that Leicester and Burghley were the key figures at court. Both had intimate access to the Queen, beyond that of any other courtiers.<sup>6</sup> However Leicester's position was unique within the Tudor and Stuart courts. In addition to being a close companion and favourite of a queen, he had also been considered by many as the strongest English candidate for her hand in marriage. He also held the office of the Master of the Horse longer than any other Master.<sup>7</sup> No other royal favourite in the early modern period was so entwined with the statecraft and governance of the kingdom or had such great influence with a monarch, and endured, as Leicester.<sup>8</sup>

Leicester left behind a series of personal papers that have been scrutinised for this study. Also extant are a series of portraits of Leicester that track his career at court.<sup>9</sup> These key pieces of evidence combine with documents held in London Livery Companies,

---

2 For the sake of continuity Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester is referred to primarily as Leicester throughout this dissertation although he was not created earl of Leicester until 1564. This is also to eliminate any confusion with reference to his son Sir Robert Dudley (1574-1649). Queen Elizabeth 1 (1533-1603) acceded to the throne of England and Ireland following the death of her sister Mary (1516-1558) on 17 November 1558.

3 The officer of the Master of the Horse was the third ranked of the officers of the Royal Household, below the Lord Steward and the Lord Chamberlain. Leicester held the office from 1558 until 1587 when he was made Lord Steward.

4 Leicester was elected to the Order of the Garter on 24 April 1559.

5 Leicester was made a member of the Privy Council in 1562.

6 S Adams, 'Eliza enthroned? The Court and its politics', in S Adams, *Leicester and the Court Essays on Elizabethan Politics*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2002, pp. 24-45, p. 30.

7 M Reese, *The Royal Office of Master of the Horse*, Threshold Books Limited, London, 1976, p. 349.

8 PE Hammer, 'Absolute and sovereign mistress of her grace'? Queen Elizabeth I and her favourites, 1581-1592', in JH Elliot and LWB Brockliss (eds), *The World of the Favourite*, Yale University Press, London, 1999, pp. 38-53. See particularly p. 41 where Hammer names Leicester, Sir Christopher Hatton and Sir Thomas Heneage as the 'most successful and enduring recipients of royal favour'. Leicester held higher Household office than Hatton or Heneage and had already spent fifteen years as a Privy Councillor before Hatton joined the Council, Heneage was not made a member of the Privy Council until 1587. See M Hicks, 'Heneage, Sir Thomas (b. in or before 1532, d. 1595)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 2 March 2010, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12921>>. See also, W MacCaffrey 'Hatton, Sir Christopher (c.1540-1591)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, online accessed 2 March 2010, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12605>>.

9 These pieces of evidence are discussed in more detail below.

and other archives, to shed new light on the people involved in supplying the court, and Leicester in particular. Leicester's papers reveal the names of many of those in his wardrobe supply network, what they were supplying and the cost of a variety of the items supplied. The papers also provide information on the names of people associated with Leicester and his household, including references to his players, his musicians, overseas associates, along with paintings and household furnishings. While Adams has published a series of these papers the majority remain unpublished in a private archive.<sup>10</sup> This thesis, then, breaks new ground on a number of fronts, the result of bringing together and analysing evidence for Leicester's consumption of dress and the production of his wardrobe.

## Chapter Outline

This chapter introduces the topic of enquiry by outlining the research questions that have shaped the project. The methodologies employed to address these questions will be discussed with reference to available evidence. Including a short biography of Leicester is necessary to briefly highlighting his position at court, his relationship with the Queen, while placing him within the broader context of the early modern English court. Additionally the extant evidence for Leicester's wardrobe will be presented. The chapter also includes an examination of literature relevant to the production of one courtier's wardrobe, and the networks involved, while considering the research questions. It is through this discussion that it will be possible to establish where this research sits within the existing historiography. Indeed the literature review, located within the introduction, pulls together the threads of a wide range of areas pertinent to historians of, or particular relevance to, this interdisciplinary topic, and highlights a series of gaps within the historiography. It thus lays the groundwork for the following chapters that build on the arguments put forward in the introduction.

Leicester was one of the younger sons of John Dudley, duke of Northumberland.<sup>11</sup>

---

10 See: S Adams, (ed.), *Household Accounts and Disbursement Books of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1558–61, 1584–86. Camden Fifth Series, Vol. 6*, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 1995. Adams draws together and transcribes the four known household accounts which are: LHA, Dudley Papers DU Vol. XIV and LHA, DU Vol. XV; BL, Evelyn MS 258b; and the now lost Staunton Manuscript for which previous partial transcriptions survive. Dr Kate Harris Curator at Longleat House has recently (2011) discovered a further Dudley manuscript that is chiefly concerned with the feeding of Leicester's household. Dr Harris is in the process of transcribing and editing the volume. The bulk of Leicester's private papers are housed at Longleat House archive.

11 John Dudley, duke of Northumberland (1504-1553) and his wife Jane Guildford (1509-1554) produced thirteen children, Robert being the fifth son. See, S Adams, 'Dudley, Robert, earl of Leicester (1532/3–1588)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 18 February 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8160>>; D Loades, 'Dudley, John, duke of Northumberland (1504–1553)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 5 May 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8156>>



His position at court and his relationship with the Queen feed in to the framing of the initial research questions - *what was Leicester wearing?* And *how far was Leicester's role at court reflected in his wardrobe?* Indeed as a leading courtier it was a necessity to be suitably attired for all occasions. Yet Leicester has been considered a spendthrift, particularly with regards to his wardrobe.<sup>12</sup> This prompts the question - *how far was Leicester's consumption of dress excessive for his position?* In order to understand what was involved in producing a suitable wardrobe for Leicester it is necessary to examine his wardrobe supply networks. This is highlighted quite simply by asking - *who were Leicester's wardrobe suppliers and how exclusive was his supply network?* The final question posed explores Leicester's use of the Great Wardrobe - *was Leicester's use of the Great Wardrobe a privilege extended to others within the court?*

### Contextual Biography

Giving Leicester's career and life some context will enable a greater understanding of the implications of the above questions. Leicester's connection with court was long-standing. His father had been in the court of Henry VIII and had held numerous posts.<sup>13</sup> Loades and Adams suggest Leicester was possibly attached to the household of Prince Edward (1537-1553) at some stage in the early 1540's.<sup>14</sup> At the beginning of the protectorate of Edward VI (1547-1553) John Dudley, Viscount Lisle was created earl of Warwick. By the end of Edward's reign Warwick had collected further posts and the title of duke of Northumberland.<sup>15</sup> Leicester also held positions in the court of Edward VI. Having been married and knighted in 1550 he was appointed gentleman of the Privy Chamber in 1551.<sup>16</sup> He replaced his older brother John, lord Lisle (later earl of Warwick) as Master of the Buckhounds in September 1552, was appointed Keeper of Somerset Place in December 1552 and Chief Carver in February 1553.<sup>17</sup> With the death of Edward VI in July 1553 came the downfall of Northumberland and his supporters, including his sons. Having proclaimed their support for Queen

---

12 L Stone, 'The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy', *The Economic History Review*, vol.18. iss.1-2, 1948, pp. 1-53, see particularly, p. 5. Later commentators have continued to echo Stone's sentiments, which are discussed briefly in this chapter and more so in Chapter Two.

13 John Dudley's posts included Master of the Tower Armoury (1534), chief trencher (1537), Vice-Admiral (1537), Master of the Horse to Anne of Cleves (1540), Knight of the shire of Staffordshire (1542), Warden-General of the Scottish marches (1542), Lord High Admiral and Privy Councillor (1543), Knight of the Order of the Garter (1543). He inherited the title Viscount Lisle from his mother Elizabeth Grey in 1542.

14 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*; Loades, 'Northumberland', *ODNB*.

15 John Dudley, earl of Warwick was made Lord Great Chamberlain (1547), Lord President of the Privy Council (1550), Earl Marshal (1551), Warden General of the Marches of Scotland (1551) and Great Master of the Royal Household. He was created duke of Northumberland on 11 October 1551.

16 Robert Dudley married Amy Robsart on 4 June 1550 at Sheen in Surrey.

17 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

Jane (1536/7-1554) the Dudleys were convicted of treason and attainted by the victorious Queen Mary (who reigned as Queen from 1553). Leicester and his brothers John, Ambrose and Henry escaped the death penalty, and were all released from imprisonment in the Tower of London by the end of November 1554. A pardon followed in January 1555 and Leicester's attainder was lifted in January 1557.<sup>18</sup>

Although not a key member of Mary's court Leicester still had a presence there. He took part in the December 1554 Anglo-Spanish tournaments and was made Master of Ordnance for the English expeditionary force to St Quentin in 1557.<sup>19</sup> On Mary's death three of the surviving four Dudleys received offices within the court of Queen Elizabeth.<sup>20</sup> It was the Queen's early and continued favour for Leicester that has marked him out for derision particularly by later commentators. Following his appointment as Master of the Horse, a position that demanded his constant attendance at court, Leicester received numerous rewards.<sup>21</sup> Financially he benefitted from licences to export wool and cloth free from customs in the early 1560's.<sup>22</sup>

Leicester's first wife Amy died by misfortune on 8 September 1560.<sup>23</sup> While in theory the death of his wife left the way clear for Leicester to marry the Queen the nature of her death proved the ultimate barrier. His suitability as a consort to Elizabeth was debated through the 1560's while he was also suggested as a possible husband for Mary Queen of Scots.<sup>24</sup> Leicester was made a Privy Councillor on 20 October 1562 and was created earl of Leicester, Baron of Denbigh at the end of September 1564. Further appointments followed as Leicester was elected Chancellor of Oxford University in December 1564 and created a member of the Order of St Michael in January 1566.<sup>25</sup>

---

18 D Wilson, *Sweet Robin: A Biography of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester 1533–1588*, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1981, p. 71. Letters patent were issued under the Great Seal lifting the attainder on Ambrose, Robert and Henry on 30 January 1557.

19 R McCoy, 'From the tower to the tiltyard: Robert Dudley's return to glory', *The Historical Journal*, vol.27, no.2, 1984, pp. 425–435.

20 Leicester was appointed Master of the Horse, Ambrose Dudley (c.1530–1590) was appointed Master of the Ordnance, Mary Dudley, Lady Sidney (1530/35–1586) was appointed a gentlewoman of the Privy Chamber. The fourth surviving Dudley was Katherine Dudley, Lady Hastings (c.1538–1620).

21 Leicester was granted Kew House in December 1558, and parcels of land during 1559, and in November 1559 he was appointed lieutenant of Windsor Castle.

22 See Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*. In 1560 Leicester was granted a licence to export wool free of customs (worth £6000), 1562 saw him receive a further licence to the value of £1000, and in 1563 a licence worth £6666.

23 C Skidmore, *Death and the Virgin. Elizabeth, Dudley and the Mysterious Fate of Amy Robsart*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 2010, p. 378.

24 S Adams, 'Queen Elizabeth's eyes at court', in D Starkey (ed.), *Rivals in Power. Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties*, Macmillan, London, 1990, pp. 146–173; See also Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

25 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*; See also, Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 179.

Leicester was granted Kenilworth in 1563, a property where he hosted the Queen on numerous progresses.<sup>26</sup> Her final visit in 1575 saw the staging of spectacular entertainments that have received considerable attention.<sup>27</sup> Leicester's prominence at court saw him embrace the role of a patron of scholars, explorers, literature, Protestantism and art. Indeed Adams suggests he was one of the great patrons of Elizabeth's reign.<sup>28</sup> It was his support and patronage of Protestantism that culminated in the English involvement in the crisis that engulfed the Low Countries in 1585. As lieutenant general he led the English forces in the defence of the Low Countries in opposition to the Spanish. Against the Queen's orders Leicester was appointed Governor-General of the Netherlands at the beginning of 1586. He returned to England in November 1586, was back in the Netherlands by the end of June 1587 and finally returned to England in December that year. He was awarded the post of Lord Steward of the Household for his service. The threatened invasion of the Spanish Armada in 1588 saw Leicester involved in military preparations at Tilbury during August. He died on 4 September 1588 in Oxfordshire.<sup>29</sup>

Leicester left no legitimate heir. A liaison with Lady Douglas Sheffield (1542/3–1608) in the 1570's, resulted in the birth of Robert Dudley on 7 August 1574. Leicester later married the widowed countess of Essex in September 1578.<sup>30</sup> Although the countess bore two children to Leicester the first died soon after birth and the second died aged three.<sup>31</sup> Leicester's estate was in considerable debt at his death, chiefly as the result of the military campaign in the Netherlands. This coupled with protracted legal battles over the estate no doubt helps to explain the loss of material culture relating to Leicester, and the loss and wide dispersal of his papers.

### **Extant evidence for Leicester's wardrobe.**

Having established Leicester in position at court we must now turn to the available evidence in order to address the research questions outlined above. No known pieces

---

26 Kenilworth, in Warwickshire, was a property that had previously been granted to Northumberland. The Queen visited on progress in 1566, 1568, 1572 and 1575.

27 W Leahy, *Elizabethan Triumphal Processions*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, 2005; E Goldring, 'Portraiture, patronage, and the progresses. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth festivities of 1575', in JE Archer, E Goldring and S Knight (eds), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, pp. 163–188; E Goldring, "'A mercer ye wot az we be": The authorship of the Kenilworth letter reconsidered', *English Literary Renaissance*, vol.38, no.2, 2008, pp. 245–269; J Nichols, *Progresses, public processions, &c of Queen Elizabeth Vol. 1*, John Nichols and Son, London, 1823.

28 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

29 *Ibid*.

30 Lettice Knollys (1543-1634) was the Queen's cousin. She had been married to Walter Devereux (1539-1576), second Viscount Hereford (later earl of Essex) in 1560.

31 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, pp. 227, 244.

of Leicester's dress survive apart from a suit of armour in the collection of the Royal Armouries.<sup>32</sup> While surviving painted portraits of Leicester illustrate his role at court, his family allegiance and his clothing, they do not identify producers.<sup>33</sup> However they do provide possible illustrations of the dress elements furnished by his suppliers. In addition these portraits also enable comparisons with his contemporaries at court. Written evidence for his dress is patchy. The most important information identifying those involved in the production of his wardrobe are a series of household accounts dating from 1558-1559, 1559-1561, 1584-86 and 1585-87<sup>34</sup>, a box of bills and warrants mostly dating to the 1560's<sup>35</sup>, and a wardrobe disbursement book of 1571-74.<sup>36</sup> Additionally a 1588 wardrobe inventory<sup>37</sup> lists an extensive collection of dress elements, however it is in itself not exhaustive and offers limited supplier/producer information. Other lists and manuscripts<sup>38</sup> name people who presented Leicester with gifts of clothing and clothing he gave as gifts. From these sources it is possible to piece together a skeletal picture of those who were involved in supplying Leicester's wardrobe.

Adams's publication of Leicester's household accounts, and the microfilming of a number of volumes of the Dudley Papers, has made them more freely available.<sup>39</sup> However many of the papers relevant to this research have not been published before. The box of bills and warrants, the wardrobe disbursement book and the wardrobe inventory are only accessible at the private archive of Longleat House in Wiltshire. A contributory factor to these documents remaining unpublished is the cost of access

---

32 This armour is on display at the Royal Armouries at Leeds. Object number: II.81.

33 Numerous portraits of Leicester survive and are dispersed in collections throughout the world. The vast majority are illustrated in: T Wedge, *Dressed Fit for a Queen: The Wardrobe of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, unpublished dissertation submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts, Textile Conservation Centre, University of Southampton, 2008, p. 45.

34 See: S Adams, (ed.), *Household Accounts and Disbursement Books of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1558-61, 1584-86. Camden Fifth Series, Vol. 6*, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 1995. Adams draws together and transcribes the four known household accounts which are: LHA, Dudley Papers DU Vol. XIV and LHA, DU Vol. XV; BL, Evelyn MS 258b; and the now lost Staunton Manuscript for which previous partial transcriptions survive. Dr Kate Harris Curator at Longleat House has recently (2011) discovered a further Dudley manuscript that is chiefly concerned with the feeding of Leicester's household. Dr Harris is in the process of transcribing and editing the volume.

35 These are LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V.

36 This is LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII.

37 This is LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII.

38 These will be referenced individually as they are referred to in the following text.

39 Adams, *Household Accounts*. The volumes that have been copied to microfilm are LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. I – V. These are available to consult at a number of libraries including the British Library and the Institute of Historical Research, London.

and prohibition of photography.<sup>40</sup> While funding was sourced for access to these documents for this research the financial constraints necessitated a very focussed study of the material.<sup>41</sup> Although mentioned by Adams, and listed in the online catalogue, the true richness of the documents was not evident until they were read.<sup>42</sup> In particular the box of bills and warrants offer information on the supply and production process not found anywhere else. Ultimately, in the time frame dictated by funding, it was not possible to fully transcribe all of the documents, however a useful range of relevant material was copied for further analysis. Fundamentally the recording of the names for suppliers, dates and goods supplied provides a broad picture of Leicester's consumption and the production of his wardrobe.

It is clear that only a fraction of the written material for Leicester's household, including his wardrobe records, is extant. The wide dispersal of Leicester's archive since his death in 1588 has been discussed in a series of articles by Simon Adams.<sup>43</sup> Those documents that have survived are not necessarily in good condition. Damage, particularly from damp, has resulted in partial loss of information or illegibility. Ideally for a study such as this a paper trail of bills, warrants, household and wardrobe accounts along with inventories that might be created when a change of staff occurred would enable a full examination of the wardrobe.<sup>44</sup> For Leicester there is a paucity of information when compared to the almost unbroken set of wardrobe warrants for Queen Elizabeth through her reign.<sup>45</sup> However Leicester's papers provide an insight into the male courtier's wardrobe beyond that of his contemporaries for whom few

---

40 These documents have not been transcribed or microfilmed and are currently only available through the payment of £20 +VAT per hour to visit the archive. Photography of the documents is prohibited, but can be purchased for £20 + VAT per page. Regrettably this creates a financial barrier to extensive study of these documents.

41 The Pasold Research Fund supported a feasibility study and a further extended period of reading of the documents.

42 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 18; TNA, Access to Archives Part of the UK archives network, *Longleat House, Dudley Papers*, online accessed 12 December 2012, <<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=2238-du&cid=-1#-1>>

43 See: S Adams, 'The Papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester I. The Browne-Evelyn Collection', *Archives The Journal of the British Records Association*, vol.20, no.83, 1992, pp. 63–85; S Adams, 'The Papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester II, The Atye-Cotton Collection', *Archives The Journal of the British Records Association*, vol.20, no.90, 1993, pp. 131–144; S Adams, 'The papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester III, The Countess of Leicester's Collection', *Archives The Journal of the British Records Association*, vol.22, no.94, 1996, pp. 1–26. The fourth article in this series has not been published due to a change in editorial policy by the journal *Archives* (personal communication with Dr Simon Adams, 23 September 2011).

44 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII. The wardrobe inventory was created by Thomas Edgeley and Alford Johnson when they succeeded Stephen Johnson as groom of the robes.

45 Copies of these are found at TNA, LC 5/32, LC 5/33, LC 5/34, LC 5/35, LC 5/36, LC 5/49; Also, BL, Egerton 2806 and BL, Additional Manuscripts 35328. These have been referred to in: J Arnold, (ed.), *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd*, Maney, Leeds, 1988.

personal papers survive.<sup>46</sup> Leicester's documents shed new light on a selection of wardrobe suppliers, the products they supplied, and the network they played a key role in.

While the survival of these documents is extremely fortunate they are not without their problems. The accounts show itemised objects and services purchased, often including the names and occupations of those involved, although this is not always the case. Entries may well briefly describe an object and its cost without naming the supplier. This is demonstrated in William Chancy's 1558-9<sup>47</sup> account which recorded 'Item for a peir of knitt hose for your lordship} liijs. iiijd.'<sup>48</sup> omitting the supplier's name. Chancy's account also assumes certain knowledge by the reader concerning the supply network. This is common to all the accounts examined. For example Chancy lists 'Item to the Spanishe teyler xs.'<sup>49</sup> without actually naming the tailor anywhere in the account. Richard Ellis's 1559-1561<sup>50</sup> account initially records the names of all persons being paid along with their goods or services and occupation. Unfortunately he ceases to be so meticulous as the account progresses with entries such as 'Paid the second daie of January for a paire of purfumed gloves} xxxvijs.'<sup>51</sup> omitting where the gloves were sourced.

Periodically the accounts also record payments to people without specifying what the payment was for. When Ellis documents a payment to Mrs Smithe, for example, he does not specify if it was a loan repayment or for goods supplied 'Paid unto Mrs Smithe silkewoman the xiiijth day of Aprell anno secundo Reginae CCCCxxxli.'<sup>52</sup> A series of loans to Leicester by business people, and a series of repayments, were entered in both the Chancy and Ellis accounts. Mrs Smithe does not appear as a creditor, although she could have been entered into an earlier account that has not survived. This highlights

---

46 Personal papers for Sir Henry Sidney, including some wardrobe-related accounts, are housed at the Centre for Kentish Studies. Permission must be sought from the Viscount De L'Isle to consult these. Personal papers for the Devereux family are held at LHA, and include a tailor's bill for Walter Devereux, earl of Essex (1539-1576) and limited wardrobe evidence for his son Robert Devereux, earl of Essex (1565-1601). Personal papers that include wardrobe information for other high-ranking courtiers such as Sir Christopher Hatton (1540-1591) are not known to exist, while a short tailor's bill of 1555 in the Cecil Papers at Hatfield House is the only known written evidence for the wardrobe of William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1520/21-1598).

47 William Chancy was a member of Leicester's household until the end of his account in 1559, but went on to have an association with the household and received livery in 1567. See Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 12, 465-466, for a discussion of William Chancy.

48 Ibid., p. 91.

49 Ibid., p. 43.

50 Ibid., pp. 14-15 & 469. Richard Ellis was a member of Leicester's household; Adams suggests he remained in Leicester's service until at least 1567 but due to poor account keeping did not continue in a financial capacity after 1561.

51 Ibid., p. 134.

52 Ibid., p. 120.

the difficulty of assessing if Mrs Smithe was supplying Leicester with goods, and therefore contributing to his wardrobe, or simply lending him money. Leicester also relied heavily on members of his household to purchase the various necessities and reimbursed them later. An example can be seen in the 1584-1586 account<sup>53</sup> which records a payment ‘To Robert Pitchford the same day which he paid for iiij paire of dry perfumed gloves for your lordship at iijs. iiijd. a paire’.<sup>54</sup> While entries such as this demonstrate household finances they fail to identify who supplied the gloves.

The box of bills and warrants contains a collection of four hundred and forty-six folios.<sup>55</sup> The first two hundred and ninety-nine folios are bills dating from 1555 to 1570 from a range of suppliers of household and wardrobe goods and services. The date distribution of the forty-eight wardrobe related bills is shown in Appendix 1.1.<sup>56</sup> These bills vary from one to forty-four folios in length.<sup>57</sup> They cover varying lengths of time, from purchases in one year (54.2%) to an extended period of purchases for up to six years (37.5%), with four bills (8.3%) giving no date. The bills demonstrate Leicester’s prolonged use of a range of suppliers, who clearly offered extended credit. Unfortunately the corresponding accounts do not survive for many of these bills, which limits the conclusions that can be drawn about total wardrobe purchases for this time span.<sup>58</sup> It is unclear whether these bills represent the sum total of his spending on his wardrobe for this period, or merely a fraction of it. They may also include sums for material supplied to members of his household or for gifts to others. Events taking place during this period such as the Coronation, Leicester’s induction into the Order of the Garter and his creation as an earl would each have called for added expenditure for the wardrobe.<sup>59</sup> These bills may therefore represent a distorted picture due to the extraordinary circumstances. They may also show the move from lesser wealth and status when Leicester had a restrained presence at court to an enthusiastic embracing of the role of courtier favourite and suitor to the Queen. What the extant bills do provide is a series of names with itemised lists of goods supplied, giving a valuable insight into the courtier’s wardrobe and its production. They also hint at Leicester’s use of members of the Great Wardrobe to produce items of dress for himself and his household.

---

53 Ibid., pp. 15–19, where Adams discusses the possible candidates as originators of this account.

54 Ibid., p. 180.

55 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V.

56 Supporting information is found in Volume Two: Appendices. It is arranged by the chapter of thesis it relates to.

57 Many of the bills have a central hole piercing the paper indicating a filing system that included a spike of some description.

58 Adams, *Household Accounts*. Adams links suppliers identified in the bills to the Chancy and Ellis accounts, although for the majority of the bills no household account survives.

59 Leicester was installed as a Knight of the Order of the Garter on 3 June 1559 (having been elected in April the same year) and was created earl of Leicester and Baron of Denbigh on 29 September 1564.

The warrants in Dudley Papers, DU Box V number one hundred and forty-six folios and cover the years 1565-1567. They are loose folios on paper of varying sizes. They are addressed to two wardrobe suppliers, Mrs Mountague, silkwoman, and Mr Pecocke, fabric merchant.<sup>60</sup> Mrs Mountague received seventy-six warrants, Mr Pecocke received seventy. These documents highlight a valuable section of the supply network and methods of procurement. The information contained within the warrant varies in detail. While most are addressed to a supplier of goods and name the artificer to whom the goods are to be delivered, they give only scant details of the end product. There is no mention of sums of money to be spent by the supplier in the actioning of the warrant, indicating the generation of a bill, now lost, by the supplier. There are no known bills from Mrs Mountague extant. Additionally she is not mentioned in any of the surviving household or wardrobe accounts. Two bills from Mr Pecocke survive largely for periods either side of extant warrants.<sup>61</sup> Without the accounts for this period the financial implications of these warrants cannot be determined. While these warrants are directed to two people they do indicate the previous existence of similar documents for Leicester's other wardrobe suppliers. The large number relating to these two people also points to these warrants being returned to the household in support of charges within a bill. They are clearly the original warrants, not later copies such as those found in the Great Wardrobe copied into books. Each of the warrants is on a small piece of paper rather than copied into a book and is signed by Anthony Forster. Further to this Mrs Mountague annotates her warrants with the date she received the authorisation to supply her products. However while these existing warrants suggest a wider use within Leicester's supply network without further evidence the extent of the use of warrants by Leicester's wardrobe remains elusive.

The wardrobe disbursement book records deliveries of fabric to various named artificers for the 1571-1574 period.<sup>62</sup> It is a record of the bills for fabrics supplied to the artificer by the fabric merchant, as it includes prices, and a description of the element of dress to be constructed. These appear to be copied directly from the fabric supplier's record of transactions. Indeed the marginal note '*heare end the booke of ambrose Smithes amounts to some of cxxli.viijs.vd.*' confirms this.<sup>63</sup> It is evident from this book that meticulous records were kept within the wardrobe, however its purpose appears to be to emphasise the fabrics used in a garment, not the various other component parts of a

---

60 Mrs Alice Mountague's name is spelt variously throughout the documents; for the sake of consistency the spelling Mountague will be used. Mr Richard Pecocke was a member of the Leathersellers' Company.

61 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 201-205v., 268. The first bill was for one year from 27 January 1564(5). Pecocke's first warrant was dated 29 December 1565. The second bill corresponds with the date of the final warrant 26 April 1567; however, fabric quantities and types are not consistent.

62 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII is 33 folios recto and verso. Unfortunately this wardrobe disbursement book is one of the documents that has sustained water damage.

63 Ibid., f. 4.



garment hinted at in the book. Entries such as '*dd to mr whittell the same tyme j ell of carnation taffetye to line a jerkin of leather imbridered for my L[ord] xiijs.iiijd.*'<sup>64</sup> show that a leather jerkin had been made, possibly by the jerkin maker, or tailor, and had previously been embroidered by the embroiderer before being passed on to the tailor to line. The embroiderer may have been using materials from both the silkwoman and goldsmith to carry out the embroidery. Therefore this book records the cost and artificers for only a small part of the process of any one particular item of dress. It also points to other books that recorded the earlier making of the leather jerkin. Without the complete accounts for a garment the true cost cannot be determined.

The 1588 wardrobe inventory was written before Leicester's death, and examined by him around the time it was created as is evidenced by the inscription '*This booke was perused by my Lo[rd]. himself, 31 May 1588*'.<sup>65</sup> The manuscript is called '*The Booke of all his Lo[rdships]: Robes at Courte or elce wher in ye charge of Thomas Edgeley and Alford Johnson the xvth of June Ano Dni 1588*' and contains very little information regarding artificers.<sup>66</sup> It does however name two of his wardrobe staff.<sup>67</sup> A number of entries indicate the place a garment was constructed, but do not give any further information. For example there is a reference to '*A long cloak of black vellet w[i]th ij fayr lacs aboute of silvr and goulde, lyned wth tuft taff[etta]= made at Amsterdame*'.<sup>68</sup> Extant accounts for periods of the 1580's record Leicester purchasing items for his wardrobe in the Netherlands, however no artificers are identified for individual items of clothing. A further entry in the inventory suggests that his wardrobe was supplemented by the spoils of war, referring to '*A Doublett of black sattin of bootye, w[i]th a smale black silck lace on the seames*'.<sup>69</sup> This inventory provides a glimpse into the contents of Leicester's wardrobe in 1588, vital evidence for what was being supplied in terms of dress. It provides very little information on methods of production or networks of supply. It does however highlight the complexity and decorative nature of his garments, indicating the skill of the artificers involved.

What is common to all the written material are the vagaries of sixteenth-century English which also impacts on the information exhibited. The name of the supplier may be spelled completely differently on the same page, while the occupation may also

---

64 Ibid., f. 2.

65 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII, f. 1.

66 Ibid., f. 1.

67 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 469, 476. Thomas Edgeley was a member of Leicester's wardrobe staff from at least 1583 and along with Alford Johnson took over the running of Leicester's wardrobe from Stephen Johnson on 31 May 1588. Alford Johnson was part of Leicester's Netherlands household before taking on the position, with Thomas Edgeley, of groom of the robes.

68 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII, f. 5.

69 Ibid., f. 11v.

vary. People supplying goods not normally within the bounds of their trade complicate this. Throughout the series of warrants Mrs Mountague's name is spelled numerous different ways, although the warrants were largely written by the same person. Key figures such as Maynard the hosier are enigmatic. He is not given a second name in the accounts or lists. Of his two surviving bills a surname occurs only in the second bill.<sup>70</sup> Hosiers are themselves difficult to trace because they had no guild of their own.<sup>71</sup> Fortunately, for most suppliers a surname is given at some stage within the evidence. It is also evident that a number of suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe were women whose surnames may have changed over the course of the accounts. This may cloud the figures for suppliers where no evidence is available for a name change.

It is through the analysis of these papers that an evaluation of Leicester's consumption of items of dress can be made. This feeds into the appraisal of his wardrobe supply network as it reflects the quality of the materials and workmanship necessary to create the garments and accessories that Leicester wore. On a purely pragmatic level it also enables the compilation of lists of suppliers. These lists form the basis for the survey of wider source material in order to establish where these people fitted into Leicester's network, the court supply system, and the fabric of the City and its Liberties. It is Leicester's consumption of dress that forms Part One of this thesis and is the basis of Chapter Two.

Material relating to the named suppliers is scattered through the Guildhall Library, the Livery Companies themselves, London Metropolitan Archives and the National Archives.<sup>72</sup> For some Guilds there is an abundance of material, for others there is none. Leicester's shoemakers are particularly difficult to track down. His silkwoman Alice Mountague is not known to be a member of the formal guild structure and as a woman is exceedingly difficult to locate apart from her dealings with Leicester and the Great Wardrobe where she appears prominently until the early 1580's. These challenges are exacerbated by the dearth of information on women traders, and trades persons

---

70 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152–157, 210–214. Maynard Buckwith is referred to as either Maynard or Maynard the hosier in his first bill. The second bill begins '*The book of Manerd Buckwith hosyer of all suche hose as he hath made for the right honourable Therle of Leicestre Begynning at the xxiiijth of Aprile Anno Septimo Elizabeth Regine as hereafter followith*' (f. 210). The survival of this bill which gives Buckwith's surname offers the key to unlock further information about his life, outside his position as Leicester's hosier, that might be found in wider archive material.

71 A discussion on hosiers is included in Chapter Six.

72 For example The Goldsmiths' Company Library, London, houses the Company minutes that relate to much of the period covered by this research, and the majority of Leicester's suppliers of goldsmiths' ware are numbered among its members. The minutes record their apprenticeships, when they were made free of the Company, and the names of their apprentices in turn. The shop locations of a few of Leicester's goldsmiths are also recorded in the minutes. The Guildhall Library, London, holds the minutes and wardens' accounts of the Worshipful Company of the Merchant Taylors. These record similar information. However the records of neither Company are complete.

accounts in general, at this time.

While these problems with the written evidence for Leicester's suppliers affect the scope of the findings of this research it is clear that the written material presents valuable evidence about Leicester's wardrobe contributors. The greatest obstacle for this research are the large gaps in information that are the result of no known extant elements of Leicester's dress, to illustrate the artificers and suppliers' goods, along with the loss and distribution of records both within and without Leicester's household. There are very few elements of dress in museum collections that can provide some context for the types of objects described in the written material and visualised in portraiture. Of the material that does survive, mostly limited to goldsmiths' wares and shepstry (seamstress) work, none has any known association with Leicester or the majority of his suppliers.

### **Contextualising the study of a wardrobe and its production network within existing scholarship, an examination of literature**

The exploration of the production of Leicester's wardrobe spans many fields. In order to establish the mechanisms for the production of one person's wardrobe, and its place in current academic thinking, it is necessary to draw on works of economic historians, historical and cultural geographers, dress historians, social historians, biographical commentators, archaeologists, art historians and historians concerned with material culture. The following discussion will examine this literature relevant to the consumption and production of a courtier's wardrobe, and Leicester. Such a survey will highlight the areas that have been overlooked by other researchers and firmly place this research within the interdisciplinary field of history that contextualises a broad range of evidence and its implications for the study of the early modern English court.

In order to investigate the production of a wardrobe for a courtier in Queen Elizabeth I's court it is necessary to understand the contents of a courtier's wardrobe and the functions it was expected to perform. The functions required of dress differed between those within and those without the court. Because Leicester held key offices in the Royal Household, was the queen's chief favourite, and a potential consort, his dress requirements were potentially unique at court. While the literature that has focussed on dress in the sixteenth century is limited it will be examined to address the question of what was in a leading courtier's wardrobe and what functions it was expected to perform. Research is also limited in the area of the production of an English male courtier's wardrobe for the sixteenth century. This is due in part to the lack of evidence for such a study. One must therefore draw on a wider pool of literature of sixteenth-century dress, chiefly on Italian dress, in an effort to determine if similarities can be seen in the English context.

The use of dress to indicate rank and legislative measures regarding dress must be considered for their implications on Leicester's wardrobe. Sumptuary legislation has received considerable attention through the twentieth and into the twenty-first century. While, here again, Leicester's position may have set him apart from these laws it is necessary to address their relevance to him. In order to better understand the courtier's choice of garment the notion of fashion and personal control over one's appearance will be examined through literature that has explored dress in the sixteenth century. Primarily, studies that have surveyed the artificers and suppliers to one person's wardrobe in the sixteenth century have focussed on royalty. An examination of this analysis will be coupled with studies of a specific specialism within each field. Necessarily, this research draws on literature discussing London Livery Companies and the networks linking the City to the Court. The importance of the local networks, particularly in London where Leicester's suppliers were largely based, will also be considered through the examination of literature relating to sixteenth-century London and trading practises. Leicester's wardrobe was constructed almost entirely from imported materials and goods. This therefore requires an acknowledgement of literature relating to trade, specifically importation of these consumables into the kingdom. Where it exists this material will be brought together and explored to determine its relevance to this dissertation and the research questions. Through the examination of these various and disparate areas of research the foundation can be laid for this dissertation, clearly establishing the contribution that this study will make to the field of sixteenth-century history.

Biographical works on Leicester have drawn, in the main, from commentators such as William Camden who, along with others, have taken the defamatory 1584 text *Leicester's Commonwealth* as a chief source.<sup>73</sup> Jebb's early biography laments the use of *Leicester's Commonwealth* and the unflattering account of Leicester by Camden from which 'he will appear to have been a monster of ingratitude and treachery, dissimulation and pride, irreligion and injustice, aggravated with the repeated commission of adultery and murder, without the least intermixture of one good quality'.<sup>74</sup> This general impression of Leicester, drawn from contemporary and near contemporary writings, is pervasive and continues to be reinforced through popular histories. It is an image that has also underpinned Leicester's assessment by art

---

73 Biographies of Leicester include; S Jebb, *The Life of Robert, earl of Leicester, the favourite of Queen Elizabeth: drawn from original writers and records*, Woodman and Lyon, London, 1727; A Kendell, *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, Cassell, London, 1980; Wilson, *Sweet Robin*; A Haynes, *The White Bear: Robert Dudley. The Elizabethan Earl of Leicester*, Peter Owen, London, 1987; Adams, 'Leicester,' *ODNB*. Camden's work is: W Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England*, Fourth Edition, R. Bentley, London, 1688. Peck's edition of *Leicester's Commonwealth* is DC Peck, (ed.), *Leicester's Commonwealth*, Ohio University Press, Athens (Ohio), 1985, online accessed 29 September 2011, <<http://www.dpeck.info/write/leic-comm3f.htm>>

74 Jebb, *The Life of Robert.*, pp. vi–vii.

historians and educators who cite his numerous surviving portraits as evidence for his interest in his own image rather than his importance as a patron.<sup>75</sup> It also leads to the assessment of Leicester's dress exhibited in the paintings as ostentatious supporting the unflattering image of Leicester's character. This evaluation fails to take into account the dress exhibited in portraits of Leicester's fellow courtiers placing Leicester's dress in context with his contemporaries. In this situation his dress appears conservative and not at the extremes of fashion, very much in line with his place at court. This can be seen clearly in portraits of his contemporaries (see Appendix 1.2: Figures One to Nine). These paintings of Leicester supply evidence not only for his dress but also of the work of those who made and supplied his dress. Additionally they help to show how Leicester chose to be presented. The historical treatment of Leicester highlights the importance of biography in shaping the interpretation of his life.

The work of Simon Adams has perpetuated much recent scholarly interest in Leicester.<sup>76</sup> Adams's series of articles locating the known, widely dispersed, papers of Leicester and publication of Leicester's household accounts has contributed to the field of consumption of the noble household, patronage and household management.<sup>77</sup> Adams's examination of Leicester has focussed largely on political activity and successfully demonstrated the wide-ranging and varied nature of Leicester's networks.<sup>78</sup> Indeed Leicester's networks underpinned his power base in local provincial politics as well as the court. Broader studies of the period such as John Guy's *Tudor England* place Leicester alongside Cecil at the heart of Elizabethan policy making, in line with Adams's general thesis that Leicester was a very significant figure.<sup>79</sup> These studies support the argument for Leicester as a key statesman, not the historically constructed

---

75 K Hearn (ed.), *Dynasties. Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530–1630*, Tate Publishing, London, 1995, p. 96; repeated in T Cooper, *A Guide to Tudor & Jacobean Portraits*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2008, p. 16.

76 Sixteen of Adams's essays on Leicester have been collated and reproduced in one volume; S Adams, *Leicester and the Court. Essays on Elizabethan Politics*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2002. Further essays previously cited: Adams, 'Papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester I'; Adams, 'Papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester II'; Adams, 'Papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester III'. Additionally see: S Adams, 'At home and away: The Earl of Leicester', *History Today*, vol.46, no.5, 1996, pp. 22–28.

77 See for example: I Archer, 'City and Court Connected: The Material Dimensions of Royal Ceremonial, c. 1480-1625', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol.71, no.1, 2008, pp. 157–179; I Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption Revisited: City and Court in the Reign of Elizabeth 1', in M Davies and A Prescott (eds), *London and the Kingdom: Essays in Honour of Caroline M. Barron*, Shaun Tyas, Donington, 2008, pp. 38–57; PS Lloyd, *Diet, Luxury and Social Identity in England, 1540-1640*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Leicester, 2009; F Heal, 'Food Gifts, the Household and the Politics of Exchange in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, no.199, pp. 41–70.

78 See particularly Adams, *Leicester and the Court*.

79 J Guy, *Tudor England*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1990, p. 258.

figure of 'a light and greedy man'.<sup>80</sup>

Biography by its very nature is a whole life narrative and while it provides a bigger picture it fails to examine the areas that are particularly pertinent to this dissertation. Derek Wilson has gone the furthest of Leicester's biographers to exploit primary sources, particularly papers from Leicester's private archive.<sup>81</sup> However Adams's *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry for Leicester provides a more balanced appraisal.<sup>82</sup> Wilson presents a chronological arrangement of events in Leicester's life identifying key appointments and gifts from the Queen. These appointments and gifts increased Leicester's position and income over the reign. How these events were reflected in his dress has not been considered. Wilson assesses Leicester at twenty-five as 'a magnificent figure of a man. Tall, by the standard of the age (a little under six feet), and slender, he wore fashionable clothes with a casual grace, his cap invariably tilted at a jaunty angle'.<sup>83</sup> While Wilson uses the word magnificent in the twentieth-century sense it reflects a quality important to nobility in the sixteenth century.<sup>84</sup>

Magnificence was a trait that was commensurate with Leicester's rising position at court yet Wilson fails to acknowledge this when he asserts that 'The man who was to hold the centre of the social and political stage for three decades was proud and more than a little vain. He was a showman capable of exploiting to the full his not inconsiderable talents'.<sup>85</sup> Mary Hazard has discussed the importance of showing magnificence through one's deeds and expenditure particularly in relation to Leicester.<sup>86</sup> Hazard's examination of magnificence contextualises its manifestation stating that in 1587 England magnificence was 'considered a virtue' and Leicester 'was the embodiment of magnificence, and Kenilworth, his seat in Warwickshire, its visible manifestation'.<sup>87</sup>

---

80 This quote is taken from an education website that discusses a portrait of Leicester held in the collection of Waddeston Manor: the museum network, '*Portraits and Portraiture an eLearning resource for teachers and pupils at Key Stages 1 & 2*', online accessed 28 September 2011, <<http://www.museumnetworkuk.org/portraits/artworks/waddesdon/img7.html>>. The original source of the quote is found in a report by the Spanish Ambassador Don Guerau De Spes to King Philip II in 1571. He is scathing not only of Leicester but also of William Cecil lord Burghley, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lincoln and Bedford, see, *Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas Vol. II Elizabeth 1568-1579*, MA Hume, (ed.), Lord Commissioners, London, 1894 p. 364.

81 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*. See also, D Wilson, *The Uncrowned Kings of England: The Black Legend of the Dudleys*, Robinson, London, 2005.

82 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

83 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 78.

84 Magnificence for nobility and Leicester in particular is discussed by ME Hazard, 'A Magnificent Lord: Leicester, Kenilworth, and Transformations in the Idea of Magnificence', *Cahiers Elisabethains*, vol.31, 1987, pp. 11–35.

85 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 79.

86 Hazard, 'A Magnificent Lord'.

87 Hazard, 'A Magnificent Lord', p. 11.

Ideas of Renaissance magnificence emerging out of Italy feed into the English court through literature and courtesy manuals. Many of the recent discussions on the idea of magnificence have focussed on buildings, particularly in Italy.<sup>88</sup> Yet the wider application of theories of magnificence was seen in other areas such as dress. Hazard certainly cites the contemporary descriptions of Leicester's demeanour and dress that reflect the 'general admiration for the Earl's magnificence', thus implying that his magnificence was reflected in his dress.<sup>89</sup> This is an important point to bear in mind when giving thought to his wardrobe and its significance for his position. While Hazard's discussion of magnificence focuses on Leicester's building at Kenilworth, Hayward has shown that magnificence evident in dress was particularly linked to the king and the English court.<sup>90</sup> Hayward also demonstrates the dangers that might face a courtier who attempted to emulate the king's magnificence. Henry Howard, earl of Surrey overstepped the mark on three counts, his words, his arms and his dress, with fatal consequences.<sup>91</sup> The court of a queen, too, would be expected to project magnificence, with the monarch at the centre. Penry Williams argues that the court was 'a theatre of display, as the gallery in which the monarch's glory was supported and enhanced by the great men of the realm'.<sup>92</sup> Williams cites Francis Bacon's advice to the Queen regarding the earl of Essex as evidence of the contemporary understanding of this display. What the quote also underlines is the importance of the visual spectacle of the court: 'If you had my lord of Essex here with a white staff in his hand, as my lord of Leicester had, and continued him so about you, for society to yourself, and for an honour and ornament to your attendance and Court, in the eyes of your people, and in the eyes of foreign ambassadors, then were he in his right element'.<sup>93</sup>

The dynamic of the male courtier's dress in the queen's court may well have changed, in comparison to that of the king; this is a point that has not been explored in any depth. Ultimately courtiers were endeavouring to please the monarch within the laws

---

88 AD Jenkins, 'Cosimo de' Medici's Patronage of Architecture and the Theory of Magnificence', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 33, 1970, pp. 162–170; R Shepherd, 'Republican anxiety and courtly confidence: the politics of magnificence and fifteenth-century Italian architecture', in M O'Malley and E Welch (eds), *The Material Renaissance*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2007, pp. 47–70; E Welch, 'Public Magnificence and Private Display Giovanni Pontano's *De splendore* (1498) and the Domestic Arts', *Journal of Design History*, vol.15, no.4, 2002, pp. 211–221; L Green, 'Galvano Fiamma, Azzone Visconti and the Revival of the Classical Theory of Magnificence', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol.53, 1990, pp. 98–113.

89 Hazard, 'A Magnificent Lord', p. 26.

90 M Hayward, 'Luxury or Magnificence? Dress at the Court of Henry VIII', *Costume*, no.30, 1996, pp. 37–46. Also M Hayward (ed.), *Dress at the Court of King Henry the VIII*, Maney, Leeds, 2007, particularly p. 217.

91 Hayward, 'Luxury or Magnificence', p. 43.

92 P Williams, 'Court and polity under Elizabeth I', in J Guy (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy*, Arnold, London, 1997, pp. 356–379, p. 357.

93 *Ibid.*, pp. 357–358.

laid down for dress. Although writing of a slightly later period Mansel suggests that ‘splendid dress was considered so important that, with name, wealth and manners, it helped to define the boundaries of court society’.<sup>94</sup> In addition he advances the opinion that ‘not to wear expensive and fashionable clothes would be demeaning for the courtier, insulting for the monarch’.<sup>95</sup> It is clear that Mansel’s argument can be applied to the Elizabethan court, where the queen expected courtiers to dress in a manner that supported the visual splendour of the court.

As Master of the Horse magnificence and splendour in the role, and associated pageantry, would have been a prerequisite. Max Reese’s publication on the office of the Master of the Horse remains the only such study.<sup>96</sup> Its many inaccuracies and lack of in-depth analysis mean that there is room for further research in this area. However Reese does show that the holder of the office needed to be well acquainted with the importance of ensuring the magnificence of the court on ceremonial occasions and during pageants.<sup>97</sup> The splendour and magnificence of the court was on constant display to visitors. To maintain the sumptuous attire throughout her court Elizabeth continued the monarch’s prerogative, employed by her father, of enabling some members of the court to dress outside the sumptuary law to present a fitting picture of a suitably magnificent court.<sup>98</sup> How far this extended to Leicester prior to his creation as earl of Leicester has not been explored. Once ennobled the sumptuary laws for dress would not have impacted detrimentally on his wardrobe.<sup>99</sup>

Adams in his entry on Leicester in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* posits that ‘Leicester’s personal tastes were not otherwise particularly extravagant, except perhaps with regard to his clothes, as was expected by the queen’.<sup>100</sup> The contextualising of Leicester’s expenditure on his wardrobe will aid in determining if his expenditure was extravagant. The effect of the Queen’s personal opinion on what he wore is more difficult to quantify. For Leicester as a favourite, and suitor, his dress needed to live up to, if not surpass, any rivals for these positions. Rachel Shulman argues that the nobility needed to ‘stay ahead and distinguish themselves from social climbers’ and this was achieved by ‘utilizing the most visible sign of status: increasingly

---

94 P Mansel, *Dressed to Rule. Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elizabeth II*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2005, p. xvi.

95 Ibid.

96 Reese, *The Royal Office of Master of the Horse*.

97 Ibid., pp. 114–118.

98 Hayward, ‘Luxury or Magnificence’, pp. 41 & 42. See also: FE Baldwin, *Sumptuary Legislation and Personal Regulation in England*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1926, p. 237; M Hayward, *Rich Apparel. Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII’s England*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Farnham, 2009; R Benhamou, ‘The Restraint of Excessive Apparel: England 1337-1604’, *Dress*, vol.15, 1989, pp. 27–37.

99 Baldwin, *Sumptuary Legislation*, p. 228.

100 Adams, ‘Leicester’, *ODNB*.



sumptuous clothing'.<sup>101</sup> Certainly Leicester's expenditure on his appearance has come in for comment by his more recent biographers.<sup>102</sup> Haynes posits that 'Like any great magnate of the Elizabethan period with several houses to maintain even when he was not personally in residence, Leicester was a prodigious consumer of luxury goods'.<sup>103</sup> This statement suggests that others were also indulging in such behaviour. However Leicester's biographers have made assessments of his expenditure without a detailed examination of the circumstances surrounding his spending. Of particular note is the repetition of the figure for Leicester's expenditure on goldsmiths' work and apparel in the first year of Elizabeth's reign.<sup>104</sup> Ian Archer posits that his expenditure on dress and goldsmith's work was exacerbated by his 'rising favour with the queen'.<sup>105</sup> Within Leicester's edited household accounts, that include these figures, Adams provides some background for household expenditure, highlighting known events and people associated with the itemised expenditure.<sup>106</sup> However the purpose of Adams's edition is not to contextualise Leicester's spending within the court. There is no examination of supporting evidence to prove that he was spending more than his contemporaries on his wardrobe.

Lawrence Stone, in his 1948 article, uses Leicester's spending on dress, along with Arundel's debts to dress-suppliers and Essex's debt to a draper, as examples of excessive consumption, supposedly the Achilles heel of the aristocracy.<sup>107</sup> Thus Stone states that 'The expenditure on clothes was not merely ruining the nobility as a class, it was upsetting the balance of English trade'.<sup>108</sup> Yet Stone's assessment of Leicester's dress expenditure is flawed. His figures are taken from an inventory of Leicester's goods following his death and therefore are not an accurate reflection of their true cost. What is more Stone's calculations are erroneous, or the reference is not cited correctly, for the dress items on the cited folio page come to total value of £73.3s.4d

---

101 R Shulman, 'Sumptuary Legislation and the fabric Construction of National Identity in Early Modern England', *Constructing the Past*, vol.8, iss.1, article 8, 2007, pp. 72–86, online accessed 4 May 2011, <<http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/constructing/vol8/iss1/8>>

102 See: Kendall, *Robert Dudley*, p. 180. See also Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 144; Wilson, *Uncrowned Kings of England*, p. 257.

103 Haynes, *The White Bear*, p. 99.

104 See, Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 144. Wilson calculates the figure to be £824.17s.5d.; M Misztal, *The Elizabethan Courtier. Ideal versus Reality Embodied in Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej, Krakow, 2002, p. 94. Misztal states the figure as 'over 820 pounds, with over 450 pounds for "apparel" alone'; S Gristwood, *Elizabeth & Leicester*, Bantam Books, London, 2007, p. 115. Gristwood merely states he 'spent more than £800 on apparel and goldsmith's work'. Skidmore, *Death and the Virgin*, also calculates the figure to be £824.17s.5d., p. 134; Also quoted by Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption', p. 49.

105 Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption', p. 49.

106 Adams, *Household Accounts*.

107 Stone, 'Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy'.

108 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

not the '£543' Stone quotes.<sup>109</sup> Stone's figures for all three examples he uses, Leicester, Arundel and Essex, require further investigation in order to establish the veracity of his argument. Stone's figures continue to be used by historians without verification of their accuracy.<sup>110</sup> Wilson is also convinced that Leicester spent too much on his wardrobe and states that 'His wardrobe was immense, running, according to an inventory, to several hundred items listed under a profusion of headings'.<sup>111</sup> Yet Wilson does not consider the size of the wardrobes of any of Leicester's contemporaries at court nor indeed the dress requirements for the leading male courtier and favourite.

Mariusz Misztal's discussion of Leicester as the ideal courtier explores his life through the guidance of contemporary courtesy manuals and Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* in particular.<sup>112</sup> Courtesy manuals were thought to be introduced to the English Court in the 1530's. However the true impact of the advice is difficult to determine.<sup>113</sup> Mary Partridge posits that Leicester's 'behaviour, like that of Hatton, conformed very closely to courtesy manual prescriptions' citing the dedication to Leicester in the 1576 translation of *Galateo* by Robert Peterson.<sup>114</sup> Misztal discusses *Il Cortegiano*'s guidance for the appearance and apparel of a courtier, effectively demonstrating the difficulty in defining Leicester's adhesion to Castiglione's ideas using the available evidence. Indeed the difficulty of ascribing the Castiglione ideals to any figure from the distance of four hundred and fifty years is conjectural and cannot help but reflect modern thinking and bias. Misztal relies heavily on published primary source material and therefore he has not had the advantage that access to the original documents can afford. Indeed he

---

109 Ibid., p. 5. For the original document Stone takes his calculations from see BL, Harley Roll D 35, I–XI. 1062, f. 15. The draper's bill quoted by Stone for Essex does not specify that the materials supplied were for dress, or indeed for dressing Essex, see, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, KG Preserved at Hatfield House Hertfordshire. Part VII*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1899, p. 386. The same is true for the collections of bills for Arundel, see, BL, Lansdowne MS 45, f. 207, *Book of the Earl of Arundell debts*.

110 Stone's figures have been quoted in: J Ashelford, *A Visual History of Costume. The Sixteenth Century*, BT Batsford Ltd, London, 1983, p. 12; J Ashelford, *Dress in the Age of Elizabeth I*, BT Batsford Ltd, London, 1988, p. 44; and LB Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London, 1500–1700*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, 2005. Luu uses Stone's figures for the 1589 consumption of goldsmiths' ware by the countess of Rutland, Stone's source is more ambiguous than he admits. See Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Twelfth Report Appendix Part IV. The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland G.C.B Preserved at Belvoir Castle. Volume I*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1888, p. 279.

111 Wilson, *Uncrowned Kings of England*, p. 257.

112 Misztal, *The Elizabethan Courtier*.

113 For a discussion assessing the impact of *Il Cortegiano* on the English court see M Partridge, *Images of the Courtier in Elizabethan England*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Birmingham, 2008, particularly Chapter Two pp. 38–81.

114 Ibid., p. 78. *Galateo* was a courtesy manual also originating in Italy: John Della Casa, *Galateo; or rather, a treatise of the maners and behauiors, it behoueth a man to use and eschewe in his familiar conuersation*, translated by Robert Peterson, London, 1576.

repeats Wilson's argument that Leicester's wardrobe was immense and quotes headings and numbers of garments cited in the calendared wardrobe inventory.<sup>115</sup> The inventory itself was a working document and included garments that were 'past service' and others that had been given away.<sup>116</sup> Simply quoting numbers of garments is misleading as it does not reflect the flow of these elements through the wardrobe. It also fails to consider how Leicester's garments were repaired and recycled either into other elements of dress or furnishings, or passed on to members of his household or the wider community.

As Janet Arnold has shown garments may have stayed in a wardrobe for many years being altered to accommodate fashion or changing body–shape.<sup>117</sup> This would result in a build–up of garments in one's wardrobe over an extended period of time. Unfortunately there have been few studies of an individual courtier's wardrobe, or its production, that would enable commentators to draw objective conclusions from the resources they have used to comment on Leicester's dress. Indeed the study carried out for my Master of Art's dissertation is the only extended study of the evidence for the contents of a courtier's wardrobe in the court of Queen Elizabeth I.<sup>118</sup> However that research focussed on the evidence for Leicester's wardrobe and must now be put in context through the course of this enquiry. Contextualising Leicester's wardrobe will be discussed in Chapter Two.

Leicester's appointments to various offices at court have been discussed by Wilson and are covered with more clarity by Adams in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry for Leicester.<sup>119</sup> The impact of these appointments on Leicester's wardrobe has received little attention.<sup>120</sup> Certainly for those positions that required adhesion to ceremony particular garments were required. Thus Leicester required robes for his membership of parliament, the Order of the Garter, the Order of St Michael and for his position as an earl. Marschner, Jefferson, Arnold and Hayward have discussed these

---

115 Misztal, *The Elizabethan Courtier*, p. 93; GD Owen (ed.), *Historical Manuscripts Commission Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable, the Marquess of Bath Preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire: Talbot, Dudley and Devereux Papers, 1533-1659. Volume 5*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1980, pp. 210–211.

116 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII.

117 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*. Although Arnold focuses on Queen Elizabeth's wardrobe it is clear that some of Leicester's garments stayed in his wardrobe for many years being repaired or altered as necessary. See particularly p. 14.

118 The evidence for the contents of Leicester's wardrobe has been explored in Wedge, *Dressed Fit for a Queen*.

119 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*. Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

120 However I have included a short discussion of his four sets of ceremonial robes found in his various inventories (Creation, Parliament, Garter, St Michael) in Wedge, *Dressed Fit for a Queen*, pp. 33–35.

types of ceremonial garments.<sup>121</sup> Only Arnold and Hayward touch on the production of these ceremonial garments, although from the point of view of royalty.<sup>122</sup> Marschner is principally concerned with manuscript material showing women's ceremonial dress in the first part of the sixteenth century. Marschner emphasises differing dress for the various ranks of women at court, highlighting that the 'early sixteenth century saw a royal ordinance which might be construed as the first regulation for a standardised court dress'.<sup>123</sup> Rank was also evident in men's ceremonial dress, particularly through sumptuary legislation. Hayward also discusses the dress privileges that membership of the Order of the Garter afforded the knights stating that 'Not surprisingly, the significance of the order and the prestige that it brought its knights was acknowledged by the knights being granted their own set of concessions in the acts of apparel'.<sup>124</sup> Certainly for Leicester, who was elected to the Order of the Garter within a year of Queen Elizabeth's accession, there is no doubt that his dress was affected by his position, not only by what he was required to wear for certain occasions but his rising status at court and an increase in financial rewards through his various offices and licences.

The regalia of the Order of the Garter have received the most attention from historians, with Elias Ashmole's 1672 publication continuing to be used as a key source.<sup>125</sup> Janet Arnold has more recently provided an account of the regalia that was necessary for members of the Order of the Garter.<sup>126</sup> In her discussion of the earliest known extant garments of the Order, Arnold includes valuable information on the production of such garments by the members of, and suppliers to, the Wardrobe. Indeed the extant

---

121 J Marschner, 'Ceremonial dress in Great Britain to denote the degrees of nobility from XVIth century sources', in AG Cavagna and G Butazzi (eds), *Le Trame Della Moda: Atti del Seminario Internazionale svoltosi a Urbino il 7-8 ottobre 1992 promosso dal Centro Italiano per lo Studio della Storia del Tessuto e dal Centro Studi sulle Società d'antico Regime Europa delle Corti*, Bulzoni Editore s.r.l., Roma, 1995, pp. 241–252; L Jefferson, 'Gifts given and fees paid to Garter King of Arms at installation ceremonies of the Order of the Garter during the sixteenth century', *Costume*, no.36, 2002, pp. 18–35; Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*; J Arnold, 'The kirtle, or surcoat, and mantle of the Most Noble Order of the Garter worn by Christian IV, King of Denmark and Norway', *The Antiquaries Journal*, vol.LXXII, 1992, pp. 141–167; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry the VIII*; Hayward, *Rich Apparel*.

122 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*; Arnold, 'The kirtle, or surcoat, and mantle'.

123 Marschner, 'Ceremonial dress', p. 247.

124 Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, p. 181.

125 E Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws & Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, London, 1672; H Tait, 'Insignia of the Order of the Garter', in J Hollis (ed.), *Princely Magnificence Court Jewels of the Renaissance, 1500-1630*, Debrett's Peerage Limited/Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1980, pp. 96-98; Arnold, 'The kirtle, or surcoat, and mantle'; Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*; J Leopold, and C Vincent, 'An Extravagant Jewel: The George Watch', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, vol.35, 2000, pp. 7, 137–149; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*.

126 Arnold, 'The kirtle, or surcoat, and mantle'.

garments provide the only known example of the work of John Parr, embroiderer to the Wardrobe. Parr was also a supplier of embroidery to Leicester.<sup>127</sup> The existence of the 1603 Garter Robes, presented to Christian IV, King of Denmark and Norway, enabled Arnold to carry out the detailed analysis of the materials, construction and workmanship of the robes. Arnold effectively uses written evidence alongside portraiture to contextualise the extant garments.

The opportunity to combine such evidence is rare. This is due to the paucity of extant sixteenth-century English garments, the dearth of personal papers relating to dress (particularly for those below the level of royalty) and a lack of corroborating portraiture.<sup>128</sup> Arnold also encounters this difficulty, as there is no portrait of Christian IV in the extant Garter Robes. However Arnold accompanies the discussion of the robes with numerous contemporary portraits of Garter Robes being worn by English Knights. The ability to correlate extant garments and written evidence with clothing depicted in portraiture is an invaluable tool for the study of dress at this period. It also provides a useful methodology for the analysis of dress. Unfortunately the opportunity to use the three types of evidence for the study of dress remains atypical. Indeed it is extremely rare to find an extant garment depicted in a portrait from this period. The earliest known English example is the portrait and bodice of Margaret Layton in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum.<sup>129</sup> The accuracy of the bodice's representation demonstrates the artist's skill in depicting dress. It also underlines the importance of the accuracy of rendering depictions of dress at this period, and therefore suggests its usefulness as a tool in dress history. Indeed Rosalind Marshall posits that 'portraits of Elizabethan England do record in minute detail what sitters wore, so that

---

127 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 199, 266, 329.

128 Arnold has surveyed many of the surviving garments in her *Patterns of Fashion* series. The lack of English examples sees her draw on garments from Europe in order to demonstrate styles of dress. See J Arnold, *Patterns of Fashion. The Cut and Construction of Clothes for Men and Women c.1560-1620*, Macmillan, London, 1985; J Arnold, J Tiramani and S Levey, *Patterns of Fashion The Cut and Construction of Linen Shirts, Smocks, Neckwear, Headwear and Accessories for Men and Women*, Macmillan, London, 2008. A summary of known extant household records is found in K Mertes, *The English Noble Household 1250-1600 Good Governance and Politic Rule*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1988. However Mertes does not include Leicester's accounts and, as Adams points out, omits the accounts of Sir Henry Sidney, earls of Essex and Hertford. Adams, *Household Accounts*, p.1. Still the most comprehensive surveys of Elizabethan portraiture are: R Strong, *The English Icon: Elizabethan & Jacobean Portraiture*, The Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art, London, 1969; R Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits Vol. 1 Text, Vol. 2 Plates*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1969.

129 The bodice is T.228-1994 and the painting is E.214-1994 See: Victoria & Albert Museum, London, Margaret Layton's bodice T.228-1994, online accessed 15 September 2011, <<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O11095/jacket/>>, and Victoria & Albert Museum, London, Portrait of Margaret Layton E.214-1994, online accessed 15 September 2011 <<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O69443/painting-margaret-layton-formerly-laton/>>. The dating for the garment is loosely located 1610-1615 while the portrait is thought to be 10 years later, c.1620.

garments and jewellery can actually be identified in documents of the time'.<sup>130</sup> Aileen Ribeiro suggests that 'the artist's reputation rested largely on the ability to paint all the details of rich clothing and jewellery, and to convey the dignity and deportment of the sitter'.<sup>131</sup> It follows then that these paintings provide evidence of the wardrobe suppliers' craft where no other physical evidence survives.

However the use of portraiture is not without its pitfalls. Arnold's commentary on three inventories of the Wardrobe of the Robes for Queen Elizabeth includes a discussion of the difficulties of achieving an accurate identification of a garment depicted in a portrait in relation to garments described in available written evidence. As she notes 'The gowns depicted in some of the paintings may well have been painted exactly as Elizabeth wore them, but they could easily have been altered out of all recognition by the time they were entered in the Stowe and Folger inventories in 1600'.<sup>132</sup> This highlights the need to contextualise the written and portrait evidence. Arnold effectively achieves this through the use of additional manuscript material. She also demonstrates the changing nature of the Wardrobe and the continued reuse of textiles at this period. Hayward faces the same challenges in her examination of dress at the court of Henry the VIII.<sup>133</sup> However Hayward has fewer portraits to draw from. She convincingly explores the written evidence and visual material of the court to contextualise the splendour of dress for the King and his court.

For Leicester too the evidence for his wardrobe and its production is found primarily in portraiture and written documents. The quantity of the evidence is far less than that available for the monarch but is nevertheless sufficient to enable further analysis. The methodologies used by Arnold and Hayward in their respective scrutiny of royal wardrobes have provided a partial framework to analyse Leicester's wardrobe evidence.<sup>134</sup> Collation of data, particularly from the written sources, has enabled the use of wider source material to begin to place the identified suppliers in context.

The uniform nature of ceremonial garments makes those that remain extant crucial to the understanding of the materials, of the way in which these garments were constructed, and of the workmanship necessary for a client such as Leicester. Arnold suggests that the Wardrobe provided the Garter Knights with fabric to make the required garments. This would imply that the knights were responsible for having their garments constructed by a tailor familiar with the uniform nature of the ceremonial robes. This raises the question; were the Garter Knights engaging the Wardrobe to

---

130 RK Marshall, *Costume in Scottish Portraits, 1560-1830*, The Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh, 1986, p. 5.

131 A Ribeiro, *The Gallery of Fashion*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2000, p. 11.

132 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 14.

133 Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*.

134 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*.

construct their robes or were their personal tailors familiar with the pattern of the robes? The creation of these types of garments may highlight a network engaged in an exchange of patterns necessary for their production. It is also possible that it may point to a particular specialisation of tailors, or the ability to engage with a wide variety of designs. This in turn would highlight the skills and abilities required of the artificers dressing the court. Yet no such study has been carried out. Arnold also suggests that English Knights 'provided their own mantles at this time, as material for them does not appear in the warrants'.<sup>135</sup> For Sir Henry Lee who was created a Garter Knight in 1597 Chambers states that the 'Royal Wardrobe furnished him with his robes, kirtle, hood and tippet, which required eighteen yards of crimson velvet and ten ells of white taffeta for the lining'.<sup>136</sup> This would indeed suggest that Lee provided his own mantle as the mantle was constructed from blue velvet, a fabric not included in Chamber's summary of the garments supplied by the Wardrobe.<sup>137</sup>

For Leicester providing the velvet for his mantle, and its construction, would have added to his wardrobe—spend for the first year of Elizabeth's accession. However this may not be the case as Leicester paid fees to the Clerk of the Signet for a warrant for his mantle and hood.<sup>138</sup> It is clear then that the Wardrobe supplied fabric for the robes, however there is some confusion over how, and by whom, the mantles were supplied. There is also some uncertainty over the colour of the mantle. Ashmole suggests that the colour of the mantle of foreign princes was changed from blue to purple from 1564 to 1637.<sup>139</sup> Arnold posits that 'presumably English Knights had to follow suit and buy new mantles'.<sup>140</sup> Yet an examination of portraits of Elizabethan English Garter Knights in their robes shows overwhelmingly the use of the blue mantle (see Appendix 1.3: Figures Ten to Fifteen). Arnold's suggestion that the crimson lake glaze may have been removed during cleaning of the portrait of the earl of Essex resulting in a blue mantle appears unlikely given the number of other portraits showing blue mantles after 1564.<sup>141</sup> However the survival of two portraits of Lord Burghley in Garter robes showing the use of both coloured mantles suggests there was some flexibility in the colour of the mantle, perhaps dictated by the event for which it was worn (see Appendix 1.3: Figures Twelve and Thirteen).

---

135 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 67.

136 EK Chambers, *Sir Henry Lee. An Elizabethan Portrait*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1936, p. 172.

137 The extant portrait of Lee in his Garter regalia show his mantle as blue, see Appendix 1.3: Figure Fifteen. The portrait is held in the collection of the Worshipful Company of Armourers and Brasiers, London.

138 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 65. This would have been supplied by the Wardrobe.

139 Ashmole, *Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p. 210.

140 Arnold, 'The kirtle, or surcoat, and mantle', p. 147.

141 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

In her monograph on the Queen's wardrobe Arnold discusses further robes of ceremony for the Queen.<sup>142</sup> These include robes of Parliament, Garter, and St Michael and their maintenance by the Wardrobe. How far the English Knights, who were required to wear such garments for their Court duties, were charged with sourcing and maintaining their ceremonial robes has not been examined by scholars. The official robes of Judges, akin to ceremonial robes, have however received some attention.<sup>143</sup> Unfortunately John Baker's history of Judges' robes does not explore the production of the garments. Baker does however use a 1637-42 account book of a London skinner to inform a discussion of adherence to dress regulations for these gowns. This would suggest specialisation by the supplier for his particular clientele. Indeed the specialisation of the artificer was clear, often loosely defined by their guild status, but the degree to which they concentrated on one aspect of their trade has also not been explored to any great extent.<sup>144</sup> Thomas Reddaway hints at the specialism within the Goldsmiths of Cheapside when he equates certain goldsmiths with certain types of product. Reddaway goes on to suggest 'specialist work, such as enamelling or the engraving of seals or the more intricate setting of precious stones was probably usually put out. "Chasing" may often have been. The trade lent itself to specialisation, and goldbeating and refining were often, if not invariably, the work of specialists'.<sup>145</sup> Leicester relied on the specialist skill of these artisans to produce elements of his dress, including his Garter regalia.<sup>146</sup>

It appears that the further one digs into the production of one person's wardrobe the wider the network of those involved becomes, particularly for members of the nobility. Indeed Patricia Wardle has shown that when garments were required in a hurry many hands were involved in their production, a practice that relied on a network of able artificers, with sufficient specialist skill to accomplish the task.<sup>147</sup> Arnold writes of

---

142 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 52-69.

143 JH Baker, 'A History of English Judges' Robes', *Costume*, no.12, 1978, pp. 27-39.

144 A freeman of a particular Company was able to practise trades other than that defined by their Company membership. See S Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, p. 110; IW Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability. Social Relations in Elizabethan London*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991, p. 124; TF Reddaway, 'Elizabethan London-Goldsmiths' Row in Cheapside, 1558-1645', *The Guildhall Miscellany*, vol.II, no.5, 1963, pp. 181-206; N Sleight-Johnson, 'The Merchant Taylors' Company of London under Elizabeth I: Tailors' Guild or Company of Merchants?', *Costume*, no.41, 2007, pp. 43-52, particularly p. 49.

145 Reddaway, 'Elizabethan London-Goldsmiths', p. 183 nn.10.

146 Numerous goldsmiths are found in Leicester's accounts supplying Garter regalia including the lesser George, jewellery for the garter and chains from which the lesser George was hung.

147 P Wardle, 'John Shepley (1575-1631), Embroiderer to the High and Mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales', *Textile History*, vol.32, no.2, 2001, pp. 133-155, p. 143. Suits of clothes commissioned for Prince Charles' attendance at the Spanish court were made in haste, one suit alone requiring '83 embroiderers working for six days' and '74 for five nights'.



Walter Fyshe specialising in the construction of women's clothing while Thomas Ludwell specialised in men's livery.<sup>148</sup> At least one of Fyshe's apprentices, William Edney, continued this specialism in women's wear when he became Lady Amy Dudley's tailor.<sup>149</sup> In spite of that it is clear that at least some tailors were flexible, adapting to their clientele. William Whittell specialised in men's clothes for Leicester, yet became a tailor to the Queen producing garments for women. However Arnold suggests Whittell specialised in the 'making and altering of doublets, jackets and jerkins' types of garments he would have been very familiar with from his production of Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>150</sup>

Other specialist garment makers such as the hosiers have received very little attention from scholars. Indeed the sheer paucity of information on hosiers in both primary and secondary source material for the sixteenth century is resounding. Although allied to tailors there were clear distinctions between the trades in the garments they supplied. Yet without their own guild in London the hosiers are more difficult to locate.

Numerous other suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe share the invisibility of hosiers within the City and Company records. The silkwomen active during Elizabeth's reign have received very little attention from historians. Marian Dale's examination of fifteenth-century London silkwomen demonstrates that the 'silkwomen kept the same rules and worked under the same conditions as the men' which included the engaging of apprentices to train in the craft.<sup>151</sup> Yet the fact that silkwomen were not members of the formal guild structure makes these people difficult to locate. Anne Sutton refers to 'silkwomen of the Mercery, so often wives, daughters, apprentices and employees of the mercers' in her discussion of the Mercers' Company citing largely silkwomen of earlier centuries.<sup>152</sup> Sutton laments the lack of evidence for these women's working practise which was tied very much to the 'working household' and therefore largely invisible.<sup>153</sup> Sutton's argument that these artificers were often the wives or widows, daughters and apprentices of Mercers may still hold true for Elizabethan silkwomen and requires further investigation. Two of Leicester's silkwomen are touched on in Sutton's treatise, Mrs Wilkinson, Mrs Smithe and Alice Mountague (Alice Smith, silkwoman and

---

148 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 177–180.

149 GL, MTC, MS 34048/4, f. 332v., William Edney completed his apprenticeship with Fyshe in 1555 and was Amy Dudley's tailor by the end of the 1550's; Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 122, 383–384.

150 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 180.

151 MK Dale, 'The London Silkwomen of the Fifteenth Century', *The Economic History Review*, vol. 4, no.3, 1933, pp. 324–335, p. 325.

152 AF Sutton, *The Mercery of London: Trade, Goods and People, 1130–1578*, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot, 2005, p. 116.

153 *Ibid.*, p. 206.

widow, married Roger Mountague, skinner, in 1562).<sup>154</sup> It is unsurprising that these leading artisans are noted, as evidence of their trading is found in the accounts of the Great Wardrobe. However Sutton's suggestion that Mrs Smith, found in Leicester's early accounts, was possibly Joan the wife of Ambrose Smith, mercer, is unlikely.<sup>155</sup> Although Ambrose Smith supplied Leicester at this time, and others of his suppliers worked as husband and wife teams, the silkwoman Mrs Smithe was more likely Mrs Alice Smith. Alice Smith supplied the Great Wardrobe and the Stables from Queen Elizabeth's coronation, and would most certainly have supplied the silk wares to Leicester for his part in the coronation, resulting in a bill, which may be reflected in Leicester's accounts.<sup>156</sup> In addition Mrs Smithe and Mrs Alice Mountague never supplied Leicester concurrently within the available evidence, Mrs Smithe supplied before 1561 and Mrs Mountague after 1565.<sup>157</sup> Mrs Mary Wilkinson supplied the silk wares for Queen Mary as well as silk wares for Mary's funeral and Queen Elizabeth's coronation.<sup>158</sup> A Wilkinson supplied silk wares to Leicester in 1558-9, for which a bill survives, as well as the evidence of a payment made to her on 9 June 1560.<sup>159</sup> This would indicate that the Mrs Wilkinson, silkwoman, supplying Leicester was Mary Wilkinson rather than Joan Wilkinson, protestant exile and supplier to Lady Lisle, suggested by Sutton.<sup>160</sup>

Alice (Smith) Mountague has received the most attention of the silkwomen supplying court for this period. Arnold has discussed her work for the Queen demonstrating the quality and quantity of goods she supplied.<sup>161</sup> The profusion of goods supplied would suggest she engaged a workforce beyond herself. Indeed Arnold states she engaged one woman in the task of mending.<sup>162</sup> The fact that she was also supplying Leicester would have certainly added to the workload and would again suggest a larger workforce. Arnold does not explore further the workers who might be required to supply the silk wares, or indeed the networks of supply to the silkwomen. Following Alice's death

---

154 J Foster, (ed.), *London Marriage Licences, 1521–1869*, Bernard Quaritch, London, 1887, p. 934. Roger Montagu, and Alice Smithe, widow of the City of London, were granted a general licence on 20 June 1562; LMA, P69/ANL/A/001/MS09016, they were married on 30 June 1562 at St Antholin, Budge Row, London.

155 Sutton, *Mercery*, p. 445.

156 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 120.

157 These dates reflect the dates of the available evidence for Mrs Smithe and Mrs Mountague supplying Leicester. Joan Smith, wife of Ambrose Smith, died on 23 April 1601; LMA, P69/PAN/A/001/MS05015, f. 69.

158 TNA, SP 12/4, f. 212, online accessed October 2011, <<http://www.sp12.hull.ac.uk/jpg/jpg4/SP12004f212.JPG>>; Sutton, *Mercery*, p. 446.

159 The bill is LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 27–28. The payment is recorded in Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 122.

160 Sutton, *Mercery*, p. 445. Joan Wilkinson died in exile.

161 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 219–224.

162 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 223–224.

in 1581 her husband Roger Mountague, skinner, continued to supply the Queen, no doubt retaining his wife's workforce.<sup>163</sup> Due to a lack of evidence it is currently impossible to confirm if Roger Mountague was still supplying Leicester with silk wares following 1581. Leicester's other silkwomen have received no attention at all; there has been no examination of the goods they were supplying or if they were being patronised by others at court.

The work of Leicester's shepsters has also been largely overlooked. The shepster supplied shirts, ruffs and other small personal linen items to Leicester's wardrobe. They also carried out work on, and supplied, household linens. Sutton references the term 'Shepstry work' in Leicester's accounts and indicates that the work was 'supplied by men and women, with a man often taking the female title of shepster with his wife'.<sup>164</sup> Sutton carried out no further analysis of their work for Leicester. Sutton suggests that, during the fifteenth century, it became harder for poorer London women shepsters to trade as the Mercers' Company placed tighter restriction on supply of linens. Sutton also indicates that 'a fortunate few worked for royalty and nobility, but all were poorly rewarded'.<sup>165</sup> It is only the position of the shepster/seamstress for royalty and nobility that has been examined in any detail by historians. Hayward states that the 'post of the king's seamstress was not created until the accession of the Stuart kings'.<sup>166</sup> Yet the shepster/seamstress was supplying the Great Wardrobe throughout the sixteenth century. Arnold posits that the queen's silkwoman may have been commissioning smocks and other linen items for Queen Elizabeth from seamstresses, or that they may have made them themselves.<sup>167</sup> The names of smock-makers did not appear in the warrants until the early 1590's. Their work was supplemented during Henry VIII's reign by at least one of his Queens and gifts from aristocratic women. The suggestion by Hayward that shirt-making was 'considered a wifely task, suitable even for a Queen to perform' may well hold true for others of the nobility but available evidence would suggest not for Leicester.<sup>168</sup>

Neither of Leicester's wives appear to have made his shirts. Prior to the death of his first wife in 1560 Leicester had been engaging shepsters to produce his shirts.<sup>169</sup> In addition the Countess of Leicester did not make shirts for her husband, choosing to

---

163 LMA, P96/MRY1/A/001/ MS07666, f. 135v., Mrs Alice 'Mowntagew,' wife of Mr Roger 'Mountagew' was buried on 10 August 1581 at St Mary Abchurch.

164 Sutton, *Mercery*, p. 445.

165 Ibid., p. 203.

166 Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, p. 112.

167 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 224.

168 Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, p. 111.

169 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 53, 119. There is no evidence for Lady Amy Dudley making her husband's shirts.

purchase them from a shepster instead.<sup>170</sup> Leicester's shepsters were also supplying shirts to Ambrose Dudley, earl of Warwick and Sir Henry Sidney both married men at the time.<sup>171</sup> This sharing of shepsters certainly demonstrates a familial network for one's personal wardrobe. How far this network was a Court-wide nexus, beyond the familial, requires further exploration. Wardle has carried out a study of seamstresses/shepsters to the Stuart Kings.<sup>172</sup> The catalogue of the Kings' seamstresses includes reference to the amount of work required and the need to employ competent needle-hands. Here again the lack of an official guild for seamstresses necessitates the examination of records within the established guild structure for apprenticeship evidence and an indication of workshop size. Wardle cites nine girls apprenticed through the Carpenters' Guild to Richard Hill and his wife to learn the art of a seamstress.<sup>173</sup> While this underlines the use of the apprenticeship system for women involved in shepstry/seamstress work it also highlights the lateral thinking which is needed to identify these people and their working practises. Further research is required in this area.

Establishing further information on Leicester's suppliers and their networks is heavily reliant on wider City and Livery Company records. Unfortunately the survival of this material is patchy. The destruction of the Cordwainers' Company hall during the 1666 fire of London resulted in the loss of much information relating to the Company and its members for the sixteenth century. The impact of such a loss is evident in the dearth of information relating to Leicester's shoemakers. Literature exists for the work of shoemakers on either side of the period. The earlier period is covered by Francis Grew and Margrethe de Neergaard's examination of shoes excavated from London sites of the medieval period from 1100 to 1450.<sup>174</sup> This also provides a valuable resource for both production and materials technology for the period. Giorgio Riello's thesis on the boot and shoe trade in London and Paris covers the long eighteenth century.<sup>175</sup> Grew

---

170 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 258. Payment was made to Mrs Barker for shirts and ruffs that the Countess had bought for Leicester in June 1585.

171 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 166, is a 1562 bill from Mrs Cowdrye al Storer for shirts for Leicester, recording that shirts of the same design were made for Warwick and were delivered together with those for Leicester. CKS, U1475 A5/4, f. 3, is the 1565–66 summary account for apparel and goldsmiths' work where Mrs Barker, shepster is recorded as having been paid xvli.

172 P Wardle, 'Divers necessities for his Majesty's use and service': Seamstresses to the Stuart Kings', *Costume*, no.31, 1997, pp. 16–27. See also Arnold, Tiramani and Levey, *Patterns of Fashion*. This book gives a brief description of the work of a seamstress with examples of extant garments and portraits.

173 Wardle, 'Divers necessities', p. 18.

174 F Grew, and M de Neergaard, *Shoes and Pattens: Medieval finds from excavations in London*, Boydell Press, London, 2001.

175 G Riello, *The Boot and Shoe Trades in London and Paris in the Long Eighteenth Century*, unpublished dissertation submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University College London, 2002.

and de Neergaard and Riello's examination of shoes and boots highlight the importance of the industry for shoeing the people. It is clear that the two hundred years not covered in these studies requires further research. Both Hayward and Arnold discuss the monarch's footwear but very little else has been written on sixteenth-century English shoe production.<sup>176</sup> Of Leicester's known footwear suppliers none were named as suppliers to the various monarchs of the sixteenth century. Leicester's shoemakers do not appear to feature in Benbow's lists of citizens involved in local government, however this is also a reflection of the loss of Company records for the period.<sup>177</sup> As an occupation Cordwainers' Company members were on average less wealthy than tailors but more wealthy than hosiers.<sup>178</sup> This would result in fewer opportunities for their names to be remembered as the great benefactors found in other City Companies and parish records.<sup>179</sup> However it is the loss of the Company records that accentuates the dearth of information on the Cordwainers, and any involvement Leicester may have had with the Company, as he did with other Livery Companies.<sup>180</sup>

The published lay subsidy rolls for London for the years 1541 and 1582 provide a snap-shot of the wealthier inhabitants of the City.<sup>181</sup> They serve as a useful guide for locating people, particularly those supplying the court. However Robert Lang argues that the uncertainty of ward boundaries led to confusion over which ward some residents were assessed in.<sup>182</sup> It would appear that not all of those who supplied Leicester are visible in these published rolls. Lang and Alan H. Nelson have suggested that while extremely valuable these rolls cover only a percentage of the population.<sup>183</sup> The invisible poor are not represented at all, although these folk are unlikely to number amongst Leicester's suppliers. The bulk of the evidence for Leicester's suppliers

---

176 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 210–216; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, pp. 113–144.

177 RM Benbow, *Notes to Index of London Citizens Involved in City Government, 1558-1603, Volumes One and Two*, unpublished manuscript held in the library of the Institute of Historical Research, London.

178 J Oldland, 'The Wealth of the Trades in Early Tudor London', *The London Journal*, vol.31, no.2, 2006, pp. 146–148. Oldland calculates the average wealth of those assessed for the Amicable Grant in 1525. Cordwainers' average wealth for those ten assessed was £17, for tailors the 161 assessed averaged a wealth of £65, and for the 14 hosiers assessed their average wealth was £7.

179 See, for example, M Davies and A Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Taylors' Company*, Maney Publishing, Leeds, 2004, p. 138; Sutton, *Mercery*, pp. 521–554.

180 See Sutton, *Mercery*, p. 508. Leicester was made free of the Mercers' Company in 1562. His dealings with the Goldsmiths' Company are recorded in the Court Minutes. GCL, Goldsmiths' Company Court Minutes Book K Part I; GCL, Goldsmiths' Company Court Minutes Book L.

181 RG Lang, (ed.), *Two Tudor Subsidy Assessment Rolls for the City of London 1541 and 1582*, London Record Society, London, 1993.

182 *Ibid.*, p.xxxiv.

183 AH Nelson, *London Lay Subsidy Rolls 1593-1600*, 2004, online accessed 20 September 2011, <<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ahnelson/SUBSIDY/intro.html>>

falls between 1541 and 1582. Given the dates of the published assessment rolls the recorded names inevitably only reflect those of Leicester's suppliers who were wealthy enough to be documented, and who were in London at that time of assessment.

Also missing from the rolls are the apprentices and journeymen who were employed by Leicester's suppliers on elements of his dress. A great deal has been written on apprenticeship and migration into London. The influx of raw recruits and skilled crafts people built the base from which the leading suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe were drawn. George Ramsay's study of the origins of apprentices admitted to the freedom of the City demonstrated that the majority of apprentices were drawn from outside the City.<sup>184</sup> Steve Rappaport, too, draws the same conclusion suggesting that 90% of those recorded in the City register of freemen by apprenticeship for the years 1551-1553 were from other parts of England.<sup>185</sup> He suggests that 'Approximately 1250 young men arrived in the capital each year in the middle of the sixteenth century to begin apprenticeships'.<sup>186</sup> This would imply that Leicester's wardrobe suppliers were most likely sourcing their apprentices from beyond the City walls. The competition to gain an apprenticeship with a master that had such a prestigious client must have been fierce. Jacob Field's study of apprentices drawn from the North-East of England has suggested the importance of networks in finding apprenticeships in London.<sup>187</sup> Although his study focuses on the seventeenth century Field concludes that at the beginning of the period familial ties were most important for a master when engaging an apprentice while economic networks increased in importance by the end of the seventeenth century.

Yet it was not just apprentices who migrated to the City. Skilled artisans, both from within and without the kingdom moved there too. Those who bought their freedom of the City by redemption paid fees to the Company and the City. Rappaport suggests that an average of £11.2s.10d was paid to the City of London for the 'twenty-seven men in 1551-3, admission by redemption cost a man several pounds in fees and/or gifts to his company'.<sup>188</sup> William Whittell, Leicester's tailor, gained his freedom of the City, and membership of the Merchant Taylors' Company, by redemption in 1554.<sup>189</sup> This suggests that he migrated to the City as a skilled artisan, and that he was sufficiently wealthy to pay the requisite fees. Added to these costs for Whittell it would have

---

184 GD Ramsay, 'The Recruitment and Fortunes of Some London Freemen in the Mid-Sixteenth Century', *The Economic History Review*, vol.31, no.4, 1978, pp. 526-540.

185 Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, p. 76.

186 Ibid., p. 294.

187 JF Field, 'Apprenticeship Migration from the North-East of England in the Seventeenth Century', *The London Journal*, vol. 35, no.1, 2010, pp. 1-21.

188 Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, p. 292.

189 GL, MTC, MS 34048/4, f. 281.

been necessary to have sufficient funds to set up a shop in London.<sup>190</sup> Although the equipment necessary for the tailors' profession was relatively small, gaining suitable premises in an advantageous location would have been essential.<sup>191</sup> In addition funds would be required to maintain the people employed within the shop and/or workshop.

These are the same types of issues facing the alien immigrants to the City who were suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe. Numerous foreign-born craftsmen and merchants are found in Leicester's accounts.<sup>192</sup> However unless they gained denization they were liable to be taxed at a higher rate than an Englishman and suffered numerous other restrictions.<sup>193</sup> Lien Luu's study of immigrants and their industries highlights the areas of specialism new immigrants brought with them.<sup>194</sup> Of the industries Luu focuses on it is the impact of the alien goldsmiths on English production that is of particular interest for Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>195</sup> Luu highlights the movement into and out of England by goldsmiths undertaking their wanderjahre travels and the immigration of alien masters.<sup>196</sup> Luu posits that it was the training of these alien craftsmen that set them apart as masters of their craft above their English equivalent and ensured they were exponents of the latest styles. Indeed Luu states that 'Continental goldsmiths were able to pick up the latest fashions and developments in the craft, and build up a collection of sketches and ideas for ornament upon which they could base their later work. Equally important, the wanderjahre enabled Continental goldsmiths to create a complex, self-renewing network of connections, through which fresh versions of fashionable ornaments could be shared and disseminated'.<sup>197</sup> Many of those without

---

190 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 46, Whittell had established a shop in London by 1558, see Chapter Five.

191 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 181, Arnold lists the basic equipment required to carry out the tailors' occupation as 'a clear working area, strips of parchment to take his measures, a yard stick, a table for cutting his cloth, a pair of shears, irons, pins, needles, thread, chalk or soap for marking the cloth and a thimble'.

192 These include for example: Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 43, 87, 89, 91, the Spanish tailor; *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 45, 62, 122 James Crokeham; *Ibid.*, pp. 41, 53, 161, Benedict Spinola; *Ibid.*, p. 56, the Spanish hosier; *Ibid.*, p. 40, Francis Berty; *Ibid.*, pp. 86, 90, 117, Hans Frank.

193 Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, p. 144, denization was awarded by the Crown by letters patent and equated to the acquisition of various rights denied to non-denizens. These included the ability to work as a master, keep a shop, 'employ up to four alien journeymen, purchase land, and allow their children to be apprenticed to English masters'. Leicester's supplier Benedict Spinola was granted full denization in 1552, see J Bennell, 'Spinola, Benedict (1519/20–1580)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 1 September 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52156>>

194 Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*.

195 *Ibid.*, pp. 219–258.

196 *Ibid.*, p. 225, defines wanderjahre travels as an essential and final part of the foreign apprentice's training. Wanderjahre formed the second half of a twelve to fourteen year training programme which saw the apprentice working for the first half of the period with one master then the remainder as a journeyman in a series of masters' workshops on the Continent, and England. Following this training he was required to submit a masterpiece to become a master.

197 *Ibid.*, pp. 224–225.

denization worked for an English master. Of those English goldsmiths Luu highlights as employing alien journeymen, at least three were supplying Leicester with goldsmiths' wares for his wardrobe.<sup>198</sup> While the impact of alien masters on Leicester's wardrobe may be difficult to quantify it is clear that the community of artificers that supplied Leicester possessed the resources to provide the latest continental styles if required.

Adams suggests that 'The regular presence of the courtiers in London produced a close intermingling with the urban and commercial elite, a significant feature of Elizabethan politics and society'.<sup>199</sup> The relationship between Leicester and his wardrobe suppliers was rooted in this relationship, and is evident in Leicester's accounts. The evidence for Leicester's engagement with those who were supplying him can additionally be found in surviving letters and Livery Company minutes.<sup>200</sup> Adams has shown that Leicester cultivated an extensive network of people at all levels of society, encompassing a wide range of fields.<sup>201</sup> Kendall, meanwhile, highlights foreign connections, found in letters, particularly to Italian merchants based in Antwerp.<sup>202</sup> These networks were certainly involved in supplying wardrobe materials, and other goods, to Leicester.

Wardrobe supply networks have been generally overlooked in costume histories for sixteenth-century English dress. These anthologies have relied heavily on portraiture to show the fashions of the Elizabethans and to demonstrate trends in dress.<sup>203</sup> The writings of contemporary commentators such as Holinshed, Stow and Stubbs are also drawn on to provide descriptions of dress.<sup>204</sup> As we have seen, only very limited extant garments exist that can be definitively dated to the period. There is a tendency

---

198 Ibid., p. 238, Luu's list of the English goldsmiths' employing aliens includes; Diricke Anthony, Edward Gylberd, Mr Kettlewood who were supplying Leicester.

199 Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, p. 116.

200 Evidence for Leicester's networks and the mutual beneficial nature of these networks will be discussed in Chapter Three. For example, GCL, Court Minutes Book K Part I, f. 102 shows that on 2 November 1559 Leicester was supporting one of his suppliers to obtain a lease on a house in Cheapside owned by the Company.

201 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

202 Kendall, *Robert Dudley*, pp. 75–76.

203 I Brooke, *English Costume in the Age of Elizabeth The Sixteenth Century*, Adam & Charles Black, London, 1950; Ashelford, *A Visual History*.

204 J Planché, *History of British Costume*, Charles Knight, London, 1834; Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* have recently been the focus of a scholarly reappraisal see '*The Holinshed Project*', online accessed 20 September 2011, <<http://www.cems.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/index.shtml>> and the resultant publication is P Kewes, IW Archer and F Heal (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013 although this has not been consulted for this thesis due to the date of its publication. See also Stow's *Chronicle*, J Stow, *The Chronicles of England, from Brute vnto this present yeare of Christ 1580*, London, 1580; Stubbs' publication is, P Stubbs, *The Anatomie of Abuses: Contayning A Discoverie, or Briefe Summarie of such Notable Vices and Imperfections, as now raigne in many Christian Countreyes of the Worlde: but (especiallie) in a verie famous Ilande called Ailgna* (sic), Printed by Richard Jones, London, 1583.



in these studies to presume the accuracy of the portrait in its depiction of dress. However these portraits may well show the sitter in their best garments, which may not reflect the remainder of the wardrobe. Elizabeth Birbari confronts the accuracy issue of dress in portraiture in her examination of dress in Italian painting.<sup>205</sup> Birbari clearly demonstrates that the status of the sitter is evident in the portrait, through their clothing. It must be remembered that the portrait, along with an inventory or will, provide only a snap-shot of what are most likely the contents of a wardrobe. Equally these sources rarely indicate where the elements of dress came from or who made them. Reference to a garment given by Leicester to Sir William Woodhouse, a member of the Muscovy Company, appears in Woodhouse's will.<sup>206</sup> Special garments that were imbued with the prestige of the benefactor may prove the exception in wills and inventories.

Jane Ashelford's analysis of Elizabethan dress spends some time examining the sources of garments, and is particularly concerned with garment types.<sup>207</sup> Ashelford quotes Lawrence Stone in her discussion of the cost of dress for those who attended court.<sup>208</sup> As we have seen Stone presents large figures for the earls of Arundel, Essex and Leicester in relation to their dress.<sup>209</sup> While some of the figures Ashelford uses may be imprecise, her discussion of the garments worn by the Elizabethan man summarises types of fashionable dress very well. However she does not quantify a wardrobe or explore wardrobe production networks beyond an outline of what garments might be obtained in London.

Much research has been carried out by scholars on subjects that may be described as being at the peripheries of the present inquiry. European and particularly Italian clothing production has been examined over the past 20 years by various researchers

---

205 E Birbari, *Dress in Italian Painting 1460-1500*, John Murray, London, 1975, p. 2.

206 TS Willan, *The Muscovy Merchants of 1555*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1953, p. 129.

207 Ashelford, *Dress*.

208 *Ibid.*, p. 44; Stone, 'Anatomy', p. 5.

209 An examination of the figure for Leicester cited by Stone, '£543' for 'seven doublets and two cloaks', is incorrect see Stone, 'Anatomy', p. 5. The total shown in the inventory for all of the garments is £73.3s.4d and includes seven cloaks, three doublets with their hose, two privie doublets, two jerkins and one doublet, see BL, Harley Roll D.35. I-XI. 1062, f. 15.

and continues to be the focus of much research.<sup>210</sup> Less attention has been paid to the clothing production networks of London for the second half of the sixteenth century, or, indeed, the entire early modern period. Work has been done on the wardrobes of the Italian elite, yet no comparative study has been carried out on an English equivalent. Elizabeth Currie has examined household accounts for numerous families in Florence that has enabled her to shed light on the role of the tailor and on the intricacies of procurement for their wardrobes.<sup>211</sup> Historians focussing on England have chosen to explore different aspects of those involved in procurement and production. The histories of the various London Livery Companies focus on the origins of the Companies, their political structures and charitable activities rather than what they were making or supplying.<sup>212</sup> Indeed Ian Archer asserts that these historians have been ‘too often overwhelmed by the institutional archives available to them, they have failed to look at what the company’s members were actually producing’.<sup>213</sup> The networks that these Companies worked within are alluded to but not explored fully.

Few of Leicester’s wardrobe suppliers have been examined beyond the repetition of a selection of names by biographers and commentators without a great deal of further comment. Those that have received limited attention are the suppliers who also dealt with royalty, with particular emphasis on embroiderers and tailors. Indeed Ian Archer has written short biographical entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* for David Smith, embroiderer, and Walter Fish, tailor, who both worked for the Great Wardrobe. Each also had connections to Leicester’s wardrobe. Archer includes a description of the type of work Smith did for the queen but focuses largely on his wealth and bequests. Archer suggests there ‘is little evidence of other business activities apart from the pursuit of his craft, but he did adventure £100 in Adrian Gilbert’s quest

---

210 C Frick, *Dressing Renaissance Florence. Families, Fortunes, & Fine Clothing*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2002; E Currie, ‘Diversity and Design in the Florentine Tailoring Trade, 1550-1620’, in M O’Malley and E Welch (eds), *The Material Renaissance*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2007, pp. 154–173; E Currie, ‘Fashion Networks: Consumer Demand and the Clothing Trade in Florence from the Mid-Sixteenth Centuries’, in MF Rosenthal (ed.), *Cultures of Clothing in Later Medieval and Early Modern Europe, The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol.39, no. 3, 2009, pp. 483–509; E Welch, *Shopping in the Renaissance*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2005; M O’Malley, ‘A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes: Commission, Cost, and Meaning in Renaissance Footwear’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol.63, no.1, 2010, pp. 45–83; R Orsi Landini, R, *Moda a Firenze 1540–1580. Cosimo I de’Medici’s Style*, Edizioni Polistampa, Firenze, 2011.

211 Currie, ‘Diversity and Design’; Currie, ‘Fashion Networks’.

212 Sutton, *Mercery*; I Archer, *The History of The Haberdashers’ Company*, Phillimore & Co., Chichester, 1991; Davies and Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Taylors’ Company*; N Sleigh-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors’ Company of London 1580-1645 with Special Reference to Government and Politics*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University College London, 1989; TF Reddaway and LEM Walker, *Early History of the Goldsmiths’ Company, 1327-1509: Including the Book of Ordinances, 1478-88*, E Arnold, London, 1975.

213 Archer, ‘Conspicuous Consumption’, p. 39.

for the north-west passage'.<sup>214</sup> Fish's business activities are equally challenging, however Archer hints at the wider courtier network that these artisan/craftspeople were part of through a letter suggesting the use of the queen's tailor as the person most suitable to make a cloak for a New Year's gift for the queen.<sup>215</sup> Certainly the security around the queen and her Wardrobe called for courtiers to engage her trusted suppliers for any clothing gifts.<sup>216</sup> Yet how far this use of the queen's suppliers extended to the courtiers' own personal wardrobes has not been examined. Patricia Wardle demonstrates, briefly, the use of the king's embroiderer by a private individual in 1618. A London attorney Michael Hugganson used his professional relationship with the embroiderer to obtain materials for a woman in Yorkshire thus indicating the wider networks in which these leaders in their field were involved.<sup>217</sup> Both Fish (called Fyshe in Arnold) and Smith are reflected in Arnold's exploration of the Queen's Wardrobe in which Arnold records the series of people who fulfilled the Queen's dress requirements. Arnold relates the dates that evidence is found for each of the Queen's artificers and suppliers, but fails to explore the networks that they belonged to. Significantly numerous individuals named in Arnold's treatise were also suppliers to Leicester.<sup>218</sup>

Historians have explored a number of individual artificers beyond those listed above. Here again the emphasis has been on suppliers to the Great Wardrobe. Wardle, for example has, focussed on suppliers to the Stuart court.<sup>219</sup> In her examination of the life and work of John Shepley, embroiderer, Wardle highlights the garments for different court activities that required the input of an embroiderer. These included elements of dress for hunting and tilting, the masque, ceremonial garments, and additional dress items such as the girdles and hangers. Her study underlines the importance of the embroiderer to the Wardrobe supply network of a king and his court, which also held true for Elizabeth's court.

Archer has touched on a number of Leicester's suppliers in his discussion of the court's impact on the London economy.<sup>220</sup> He posits that the relationship between the

---

214 I Archer, 'Smith, David (d. 1587)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 19 September 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/93686>>

215 I Archer, 'Fish, Walter (d.1585)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 19 September 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/93685>>

216 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 179.

217 P Wardle, 'The King's embroiderer: Edmund Harrison (1590-1667): Part II', *Textile History*, vol.26, no.2, 1995, pp. 139-185, p. 158. The King's embroiderer was a client of Michael Hugganson. Hugganson used his relationship with the embroiderer in order to obtain the best materials possible to send to Mrs Elizabeth Danby on the Yorkshire moors for her personal use.

218 Those individuals who were supplying the Wardrobe and Leicester's wardrobe are discussed further in the following chapters.

219 P Wardle, 'The King's embroiderer: Edmund Harrison (1590-1667): Part I', *Textile History*, vol.25, no.1, 1994, pp. 29-59; Wardle, 'Edmund Harrison Part II'; Wardle, 'Divers necessities'; Wardle, 'John Shepley'.

220 Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption'.

courtier and the tradesman was by no means equal but 'one of mutual dependency. Aristocratic patronage was potentially extremely lucrative not only because of the large orders involved, but also because trading networks could be extended from one patron to another'.<sup>221</sup> Archer's examination of the links between the City and the court, through suppliers to royal coronations and funerals, illustrates the symbiotic relationship, a relationship that was crucial to Leicester's wardrobe. Archer also highlights the relationship between the Haberdashers' Company of London and the court as one that was 'broadly constructive'.<sup>222</sup> Archer includes Leicester among a list of courtiers and ministers who promoted 'candidates for freedoms by redemption'.<sup>223</sup> Although Archer does not identify Leicester's candidate the fact he is lending support demonstrates the involvement of Leicester in these business networks beyond his role as a consumer. The intermingling of the court and the City elite is amply illustrated by the work of Anne Sutton in her exploration of the Mercers' Company.<sup>224</sup> Sutton highlights the Mercers' dinners, such as that which took place on 17 July 1564, as grand events that saw the leaders of the City and the court dining with the Company.<sup>225</sup> Both sides used these networks to their advantage. Leicester provided a contact at court for petitions to the Privy Council or to forward suits to the queen while the City elite provided the financial means through loans to advance Leicester's plans when necessary.

Published work on the business practises of Leicester's suppliers is slight, and this is particularly true of the artificers. John Benson and Laura Ugolini note that 'attempts to stress the innovative nature of early modern retailing have had the unwanted – and unfortunate – effect of concentrating attention on the minority of urban, often London-based, innovative, 'modern' shopkeepers at the expense of the majority of retailers, particularly 'traditional' craftsmen-retailers such as shoemakers, tailors, saddlers, bakers, or cabinetmakers, about whom we still know all too little'.<sup>226</sup> Many of Leicester's suppliers would have fallen into the traditional craftsman-retailer category, however others were leading business people in the City. Leicester himself visited his

---

221 Ibid., p.54.

222 Archer, *Haberdashers' Company*, p. 149.

223 Ibid.

224 Sutton, *Mercery*.

225 Ibid., p. 488. Sutton lists those in addition to the members of the Mercers Company who attended the dinner including; Lord Mayor Sir John White, grocer, Sir William Garrard, draper, Sheriffs Edward Bancks and Rowland Heyward, Aldermen Roger Martin and William Aleyne, Richard Chamberlain, ironmonger, Mr Compton, Benedict Spinola, Messrs Smith and Patrick of the Customs' House and Mr Patente. The French Ambassador, earls of Pembroke and Warwick, Lord Robert Dudley, the lord chamberlain, Lord Howard, Lord Hunsdon, Mr Tamworth and Mr Heneage.

226 J Benson and L Ugolini, 'Introduction: Historians and the nation of shopkeepers', in J Benson and L Ugolini (eds.). *A Nation of Shopkeepers. Five Centuries of British Retailing*, IB Tauris & Co Ltd, London, 2003, pp. 1–24, p. 2.

suppliers' shops, particularly in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. Yet there has been no study of his shopping practises or the geography of his supply network. Claire Walsh's study of the social relationships of shopping in early-modern England sheds some light on the importance of personal relationships for distance shopping.<sup>227</sup> Members of Leicester's household were clearly tasked with obtaining items for his wardrobe for him and their involvement in his wardrobe requires further analysis. As Bruno Blondé and Natacha Coquery have pointed out, it was the relationship between the sellers and the customer that underpinned early modern retailing.<sup>228</sup> The maintenance of a reliable supply network was crucial and the success of these relationships are reflected in the long-term patronage of clients. The most intimate of these relationships would have been with the tailor and hosier where a personal fitting was necessary. Carole Frick discusses the relationship of the tailor and client suggesting that there were 'socioeconomic connections among tailors and between tailors and their clients that went beyond the business level'.<sup>229</sup> Leicester's continued patronage of certain members of his wardrobe-supply network would imply a level of satisfaction with the goods supplied and the suppliers' ability to satisfy their client.

Malcolm Smuts in his discussion of art and material culture demonstrates the disproportionate attention that has been paid to artists compared to the craftspeople-retailers who contributed more to the magnificence of the Court. As he notes 'Van Dyck and Rubens are household names, probably known to a wider proportion of the population today than in their own lifetimes'. Yet 'People like Benjamn Henshawe, the silk mercer who sold James 1 and Queen Anne £45,000 worth of goods between 1616 and 1618, have been forgotten even by experts'.<sup>230</sup> These suppliers of dress and textiles underpinned the magnificence and splendour of the Court. They also played leading roles in their communities. However it was a mutually beneficial relationship that paid dividends for both parties.

## Summary

The preceding review of literature and its relevance to this study has revealed several important key points. Leicester and his consumption of material culture, specifically his wardrobe, have not previously been placed in the broader context of the early

---

227 C Walsh, 'The Social Relations of Shopping in Early-Modern England', in B Blondé, P Stabel, J Stobart and I Van Damme (eds), *Buyers and Sellers Retail Circuits and Practices in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, Turnhout: Brepols, Turnhout, 2006, pp. 331–351, particularly p. 338.

228 B Blondé and N Coquery, 'Introduction', in B Blondé, E Briot, N Coquery and L Van Aert (eds), *Retailers and Consumer Changes in Early Modern Europe. England, France, Italy and the Low Countries*, Presses Universitaires Francois-Rabelais, Tours, 2005, pp. 5–19.

229 Frick, *Dressing Renaissance Florence*, p. 66.

230 RM Smuts, 'Art and the material culture of majesty in early Stuart England', in RM Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart Court & Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 86–112, p. 112.

modern English court. Indeed there is no research into the wardrobe requirements of a high-ranking courtier. Assumptions have been made about Leicester's wardrobe expenditure, but there has been no study to support these arguments. Furthermore there has been no study of the networks involved in the supply and production of wardrobe materials for an English courtier in the early modern period. This has resulted in important contributors to the supply network, such as women and strangers, being largely overlooked when considering their impact on the visual splendour of the court. Missing too are the studies of individual suppliers and the products they were supplying. There has also been no study that examines Leicester's patronage of merchants and artificers and the impact his patronage had on their careers. Given the wide gaps within the existing historiography it is clear that there are many avenues that this research could traverse. The following chapters will seek to fill a number of the voids highlighted in the above survey of literature.

It is the work of the artificers and the diversity of those involved in the production and supply of Leicester's wardrobe that I am particularly interested in. However in order to discuss these networks, key questions must first be addressed. These are three of the research questions highlighted at the start of this chapter – *what was Leicester wearing? How far was Leicester's role at court reflected in his wardrobe? How far was Leicester's consumption of dress excessive for his position? Once these questions have been addressed further questions can be considered – who were Leicester's wardrobe suppliers and how exclusive was his supply network? And was Leicester's use of the Great Wardrobe a privilege extended to others within the court?* This series of questions effectively divides the thesis into two sections – Part One: Consumption and Part Two: Production.

Part One: Consumption is contained within Chapter Two. The analysis focuses on Leicester's dress, his expenditure on dress, and his use of dress to demonstrate his position – and seeks to place his wardrobe into context with that of his contemporaries. The methodologies of Hayward in particular provide a framework in order to establish Leicester's wardrobe consumption and the basis of the wardrobe network.<sup>231</sup> This approach, that draws together the available evidence, enables the quantitative analysis of data for a wardrobe and the subsequent conclusions that can be presented on Leicester's consumption of dress.

Part Two: Production, looks at the wardrobe suppliers' network, who they were, whether they supplied others at court, and what products they were supplying. These aspects are examined over four chapters. Chapter Three explores Leicester's extensive network of suppliers to his wardrobe based within England. It seeks to identify the figures named in extant accounts and locate them within their local and business

---

231 Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry the VIII*. Hayward uses the framework established by Arnold in her book, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, for her analysis of the dress at the court of King Henry VIII.

communities. While this network reached beyond the shores of the kingdom to source materials suitable to dress Leicester its powerhouse was centred in London and its Liberties. The geographic distribution across the City and the Liberties is considered. Also addressed is the ethnicity of the suppliers in the network and the impact of the mix of people involved in supplying Leicester's wardrobe.

Chapter Four focuses on how Leicester managed his wardrobe network and how the network worked to achieve a successful outcome for all of the parties concerned. Key to the functioning of the network was clear communication. The many forms of communication used within the network are explored through the surviving documents. Through the close analysis of these documents Leicester's engagement with his wardrobe supply network is teased out and the part his wardrobe officers played in the network can be explored.

Chapter Five is an examination of one of Leicester's suppliers in further depth. William Whittell, merchant taylor, had a career that was clearly elevated by Leicester's patronage. This chapter examines Whittell's business practise and position within the Merchant Taylors' Company of London while considering the impact of his principal client, Leicester, on his career. Evidence for Whittell's activities extends beyond Leicester's death; this period is included in the discussion in order to provide a wider understanding of the long-term impact of Leicester's patronage.

In Chapter Six the hosier's role in supplying Leicester's wardrobe is discussed with specific reference to Maynard Buckwith. Buckwith provides an interesting focal point as he embodied a master craftsman practising in the Liberties of London outside the livery system. He also becomes an exemplar for the alien craftspeople Leicester patronised. Indeed through the examination of Buckwith's business and social network the complexity of the system supplying the court begins to be revealed.

Chapter Seven takes the form of the conclusion that pulls together the findings of this research and reconsiders the research questions highlighted in the introduction. The chapter also reflects upon the development of this research and future directions highlighted through the production of this thesis.







## Part One: Consumption.

Leicester's reputation as a prodigious consumer of luxury goods has been emphasised with specific reference to his wardrobe. The main purpose of the following chapter is to establish Leicester's consumption of elements for his wardrobe and examine his investment in his wardrobe. This is achieved through close scrutiny of Leicester's extant household accounts where they provide evidence for the consumption of items related to his wardrobe. It also explores the evidence available for the consumption by his contemporaries in an effort to consider whether Leicester's levels of spending on his wardrobe can be described as excessive for his position when placed alongside that of his peers. Theories of consumption, in particular conspicuous consumption of dress, have been applied to the English court in the past.<sup>1</sup> Of particular relevance here is the period prior to the accession of James 1 when clothing sumptuary laws were abandoned. Throughout the period under scrutiny these laws provided status markers through dress; how effective the laws were has been debated elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> David Kuchta in particular ties the sumptuous display of dress to the degree of nobility of the wearer. Kuchta argues that 'Conspicuous consumption was considered a rightful and manly honor bestowed upon him by his noble status and position at court. Rich clothes proclaimed high status. Conspicuous consumption made the social order conspicuous'.<sup>3</sup> The following study of Leicester's accounts that identify his spending on his wardrobe will build on Kuchta's thesis as Leicester is placed in context alongside his fellow courtiers.

---

1 D Kuchta, 'The semiotics of masculinity in Renaissance England', JG Turner (ed.), *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe. Institutions, texts, images*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, pp. 233–246.

2 NB Harte, 'State Control of Dress and Social Change in Pre-Industrial England', in DC Coleman & AH Johns (eds), *Trade, Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England: Essays Presented to FJ Fisher*, Littlehampton Book Services, London, 1976, pp. 132–165, particularly pp. 143–148; R Shulman, 'Sumptuary Legislation'; MG Muzzarelli, 'Reconciling the Privilege of a Few with the Common Good: Sumptuary Laws in Medieval and Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol.39, no.3, 2009, pp. 597–617, particularly pp. 609–611; Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, particularly pp. 24–29, 335–349; W Hooper, 'The Tudor Sumptuary Laws', *The English Historical Review*, vol.30, no.119, 1915, pp. 433–449; A Hunt, *Governance of the Consuming Passions: A History of Sumptuary Law*, St Martins Press, New York, 1996, particularly pp. 325–344.

3 Kuchta, 'The semiotics of masculinity', p. 241.



## Chapter Two: A very practical wardrobe or excessive consumption?

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Leicester's dress has been considered overindulgent by many twentieth-century commentators.<sup>4</sup> Spending on his wardrobe has provoked negative comment, even indignation, culminating in unfavourable judgments, and has been used to support the argument that the aristocracy were weakened by their excessive consumption.<sup>5</sup> What these commentators have failed to appreciate are the specific dress requirements of a leading courtier. Indeed most scholars have neither explored the extent of Leicester's wardrobe, or those of his contemporaries at court, nor examined exactly what he was purchasing and why. Furthermore no attention has been paid to how his dress was viewed by his contemporaries. Indeed those historians speak from a position of little understanding of the importance of the role of dress for a favourite, suitor and courtier. Yet these issues must be addressed in order to move forward with the exploration of Leicester's wardrobe production network. This chapter, then, will also seek to examine recorded comments on Leicester's dress, both by his contemporaries and by more recent commentators. An understanding of the dress elements that Leicester's suppliers were providing, and in the associated costs, not only reveals the routes of supply and trading practises but the financial resources of the networks. The dress elements provided also demonstrate an understanding of the appropriate types of dress for Leicester's position within the community of the supply network.

In order to determine if Leicester's wardrobe was excessive, the contents of a courtier's wardrobe, and the functions it was required to perform, will also be examined in this chapter. This calls for the collating of data on Leicester's wardrobe. To provide some useful comparison it is necessary to refer to other courtiers' wardrobes. However information is sparse for those of comparable status to Leicester. Ideally this type of comparison would be limited within the bounds of members of the Order of the Garter, however very little information is known to exist for Garter Knights' personal wardrobes and reference will therefore be made to a limited number of peers who were not members of the Order. This examination is necessary to give some context to Leicester's dress. Armed with this information the scrutiny of Leicester's dress expenditure can be more carefully considered. It is only after the examination of these factors that any assessment can be made of Leicester's wardrobe consumption to determine if he was pragmatic or extravagant in his approach to dress. The questions developed to address these issues are: How is Leicester perceived now and in his lifetime and are these views justified? What did he spend on his clothes? Was this expenditure warranted?

---

4 See for example Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 79.

5 Stone, 'Anatomy'.

In his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry for Leicester Simon Adams wrote that ‘Leicester’s personal tastes were not otherwise particularly extravagant, except perhaps with regard to clothes, as was expected by the queen’.<sup>6</sup> Other historians have commented that Leicester was ‘vain, proud and headstrong’.<sup>7</sup> Indeed Wilson goes on to suggest that ‘Dudley was an utter spendthrift on anything that might make a show and enhance his public persona’.<sup>8</sup> This assessment is coupled with art historians’ suggestions that he was someone who ‘was noted for taking particular interest in his appearance’<sup>9</sup> and was ‘exceptionally interested in his own image’.<sup>10</sup> However these commentators have failed to appreciate the importance of a suitable wardrobe for a courtier–favourite, suitor to a Queen and surrogate consort. They have focussed on the surviving evidence that is considerable for Leicester in comparison to his contemporaries. The household or wardrobe accounts of his contemporaries, where they still exist, provide much less detail of wardrobe expenditure. This results in an unbalanced assessment, giving only fragmentary evidence to compare Leicester’s wardrobe expenditure against. Indeed any evaluation of Leicester’s wardrobe expenditure itself can only be speculative given the piecemeal nature of the records available.

To be constantly at Court in attendance on the Queen was an expensive business. For an English man who was seeking to marry the Queen the necessity to present himself visually as a suitable match was continuous for the first fifteen years of the reign.<sup>11</sup> The various activities engaged in at court also called for the necessary clothing. Suitable garments were required to be worn for entertaining foreign princes, engaging in sport, ceremonial wear, governance, riding, processions, pageants, masqueing and garments to wear in one’s private chamber. These considerations must be taken into account when evaluating Leicester’s expenditure on his appearance.

Where portraiture is considered Leicester has been appraised not only by the number of portraits he sat for, estimated to be high in comparison to his fellow courtiers, but in the sumptuousness of his attire.<sup>12</sup> Yet his dress in these portraits does not differ greatly

---

6 Adams, ‘Leicester’, *ODNB*.

7 Wilson, *Uncrowned Kings of England*, p. 257.

8 *Ibid.*

9 Cooper, *Guide*, p. 16.

10 Hearn, *Dynasties*, p. 96.

11 Following the death of his wife in September 1560, it was widely believed Dudley hoped to marry the Queen. Commentators broadly agree that the Kenilworth entertainments of 1575 were Leicester’s last attempt to convince the Queen to either marry him or release him to marry another. See: S Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony. The Courtships of Elizabeth I*, Routledge, London, 1996, pp. 40–72; JE Archer, E Goldring and S Knight (eds), *The Progresses, Pageants & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, particularly pp. 52, 172–176; Adams, ‘Leicester’, *ODNB*.

12 Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits, Vol. 1*, p. 195, Strong notes that more portraits survive from this period of Burghley and Leicester than any other figures besides the Queen.

from that of his contemporaries, with the exception of office-holders such as Lord Burghley (1520/21-1598). Where Burghley chose to be painted in the garments of an administrator, themselves far more expensive than they might look to the modern eye, Leicester chose to be depicted in what might be called 'fashionable attire'.<sup>13</sup> Both men used dress, and portraiture, as a means of conveying their status to those who viewed these paintings. This is exhibited plainly in their respective Garter portraits (see Appendix 1.3: Figures Eleven, Twelve and Thirteen). Leicester's patronage of numerous artists was not limited to commissions of his own image.<sup>14</sup> While it could be argued that the sitters Leicester chose for inclusion in his portrait collection were carefully considered to reflect his position and familial connections, it also demonstrated his importance as a patron. As was recently discussed by the participants at a National Portrait Gallery conference<sup>15</sup> these portraits were a vehicle for displaying one's position primarily through dress and symbolism within the painting. The face pattern could be repeated through a series of portraits of the same sitter, to varying levels of competency, where the dress elements were often changed. These elements of dress were painted by specialists in the artists' studio to a generally higher standard than the face.<sup>16</sup> The dress was often far more valuable than the painting in which it was depicted.<sup>17</sup>

It is clear that physical appearance featured highly in the criteria necessary to woo the Queen. Embassies were sent abroad to confirm a suitor was not deformed while portraits were also used as a tool to convey the suitability of a suitor for the Queen's

---

13 William Cecil, lord Burghley was twelve years older than Leicester which may have contributed to his choice of clothing.

14 Leicester commissioned portraits of the Queen, his wife the countess of Leicester, officials in the Netherlands and perhaps Douglas Sheffield. Leicester's collection of portraits was considerable and is the subject of a forthcoming (June 2014) book by Elizabeth Goldring, *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the World of Elizabethan Art Painting and Patronage at the Court of Elizabeth I*, Yale University Press/The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, forthcoming 2014. See also, Strong, *The English Icon*; E Goldring, 'Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I and the Earl of Leicester for Kenilworth Castle', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.147, no.1231, 2005, pp. 654–660; Goldring, 'Portraiture, patronage, and the progresses', see particularly p. 164.

15 *The Making Art in Tudor Britain A Scientific Survey of the Collections 1500–1620 Conference*, held at the National Portrait Gallery, London, 2–4 December 2010.

16 *The Making Art in Tudor Britain A Scientific Survey of the Collections 1500–1620 Conference*, held at the National Portrait Gallery, London, 2–4 December 2010. Notes taken during Catherine MacLeod's paper 'Robert Peake: technical evidence and patronage' and discussion following. See also AR Jones and P Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, for a discussion on the importance placed on clothing in portraits, especially pp. 34–42.

17 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 373, Leicester commissioned a painting of a Burgomaster that cost £4 in January 1585. The cost for a suit of clothes seen in Leicester's portraiture was considerably more as will be discussed later in this chapter. See also, Smuts, 'Art and the material culture of majesty', p. 96, for a discussion of the cost of portraiture in comparison to dress.

hand.<sup>18</sup> Foreign princes supplied a portrait to support their cause.<sup>19</sup> Leicester's use of portraiture may have been an attempt to counter these portraits of foreign princes and push forward his own suit. With the arrival of each prince's portrait Leicester was perhaps motivated to have a new updated portrait of himself painted to fend off perceived competition, and for his dress depicted in them to be of comparable magnificence. While there may have been a temptation by the artist to emphasise the sumptuousness of the attire being depicted in Leicester's portraits, the strong correlation between garments and jewels in Leicester's wardrobe and those depicted in portraits would suggest this was not the case.

Dress as a marker of social status in the sixteenth century and beyond has been a central theme for those historians focussing on personal adornment.<sup>20</sup> The expectation that one must dress appropriately for one's position, or the position one aspired to, was a widely held belief for sixteenth-century contemporaries. Phillip Stubbes in his *Anatomie of Abuses* wrote:

Do not, both Men and Women (for the most part) euery one in generall go attyred in silkes, veluets, damasks, satans, and what not? which are attyre onely for the nobilitie and gentry, and not for the other at anie hand?<sup>21</sup>

---

18 See: Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony*, p.142; *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 8: 1566–1568*, AJ Crosby (ed.), 1871, pp. 98–112, online accessed 10 September 2011 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=72111&strquery=dannett>> Thomas Dannett was sent to Vienna in May 1566 to further negotiations with Archduke Charles. In his report to the Queen he writes on the Archduke's physical appearance. 'As for his person he lacks a little of the height of the Emperor, of a sanguine complexion, and for a man beautiful and well faced, well shaped, small in the waist, and well and broad breasted; he seems in his clothes well thighed and well legged, the same being a little embowed; by use of stooping a man would think him a very little round shouldered' and 'Yesternight, riding with his Highness to see a regiment of lanzknechts, his cloak fell so from his shoulders that Dannett discerned that he was as straight in his body as any man alive. He has a fair seat and handles his horse like a gentleman'.

19 See: Hearn, *Dynasties*, p.93. Hearn discusses two portraits of Eric XIV of Sweden seen by Elizabeth. One was taken to show her by envoys of the King in 1559 and the second painted under the direction of the queen's servant John Dymocke by Master Staffan. Both portraits were intended to show the King as a suitable marriage partner for the queen – the English commission was no doubt employed to ensure the first portrait had been accurate; E Goldring, 'The earl of Leicester and portraits of the duc d'Alençon', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.146, no.1211, 2004, pp. 108–111. Goldring suggests at least three portraits of Hercule-Francois duc d' Alencon were sent to Elizabeth's court during the Duc d' Alencon's suit in the 1570's. Leicester's inventories show he had two paintings of Alencon in his collection. Queen Elizabeth supplied a portrait of herself to support negotiations.

20 See the following publications as a sample of literature on the topic: S Vincent, *Dressing the Elite. Clothes in Early Modern England*, Oxford, Berg, 2003; Mansel, *Dressed to Rule: J Ashelford, The Art of Dress. Clothes and Society 1500–1914*, London, The National Trust, 1996; Shulman, 'Sumptuary Legislation'; Hayward, *Rich Apparel*; Frick, *Dressing Renaissance Florence*; Kuchta, 'The semiotics of masculinity'; R Lauer, & J Lauer, *Fashion Power. The Meaning of Fashion in American Society*, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1981, particularly pp. 151–153.

21 P Stubbes, *Anatomie of Abuses*, p. 6.

Indeed the legislative measures that were taken to ensure that certain highly priced elements of dress were only available to those of a particular rank were in effect throughout Queen Elizabeth's reign. Leicester, a Privy Councillor from 1562, was clearly well acquainted with these laws.<sup>22</sup> Indeed he was involved in reviews of sumptuary legislation during his tenure on the Privy Council.<sup>23</sup> His office of Master of the Horse was also named in the 1580 proclamation that gave him the power to enforce the statutes of apparel along with the ability to set orders for the apparel of the Household.

1. Inprimis that all officers of her majesty's household and other her servants in ordinary not contained within the rates limited and set forth by proclamation shall observe such orders for their apparel as shall be from time to time set down in writing by the Lord Chamberlain, the Master of the Horse, and other her majesty's principal officers of her household.<sup>24</sup>

As a leading courtier, a member of the Royal Household and a Garter Knight Leicester was among the fortunate elite who faced very few restrictions in dress. The grey area for Leicester's dress under sumptuary legislation is the period from his father's attainder, followed by his own, until his election as a Knight of the Order of Garter.<sup>25</sup> Prior to his attainder Leicester's father's position impacted on the fabrics and garments that Leicester was legally able to wear. As John Dudley rose from a knight to a viscount then to an earl and finally a duke his, and his sons', ability to wear more sumptuous and costly clothing increased. As the son of a duke, a knight in his own right, and a member of the Royal Household immediately before his arraignment for treason, Leicester's clothing choices were ranked directly below the king's in the 1533 Act.<sup>26</sup> At his attainder Leicester forfeited all his goods and lands to the crown, as did other members of his family on their attainder. It is unclear how much of his wardrobe he lost. Certainly there are no wardrobe elements listed in the inventory of goods belonging to Leicester that were found at Sir Francis Jobson's house at Westminster.<sup>27</sup> The list of Leicester's goods is very small and no other list of Leicester's stuff relating to his attainder is known to be extant. The existence of what may have been a larger

---

22 Leicester became a member of the Privy Council in October 1562. He was therefore not involved in the Proclamation on apparel made in May that year recorded in Machyn. See, JG Nichols (ed.), *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London From A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*, The Camden Society, London, 1848, p. 281.

23 Baldwin, *Sumptuary Legislation*, p. 223, Leicester signed the proclamation at Greenwich 12 February 1565/6.

24 PL Hughes and JF Larkin (eds), *Tudor Royal Proclamations, Volume II, The Later Tudors (1553–1587)*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1969, p. 460.

25 Leicester was attainted at the second parliament of 1554 and was elected a Knight of the Order of the Garter in April 1559.

26 Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, p. 29–39 is an overview of Henry VIII's acts of apparel, the 1533 act was still current at the Dudleys' attainder.

27 TNA, E 154/2/39, f. 61. See Appendix 2.1 for a transcription of the goods belonging to Robert Dudley found at Sir Francis Jobson's house.



inventory is alluded to in the State Papers of 21 August 1553, which includes the following entry:

Lord Robert Dudley. A lettre to John Piers, Clerke of the Checke, to delyver by inventarie indented, suche apparell and other things as he hathe gotten into his hands of the Lord Robert Dudley's, unto the Ladie, his wife, and the same beine called for her-after to be allwayes aunswerable [for their] furthecomynge to the Quenes Highnes' use.<sup>28</sup>

Part of his wardrobe may have travelled with him to Kings Lynn where he proclaimed Lady Jane Grey on 18 July 1553.<sup>29</sup> No doubt he was able to take some of his wardrobe to the Tower with him, as Northumberland had.<sup>30</sup> But he may also have successfully concealed some of his goods as Sir Andrew Dudley was able to accomplish for some of his stuff.<sup>31</sup> Exactly how the acts of apparel applied to those under attainder is unclear. Northumberland was still able to wear the garments he had worn as a duke in the Tower, though the number of these garments was greatly diminished. It would appear that Leicester too was able to wear garments that reflected his previous status even though he was under attainder. Following his release in October 1554 until his pardon in January 1555 it is not clear if Leicester was required to wear less sumptuous attire. His involvement in the December 1554 Anglo-Spanish tournaments, along with that of his brothers Ambrose and Henry, would suggest the Dudleys were still considered important figures at court.<sup>32</sup> Participation in such an important event required a suitably sumptuous display.<sup>33</sup> Where Leicester obtained the necessaries to present such a display is uncertain, but as his brothers (who were married to wealthy heiresses) were also taking part the familial network was probably the source.<sup>34</sup> The requirement for suitable dress for these occasions is without question. Participants in tournaments

---

28 *Acts of the Privy Council of England: A.D. Volume 4: 1552–1554*, JR Dasent (ed.), Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1892, pp. 323–324, 328, Leicester's wife was also affected by his attainder. On 22nd August 1553 a letter was sent by the Privy Council to 'mr. Vicechamberlayn of the Quenes House, for redelyvery of such apparail and other things as he hath of the Lady Dudley's, the Lorde Robertes wief'.

29 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

30 TNA, E 154/2/39, f. 15, certain elements of Northumberland's wardrobe were delivered to him in the Tower.

31 ST Bindoff (ed.), *The House of Commons: 1509–1558, I*, Secker & Warburg, London, 1982, p. 62, Sir Andrew Dudley c.1507–1559, younger brother of John Dudley, duke of Northumberland. He was imprisoned with Northumberland in August 1553. Following his release from the Tower in January 1555 he was pardoned of treason on 23 April and granted those goods that he had "craftily concealed" after his attainder and therefore [were] not granted away'.

32 Nichols, *Progresses and Public, Volume 1*, p. 527. Leicester was exchanging gifts with Queen Mary at New Year's 1556–7. Leicester's gift was a 'faire purse with £10. half soveraigns' he received a gilt cup 'weighing 20 ounces and a half'.

33 McCoy, 'From the Tower to the Tiltyard'.

34 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*, Adams states that although Ambrose and Henry Dudley were both attainted, which cost them their existing estates, they were both married to wealthy women which ensured they were not without income.

were exempt from the 1533 act of apparel as were ‘men of war in the king’s service’.<sup>35</sup> Leicester, with his involvement in tournaments and as the Master of the Ordnance for the 1557 expeditionary force to St Quentin, fitted both these categories, though only for the short period of the event.<sup>36</sup> The lifting of Leicester’s attainder in 1557 enabled him to inherit the Robsart estate and to begin to generate an income.<sup>37</sup> Unfortunately a lack of evidence for Leicester’s wardrobe for the period until the end of 1558 makes further analysis difficult.

Elizabeth I’s courtiers were expected to convey a sense of nobility and authority through their dress. Leicester – as a key member of the court, a favourite, and suitor to the Queen – had every reason to ensure that his dress identified him as the consummate courtier and potential consort. Intriguingly Leicester’s dress is not singled out for comment in Henry Machyn’s diary.<sup>38</sup> Indeed Leicester’s dress is not mentioned at all though he is identified within the various pageants described. Machyn was interested in dress and commented on the attire of other noble figures he observed, particularly the Queen.<sup>39</sup> This lack of comment suggests Machyn had no reason to consider Leicester’s dress extraordinary for his position.

The Dudleys’ close links to successive Tudor courts laid the foundation for Leicester’s understanding of the importance of dressing for his position.<sup>40</sup> Indeed education in the way of the courtier would have formed part of Leicester’s early training and presenting oneself in a suitable manner was emphasised in contemporary texts.<sup>41</sup> In Hoby’s 1556 translation of Castiglione’s *The Courtyer* he suggests that the courtier

---

35 Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, p. 39.

36 Adams, ‘Leicester’, *ODNB*.

37 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 71.

38 Nichols, *Diary of Henry Machyn*.

39 *Ibid.*, pp. 130, 133–134, 198, for example Machyn describes the dress of the duke of Muskovea as ‘a gowne of tyssuw ryche, and ys under garmentt in purpull velvett in brodere, the pard and ys hatt and the border of ys nyght-cape sett with owtchys of perlles and stones’. He also records the dress of those in the procession for the creation of the earl of Northumberland and the Garter procession, and he describes the French embassy as ‘for ther wher gorgyus aparell as has bene sen thes days’.

40 Robert Dudley’s grandfather Edmond Dudley (c.1462-1510) was an administrator for Henry VII. While Robert Dudley’s father John Dudley (1505-1553) served in Henry VIII’s court rising to Lord Admiral by the king’s death. John Dudley’s rise continued through Edward VI’s reign to Grand Master of the Household, and President of the Council, and he was created Duke of Northumberland.

41 See: Misztal, *The Elizabethan Courtier*, Misztal discusses the use of courtesy books in the education of the upper classes of society. Particular emphasis has been placed on Castiglione’s *Il Libro del Cortegiano* (1528), a book used in England through the sixteenth century, of which Leicester’s nephew Sir Philip Sidney had a copy. See also, Partridge, *Images of the Courtier*.

ought to determine with himselfe what he will appeere to be, and in suche sorte as he desireth to bee esteamed so to apparaile himselfe, and make his garmentes helpe him to be counted suche a one, euen of them that heare hym not speake, nor see him doe anye maner thyng.<sup>42</sup>

This implies that the courtier should be well aware of the impression his style of dress would make on the observer and carefully craft his image to suit. The notions of controlling one's image through careful consideration of how it will be observed by others implies a self-determined visual representation which the Renaissance English nobleman would appear at first glance to demonstrate. However Leicester was not a creature of self-determination alone, he was clearly shaped by events and those around him, as was his wardrobe. It was not only his familial experience but his early role as a gentleman of the Privy Chamber to King Edward VI which would have exposed him to court dress code etiquette.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore he was open to suggestions from those in his household about elements of his wardrobe.<sup>44</sup> In addition evidence would suggest that artificers worked in collaboration with Leicester to create the desired end-product.

Evidence for this awareness of the importance of dress begins with his surviving household accounts from the accession of Queen Elizabeth. For Leicester, whose position as Master of the Horse saw him continually at court, in the company of the queen, what he wore was constantly under scrutiny by those at court and elsewhere. The best chronicle of the kind of examination his dress was subjected to is found in an account of Leicester's visit to Warwick in September 1571. The account was recorded as follows:

And then cam my said Lord therle of Leycester by himself apparellid all in white his shoes of velvet his stoks of hose knitt silk his upper stoks of white velvit Lned wt cloth of silver his dowblet of silver his ierkin white velvet drawn with silver beautified with gold and precious stone his girdle & skabard white velvet his Robe white satten embrowdered wth goold a foot brood very curiosly his cap black velvet wth a white fethr his color of gold besett with precious stones and his garter about his legg of saint Georges order a sight worthie the beholding And yet surely all this costly and curius apparell was not more to be praised then the comely gesture of the same

---

42 B Castiglione (1528), translated by Thomas Hoby (1556), *The Courtier of Covnt Baldessar Castilio diuided into foure bookes*, Wyllyam Seres at the signe of the Hedghogge, London, 1561, pp. i,v. Published originally in Italian the first English translation was by Thomas Hoby in 1556, printed in 1561. Hoby dedicates his translation to Henry Hastings, earl of Huntington (c.1536–1595), brother-in-law to Leicester. There is no evidence that Leicester owned a copy in his formative years, however his proficiency in reading and speaking Italian has been documented by Dr Simon Adams see, Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

43 *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office. Edward VI, Vol. IV A.D. 1550-1553*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1926, p. 270. On 11 November 1552 'lord Robert Dudley, knight, one of the gentlemen of the Privy Chamber' was granted the patent for life for the office of master of the king's 'buckhoundes' previously held by his brother John, earl of Warwick from 1550–1552.

44 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.II f. 183. Letter from Thomas Aglionby to Leicester 30 July 1578 discussed below.

Earle whose stature being reasonably was furnisshed wth all proporcion and Lynaments of his body & parts answerable in all things so as in the eise of this writer he semed the only goodliest psonage made in Englund wch padventure might be assertid but surely to all the beholders it was a sight most comendable.<sup>45</sup>

The clothing Leicester wore in this situation had the desired effect on the recorder observing his movements. Castiglione's advice appears to have been well heeded. Waldman asserts of Elizabeth that:

Like every other monarch of her time she would have died of shame had her Court not done her credit, and on the unimpeachable word of roving Italians who had drunk their Castiglione pure she possessed in Robert as brilliant an ornament as could be found an any court in Europe.<sup>46</sup>

While selling Leicester's other abilities short, this judgement reflects the importance of appearance at court – and Leicester's success in presenting himself especially well. The contemporary Warwick narrative clearly demonstrates the impact of magnificent dress without a hint of excess implied.

Yet how much did Leicester put his own stamp on how he looked? Various other factors no doubt played their part. In his youth Leicester's dress was certainly influenced by gifts from his older brother John Dudley, lord Lisle.<sup>47</sup> From the end of 1558 the chief influence may have been the Queen. While the extent of the Queen's input is difficult to determine it cannot be discounted given their long-term close relationship and her interest in fine clothing. Indeed the Queen gifted Leicester jewellery and ten dozen buttons set with diamonds and pearls at New Year's 1563/4, no doubt with the expectation he would wear them.<sup>48</sup> Leicester's wardrobe choices may also have been biased by the sumptuary legislation. This could have created psychological barriers to wearing particular cheaper types of fabrics. There were certainly very few pieces of inexpensive cloth found within the fabric disbursement book of 1571-1574.<sup>49</sup> The yard and three quarters of yellow canvas that was delivered to Whittell on the 2nd of May 1572 cost a total of xjs.viiijd. (vjs.viiijd. the yard) and was the least expensive outer fabric used in a doublet for Leicester.<sup>50</sup> This value of cloth is reflected in the acts of apparel as the most a 'gentleman with lands and tenements,

---

45 T Kemp, (ed.), *The Black Book of Warwick*, Henry Cooke and Son, Warwick, 1889, p. 36.

46 M Waldman, *Elizabeth and Leicester*, Collins, London, 1969, p. 98.

47 Bod., MS. Add. C. 94, f. 1 shows that on 2 March 1545(6) 'Sir Robart Duddleley' was given 'a black damaskecote gardit w[i]th veluet' at Suffolk place. Further gifts are found on ff. 1v., 2, 2v., 8, 10.

48 BL, Add. 78172 Evelyn Papers Vol.V., f. 1.

49 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII.

50 Ibid., f. 13.

fees or annuities of £20 per year' was legally able to spend on cloth for a garment.<sup>51</sup> Leicester's canvas doublets were perhaps the more utilitarian garments he wore when dealing with horses in his role as Master of the Horse. Firmly established 'uniforms' for various other positions dictated what he could wear at certain times.<sup>52</sup> Beyond the ceremonial the sober business of governance, as a member of the Privy Council, may have influenced Leicester's wardrobe, certainly in later years, demonstrated by the predominance of black in the 1588 wardrobe inventory.<sup>53</sup>

Based on portrait evidence, the dress of those around him affected what he wore in that he conforms to the style of a courtier; however this may have been a symbiotic process. Leicester was certainly fashionable in his dress but in a conservative manner rather than in the extroverted style of those fashion leaders who evoked the condescension of commentators such as Stubbs. Indeed the clothing of Leicester's courtier contemporaries, shown in portraits, was remarkably homogenous and parallels can be convincingly drawn between wardrobes of other key figures where evidence exists.<sup>54</sup> This includes fabric and material types used, colouring, surface decoration, garments and accessories. There are indications that Leicester did choose elements of his wardrobe to express his familial connections but this too was not unusual. Buttons created with the family device marked him out as a Dudley, with a clear reference to the earls of Warwick, as did embroidery applied to numerous garments.<sup>55</sup> The use of identifiable livery for his household marked out his retainers' allegiance, but here again

---

51 Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, p. 33.

52 BL, Harley Roll D.36. I-XI. 1062D, f. 12. The robes of State, Creation, the Order of the Garter and St Michael were all worn ceremonially by Leicester. The garments worn under these robes may also have been standardised as they were for the Garter robes. See Arnold, *The Kirtle, or surcoat, and mantle of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*.

53 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. XIII, '*The booke of all his Lordships Robes at Courte or elce wher in ye charge of Thomas Edgeley and Alford Johnson the xvth of June Ano Dni 1588*'; See also Wedge, *Dressed fit for a Queen*, p. 32.

54 See Appendix 1.2: Figures One to Nine. The portraits show Leicester and a selection of his fellow Garter Knights in court dress. The portraits exhibit the use of similar styles of hat, jewelled hat bands and feathers. Each courtier wears a starched ruff. Their garments are decorated with jewelled buttons, embroidery and lace. Each sitter wears the insignia of the Order of the Garter, either the lesser George or the collar from which the Great George is suspended.

55 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 127. The account reads 'Paid unto Harryson gooldsmith for one dousen of goold buttones of the ragged staffe waing one oz. di at lvs. the oz., sum iiijli. ijs. vjd. and for the fasshion at xvjd the button, suma xxiiijjs.} vli. vjs. vjd.'; E Goldring, 'The Earl of Leicester's Inventory of Kenilworth Castle, c.1578', *English Heritage Historical Review*, vol.2, 2007, pp. 36–59, p. 50. The inventory records 'Item ij nightcappes of white satten embrothered with ragged staves & roses, the one with blacke silke & golde thother with crimson silke and silver'; Bod., MS. Add. C. 94., f. 2. The 1546 inventory reads '*Item a veluet cote sett with roses, and ragged staves oof goldsmiths work, whiche my Lady of Warwick had at Enveld, and yone the cote to Sr Robert Duddeley} 1548 Janu 8*'.

this was a practice common among his peers.<sup>56</sup> It is clear then that Leicester's wardrobe reflected his position at court by necessity and his ancestral lineage by tradition, a practice shared by other courtiers throughout the sixteenth century. For Leicester this is seen in the circa 1564 Waddesdon portrait and in his circa 1575 extant suit of armour (see Appendix 2.2: Figures Sixteen and Seventeen). The portrait clearly exhibits his membership of the Order of the Garter. His armour was engraved with his device (the ragged staff), the emblem of the Order of the Garter, and his initials.

Evidence for long relationships with his tailor, hosier and embroiderers is found in the written accounts, but there is limited evidence for their input, or indeed Leicester's, into the design of clothing. Pinning down where the designs came from is also difficult, however it was probably a collaborative effort. Embroiderers created patterns for Leicester's approval while his tailors may have worked from their own sets of pattern books in discussion with Leicester.<sup>57</sup> A letter from one of his household demonstrates that Leicester was open to advice on his wardrobe. In this missive Thomas Aglionby, a member of Leicester's household from at least 1557, suggests how a new riding coat might be trimmed and supplies Leicester with samples of fabric from which a new night gown might be constructed, observing that,

*The rydinge cote yo[u]r l[ordship] spak to me of although yo[u]r lordship saide  
yow wolde haue it of velvet, yet did yow not resolve howe yow wolde haue it tr[i]  
mmed whether garded w[i]th the same or garnished w[i]th gold silver or silke lace  
I think it wolde be very prety and faire to be welted downe right somewhat thicke  
w[i]th sattin turned in & snipt on the edge w[i]th some prety lace of gold & silk  
or silv[e]r and silke downe the midst of the welt yf I may knowe yo[u]r l[ordships]*

56 FR Raines, (ed.), *The Stanley Papers Part II. The Derby Household Books*, The Chetham Society, Manchester, 1853, pp. li, 5. The 1561 household expenses of Edward, earl of Derby (1509–1572) show that he spent £152.18s.7d. on cloth and badges for livery. The livery of his son Henry, the fourth earl of Derby (1531-1593) was worn by a range of men, including some of Leicester and Walsingham's men, when they joined Derby on his 1584 embassy to invest Henry III in the Order of the Garter. The livery was described as follows; 'my Lord's Liverye ... was a purple in graine Cloake of Cloathe wth sleeves and garded wth Velat and a gold lasse of either side the garde and his gentleme- had black Sattinne doublets & blacke velvat hoase & his Yeome- had blacke taffatie doublets & hoese of cloathe like vnto their Cloakes wth like garde and lasse in wch boeth liveries he had of his owne three score & tenne & his holle treane was in all sixscore and tenne or thereabouts'; See also Nichols, *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p. 32. The earl of Pembroke and his company of 100 men were noted by Machyn, who described the company of men wearing 'chenes of gold, alle in bluw cloth, playne, with a bage on ther slewe a dragon'.

57 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V., f. 98v.–100, is a 1561–1565 bill from David Smith, the Queen's embroiderer. Mr Smith charged 6s.8d. for making samples of embroidery of ragged staffs and diamond cut cloth for livery. A small number of tailor's pattern books survive in archives and museums around the world. None are known in the United Kingdom and none are English. The most relevant is a 1 July 1567 manuscript written in Breslau Germany for the Master Tailor of Bytom, Poland, held in the collection of the Los Angeles County Museum, Polish Tailor's Cutting Guide, catalogue number AC1992.243.1, online accessed 12 May 2011 < <http://collections.lacma.org/node/173816> >

*pleas[ur]e then I will set it in hand forthw[i]th.*<sup>58</sup>

Aglionby's letter is an indication of the relationship that the wardrobe staff had with Leicester. Certainly as a result of his long association with Leicester Aglionby clearly felt able to suggest a style that would suit Leicester's needs. The letter is also illustrative of one of the aspects of the network that contributed to dressing Leicester. Through Aglionby, Leicester was shopping by what Claire Walsh has called 'correspondence shopping'.<sup>59</sup> However the tone of the letter suggests a greater engagement by both parties in the process than Walsh's definition allows. Leicester's wardrobe staff were able to facilitate his dress needs in a broader manner than simply carrying out simple shopping tasks. The letter speaks of a more sophisticated interaction, the result of an ongoing dialogue between Leicester and those who managed his wardrobe. The Leicester we see in the portraits, then, is less the product of the individual's self-definition and more the result of collective fashioning.

Faced with the evidence for Leicester's spending on his wardrobe found in the 1558–1561 household accounts, all indications are that he was investing heavily in his appearance. However this evidence must be contextualised. It is clear that certain key factors would have necessitated such expenditure. Having been sent to the Tower, arraigned for treason on 22 January 1554 and attainted at the second parliament of 1554 his goods would have been forfeited to the crown. Therefore Leicester went from a period that saw the loss of everything to taking a central role at court only five years later. This was a transition that must have required considerable investment – investment that is clearly evident in the household accounts.

As has previously been discussed above it is unclear how much of Leicester's wardrobe was lost at his attainder. However his attainder clearly resulted in constrained financial circumstances. Adams cites Leicester's brother's actions in his financial straits where he was 'left with nothing to live by and having most need of [] friendly and brotherly [love?]'.<sup>60</sup> Indeed Wilson suggests that Leicester was so short of money in December 1556 that he 'had to enter into a bond of £20 with Thomas Borrowe, a London

---

58 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. II. f. 183, Thomas Aglionby to Leicester, 30 July 1578. A short account of Thomas Aglionby can be found in the Index of Servants in Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 461.

59 Walsh, 'The Social Relations of Shopping', p. 338. Walsh's definition of correspondence shopping is 'that carried out by agents, bankers, servants or tradespeople. Requests for agents and other employees to make purchases usually involved a simple request by letter for the purchase of a stated item, followed by the direct reimbursement of the price and no obligation to return the favour of shopping in turn'.

60 Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, p. 159. On the death of the Duchess of Northumberland in 1555 Queen Mary allowed Ambrose Dudley to inherit despite his attainder. The Dudley brothers then ensured Robert was not left destitute through a series of exchanges that included the Hales Owen estate.

gentleman, to pay an outstanding apothecary's bill of £5'.<sup>61</sup> These circumstances were relieved somewhat in early 1557. Adams states that 'On 30 January 1557 both Hemsby and his rights of inheritance to the Robsart estate were restored to him despite his attainder, together with such of his chattels still in the possession of the crown'.<sup>62</sup> This statement implies that at least some of Leicester's chattels had been confiscated. Any wardrobe losses would require replacement, particularly as he maintained a connection with the court until his full rehabilitation at Elizabeth's accession.

Given his almost continuous attendance at court following the accession Leicester needed a substantial wardrobe to satisfy his basic dress requirements. Largely lacking in the archives is information on wardrobe expenditure and information on the overall contents of one person's wardrobe. Even Leicester's 1588 wardrobe inventory does not include all of the garments he wore.<sup>63</sup> Numerous items of clothing are found in his probate inventories that do not appear in his wardrobe inventory, while some garments are not recorded anywhere save in the household accounts. Determination of the requirements of a courtier's wardrobe compared with the contents of Leicester's wardrobe will assist in ascertaining if his dress expenditure was excessive for his position.

John Dudley, Lord Lisle's wardrobe accounts consist of inventories for six consecutive years from 1545 to the end of January 1551.<sup>64</sup> Reflected in these documents is the basic courtier's wardrobe while their consecutive nature provide a clear picture of his increasing wardrobe as his prominence at court rose.<sup>65</sup> From the first inventory Lord Lisle's wardrobe contained a combination of velvet and taffeta hats and caps, gowns of velvet, cloaks, coats and riding cloaks in velvet, satin and broadcloth, doublets and hose in satin and velvet, jerkins, knit-waistcoats, shirts, nightgowns and night caps, along with jewellery and rapiers and an array of shoes, slippers and boots. These increased in number and quality over the six years recorded. For example seven doublets were recorded as entering the wardrobe in 1545, eight in 1546, five in 1547, ten in 1548, thirteen in 1549 and twenty-four in 1550. This same trend is reflected in other items found in Lisle's wardrobe (see Appendix 2.3).

A direct comparison can be made with the number of garments being constructed for Leicester found in the fabric disbursement book for the year from 1571–1572 (see Appendix 2.4).<sup>66</sup> Appendix 2.4 shows that Leicester, as an established member of

---

61 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 69.

62 Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, p. 160.

63 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII. See also, Wedge, *Dressed Fit for a Queen*, pp. 26–27.

64 Bod., MS. Add. C. 94.

65 John Dudley, Lord Lisle (Leicester's older brother) was made a Knight of the Bath on 20 February 1547 and created earl of Warwick in 1551. See, Loades, 'Northumberland', *ODNB*.

66 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII. ff. 1–11.



court, was having approximately the same number of doublets and hose constructed (including riding slops/breeches) as his brother in 1550. These tables exhibit a close approximation of the basic requirements for a high-ranking male courtier's wardrobe. For Lisle his rising status at court is reflected in the wardrobe expansion demonstrated in the inventories. Although the cost of Lisle's items is not documented the quality and quantity of the contents suggest a large investment in dress over the period. For Leicester who was entering the new court in a key role, as Master of the Horse, from a position of constrained financial circumstances and with what was probably a severely diminished wardrobe the necessity to invest in garments suitable to his new position cannot be over emphasised. It is the extent to which his wardrobe expenditure continued to grow with his position or remained consistent which will determine if his expenditure was excessive.

Leicester's first extant household account, compiled by William Chancy, dates from 20 December 1558 to 20 December 1559.<sup>67</sup> The account contains numerous references to purchases for Leicester's wardrobe. A particularly high expenditure was only to be expected considering the events which took place during that year. Preparations for the Coronation on 15 January 1559 and Leicester's installation as a Knight of the Garter in June of that year are reflected in the dress spending. Interspersed with these ceremonial events were affairs of state in which Leicester participated, such as the greeting and entertaining of foreign dignitaries in May and October.<sup>68</sup> In particular Leicester had a new coat made for early October 1559 which he wore when he met John, Duke of Finland, at Harwich in Essex before escorting the duke and his entourage into London.<sup>69</sup> The duke as representative of his brother Eric XIV's suit for the Queen's hand in marriage was the embodiment of the proposal.<sup>70</sup> There is no doubt that Leicester's dress had to be suitable to meet a foreign prince. Leicester, alongside the earl of Oxford, were the immediate symbols of the Queen and court.<sup>71</sup> Their entrance into London, along with a retinue numbering more than 200, is described by Machyn.

---

67 See Chapter One footnote 47 for William Chancy, as an officer in Leicester's household, he receiving livery in 1559 (a coat) and 1567 (a length of cloth).

68 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 66, 100. Leicester greeted the French embassy arrived to ratify the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis on 23 May 1559. Leicester's greeting of John, Duke of Finland occurred on 5 October 1559.

69 Ibid., p.106.

70 See: S Adams, IW Archer, and GW Bernard, (eds), 'A 'Journall' of Matters of State Happened from Time to Time as well Within and Without the Realme from and Before the Death of King Edw. the 6th Untill the Yere 1562 Certayne Brife Notes of the Controversey Betwene the Dukes of Somerset and Duke of Nor[t]humberland', in IW Archer, S Adams, GW Bernard, M Greengrass, PEJ Hammer, and F Kisby (eds), *Religion, Politics, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England. Camden Fifth Series, Volume 22*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, pp. 35–136, p. 70; Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony*, pp. 30–31; J Bruce, (ed.), *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth by Sir John Hayward*, The Camden Society, London, 1840, p. 37.

71 John de Vere, 16th earl of Oxford (1516-1562).

While Leicester's dress is not highlighted by Machyn's account the textiles used to decorate the Bishop of Winchester's place were described when the chronicler noted that, '[it] was rychely hangyd with ryche cloth of arres, wrought with gold and sylver and sylke'.<sup>72</sup> Leicester as Master of the Horse was part of a display of pageantry staged for the visitor; it was therefore necessary for his dress to fit the occasion. The garment he wore was clearly decorated with substantial goldsmiths' work as is evident by the account entry:

Imprimis paid to Stocke of Chepesyde for perle and sylver parle delyverid by him to Smyth the embroderer to make the cote which your lordship rode in the same daie the Prince of Fineland came in and allso for to imbroder a pair of bss' of black vellet} xxxli.<sup>73</sup>

The entry is also illustrative of the networks involved in the production of Leicester's wardrobe. Thus James Stocke, goldsmith, had delivered embroidery materials to David Smith, embroiderer, to decorate the coat (made by the tailor) in order that Leicester could be suitably attired.<sup>74</sup>

Clearly-identified elements of dress for Leicester, shown in Chancy's account for this period, totalled £193.3s.1d.½d. (see Appendix 2.5). A further £28.5s.6d. was expended on items that were most likely to have been for Leicester but are not specifically ascribed to him. The accounts show that Leicester dressed members of his household, and family, in addition to supplying livery to his most visible servants. Entries most often identify the recipient of the dress when it was to be for someone other than Leicester. Therefore the account entries that specified neither Leicester nor another are assumed to have been for Leicester given the quality of the item and the purpose of the account. In total the amount spent on dress items which appear to be for Leicester in this first account are £221.8s.7d.½d. This appears to be a large sum for dressing one person. However figures for the apparel with rapiers and daggers for Edward de Vere, earl of Oxford (1550-1604) provide some context for this figure. Oxford as a royal ward, and aged 12-13 years for the period 1562-1563, spent a total of £154.5s.6d. on apparel and personal arms.<sup>75</sup> Over the four full years recorded the average yearly expenditure on Oxford's wardrobe was £154, with the yearly figures shown in Appendix 2.6. Unfortunately there is no further breakdown of the figures in the form of accounts or bills to establish exactly which elements of dress were being purchased. A tailor's bill survives for Walter Devereux, earl of Essex for the period

---

72 Nichols, *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p. 214.

73 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 106, the bosses referred to in the account entry ('pair of bss' of black vellet') were probably for the bridle of Leicester's horse.

74 GCL, Goldsmiths' Company record cards. James Stocke, Citizen and goldsmith of London, was made free of the Goldsmiths' Company in 1543. He was chosen to come into livery in 1555 and had a shop on the north side of Cheapside; Archer, 'Smith', *ODNB*.

75 TNA, State Papers, SP 12/42, f. 91.

covered by Leicester's early accounts.<sup>76</sup> The bill includes charges for fabric, lace, sewing materials, buttons and the making of the garments to a total cost of £158.9s.9d. It must be remembered that this figure does not include all of the accessories that are found in Leicester's accounts such as hats, gloves, shoes, stockings, and jewellery, or the rapiers and daggers in Oxford's spending.

The 1561 declaration of the household expenses of Edward, Earl of Derby gives expenditure for 'Paymentes that be not of haushold' and are called 'ornaments apparell and jewells bought' to a total of £1030.19s.10½d.<sup>77</sup> This total includes £50 for the apparel of Thomas Gruffer and another £87.4s.0d. for another bill that appears to relate to Thomas Gruffer.<sup>78</sup> The remainder total of £893.15s.10½d. omits the sum found in the marginal note 'besydes cc pare of Aglettes worthe by estimac'on cc m'kes not yet paid for'.<sup>79</sup> The title of the document suggests the purchases were for Derby's personal use. However there is a limited breakdown of the bills into reimbursements to the 'Clarkes', the 'Stewarde' and the 'Receivor' offering no further clues to exactly what was being purchased for Derby. The clerks were reimbursed £36.6s.4½d. for the outlay on ornaments, which may not be dress related. The steward received £67.10s.9d for apparel and ornament, which implies elements of dress and possible non-dress items. The receiver was reimbursed for his outlay on apparel and jewels to the value of £789.18s.10d. While this figure may represent a closer approximation of Derby's wardrobe expenditure for 1561 it must still be treated with caution. Part of the bill may include New Year's gifts such as the embroidered satin purse Derby gave to the Queen for New Year 1561/2.<sup>80</sup> Without the further breakdown of these totals it is not possible to determine true expenditure for Derby's personal wardrobe. The bills that relate to this expenditure are not known to have survived.

Using these three comparative contemporaries of Leicester it is evident that other nobles' expenditure on their wardrobe was within the orbit of Leicester's expenditure.

---

76 JJN McGurk, 'Devereux, Walter, first earl of Essex (1539–1576)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online, accessed 7 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7568>>. Walter Devereux, Lord Hereford (1539–1576) was created earl of Essex in 1572. Hereford was at court from Queen Elizabeth's accession and married Lettice Knollys (1543-1634) about 1561; LHA, Devereux Papers, DE Vol. III, ff. 14-25. The tailor's bill covers the period from October 1558 to May 1560.

77 Raines, *The Stanley Papers*, p. 6; LA Knafla, 'Stanley, Edward, third earl of Derby (1509–1572)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 17 Nov 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26262>>. Edward, earl of Derby (1509-1572), had been made a Knight of the Bath in 1533, a Knight of the Garter in 1547, and was a Privy Councillor for Queen Mary and for Queen Elizabeth.

78 No further information on the identity of Thomas Gruffer is given.

79 Raines, *The Stanley Papers*, p. 6, this entry refers to two hundred pair of aglets. The figure of two hundred marks given for their value would calculate to approximately £133.6s.7d.; this figure was not included in the total sum.

80 TNA, C 47/3/38.

However a further breakdown of Leicester's expenditure is necessary in order to establish just how much was spent on each element of dress to determine the practicalities or excessiveness of this spending in comparison to his contemporaries.

Similar quantities of expenditure are seen in Leicester's accounts for 1559–61, compiled by his household officer Richard Ellis.<sup>81</sup> The total of £249.12s.5½d. reflects elements of dress definitively and most likely for Leicester in that period, shown in Appendix 2.5. However the items definitively ascribed to Leicester in the Ellis account are fewer, while the items most likely to be for Leicester are greater, no doubt due to the different accounting procedures used by Ellis. The later account, covering the period 1584–86, shows a total expenditure of £216.10s.6½d. on dress items. Figures in this later disbursement book correspond to the 1558–9 Chancy account and show a remarkably consistent spend on dress. However this consistency is misleading when examining the items of dress procured. The tables in Appendices 2.7 through to 2.20 show that Leicester's dress spending over the 1584–86 period was made up largely of goldsmiths' work and accessories. Missing from this account is evidence for spending on items of dress that had a reasonably high turnover such as doublets and stockings. Evidence is also lacking in all the accounts for coats, capes, cloaks and riding cloaks that were an essential element of his wardrobe both in his role as Master of the Horse and for partaking in hunting and general horse riding.

The bills from known suppliers of dress items included in the Chancy account total £471.17s.1d..<sup>82</sup> However the exact proportion of the bill directly relating to Leicester's dress is unknown.<sup>83</sup> These figures too require further analysis to determine the proportion of these bills that apply to Leicester's dress. Unfortunately without the actual bills that these totals apply to this analysis is largely not possible.<sup>84</sup> Analysis of extant bills that generally cover a slightly latter period may offer some clues however, and these are discussed below. Variance in the total bills from known suppliers of dress items in the Ellis account and 1584–1586 disbursement book is considerable (see Appendix 2.5). For the 1559–61 period the bills total £4,023.1s.5d., while the 1584–6 period totals £64.14s.9d. The figures suggest that Leicester invested heavily in

---

81 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 469, see also Chapter One, footnote 44 for Richard Ellis.

82 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 45. The totals for these bills were simply recorded in this account, for example 'to Jamys the shomaker upon a bill} lxs'.

83 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 4. Christopher Carcano's extant bill (1557-1559) demonstrates that a variety of goods might be supplied. These were not necessarily all for Leicester, but may have been for members of his household, and they were not all elements of dress. This bill included, for example, '*a fan of black straw iijs. iiijd, a glass of pomatd(er) xijd., silver spores xjs., gilt spores vjs., a payer of wytt pfumed gloves xiijs. iiijd., a horse harness of black velvet iijli. vjs. viijd*'.

84 Bills and warrants that are in LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V are the only known collection of bills for Leicester's wardrobe. They largely do not correspond with the sums found in the accounts although some do have dates within the period of the extant accounts.

his wardrobe in the early years of the reign. However as has previously been discussed these later accounts may well be lacking complete information. This is certainly the case for the 1585–7 disbursement book which exhibits only a £19.2s.0d. spend on clothing and, as Adams explains, is only a fragment of a much larger document.<sup>85</sup> The large total for the bills in the 1559–61 period also correspond to a time in Leicester's life when he was able to repay some debts built up over the years since his attainder.<sup>86</sup> His financial situation improved through licences granted by the Queen and sale of lands.<sup>87</sup> In particular Leicester was granted a licence in 1560 to export wool free of customs worth £6000.<sup>88</sup> The high figure in the 1559–61 period, then, is not a true reflection of how much Leicester spent on dress-related elements for this year. In addition the suppliers' bills may also reflect his investment in the furnishing of a household, the mercers who supplied silks for his wardrobe also supplying fabrics for the decoration of his residences.<sup>89</sup>

What has not been included in these calculations is the endless spending on rewards for various servants, related to other expenses such as the writing of warrants, and for delivery of goods (see Appendix 2.7). The transport of goods cost more money, and people involved in the production of the elements of dress were also rewarded and reimbursed for costs. Not only Leicester's personal dress suppliers received rewards. Rewards were also recorded at New Year 1559/60 to members of the Queen's Household, including the Great Wardrobe.<sup>90</sup> Leicester had a great deal to do with the Wardrobe through his role as Master of the Horse. This gave him unique access to the craftspeople that supplied the Queen. Rewards paid to the Wardrobe were an acknowledgement of his appreciation for their service. However they also supplied elements of his personal wardrobe and members of the Wardrobe were prominent among his suppliers, an aspect of the supply network that will be discussed further in the following chapter.

Transportation expenses provide clues to Leicester's whereabouts throughout the

---

85 See Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 9. Adams describes the original form of the manuscript as containing 333 pages, from which only partial transcriptions survive, the original being lost in the 1879 fire at the Birmingham Reference Library.

86 Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, p. 71. The attainder was lifted for Leicester and his two brothers, Ambrose and Henry, on 30 January 1557.

87 Leicester's financial situation has been discussed in: Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, see especially p. 72 for the period of his attainder. Some discussion is found in Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

88 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*.

89 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 42. Leicester was granted a house at Kew in December 1558, although he was primarily based at court.

90 Hereafter the Great Wardrobe is called the Wardrobe as opposed to Leicester's wardrobe which is not capitalised.

accounts and disbursement books.<sup>91</sup> The high cost of carriage found in the 1584–1586 period was related to his activities in the Netherlands.<sup>92</sup> It is evident that as Leicester campaigned around the Netherlands his wardrobe went with him, which can be seen in the following entry in his household accounts:

Payd to Steaven Johnson of your lordship's wardrop wich he payd for the carriage of your lordship's chamber stoufe and wardrop stoufe from the watersyd at Telt to your lordship's logging and for carring it bacagan in the morning to the watersyd and from the water to your logging at Bommell the vth of June 1586 } vijs. vjd.<sup>93</sup>

However it was not just overseas charges for transport that were high. As one would expect, the further away from London the higher the transportation charge. Spending any time at Kew increased the cost for any communication with the City. Leicester also paid for carriage of his wardrobe as the court moved around the various palaces as dictated by the Queen. The quantity being transported also affected the cost, for the larger his wardrobe, the more it cost to move. The exact quantity of wardrobe elements transported is difficult to determine from entries such as 'Item paid for the hier of a westermen barge that your lordship's apparell and other stuff from Kewe } xvs.'<sup>94</sup> While he was at court and expected to stay close to the Queen, Leicester had little control over transport costs.

The writing of warrants itemised in the Chancy account, totalling £0.18s.4d, relates to the necessary garments for Leicester's installation as a Knight of the Garter, which would suggest these were supplied by the Wardrobe. No other warrants occur in the accounts though it is possible they were written for his robes of Creation, St Michael and Parliament. These robes were initially required during a period for which no accounts are known to survive. What is evident in the fabric disbursement books are costs for the maintenance of Leicester's robes. William Whittell relined his Parliament Robes on 16 May 1572 at a cost of £4.14s.6d for the fabric alone.<sup>95</sup> It is clear that maintenance of his ceremonial dress became Leicester's responsibility once he had been given the robes.

While references to Leicester's dress for installation as a Knight of the Garter are visible in Chancy accounts his dress expenses related to the Coronation and surrounding pageantry are less obvious. As Master of the Horse he was given cloth from the Wardrobe for his gown as follows:

---

91 Adams, *Household Accounts*. Adams highlights Leicester's movements and current affairs in his editing of the accounts.

92 For Leicester's activities in the Netherlands see FG Oosterhoff, *Leicester and the Netherlands 1586-1587*, Hes Publishers, Utrecht, 1988.

93 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 355.

94 Ibid., p. 173. Leicester's goods were being moved from Kew to Westminster.

95 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. XII, f. 13.

*Master of the horsse.*

*Cloth of golde incarnate for p[ar]te of a gowne – vij yerdes iij q[ua]rt[ers]*

*Clothe of golde purple for p[er]formanuce of the same – vij yerdes iij q[ua]rt[ers]*

*Clothe of golde purple for a caparison and harnesse – x yerdes*

*A Saddle w[i]t[h] the furniture<sup>96</sup>*

The most overt reference to these materials in Chancy's account is an entry for the cleaning of the 'Coronation stuff xxvs'.<sup>97</sup> It appears the making of Leicester's gown was his responsibility. For this he may have engaged one of the tailors listed in Chancy's account. The prominence of William Whittell, 'taylor', in this account would suggest he was involved in the production of the necessary garments. Wilkinson's bill itemised a delivery of silver lace to Whittell on 18 November 1558 which demonstrates that Leicester was utilising Whittell before the Coronation.<sup>98</sup> Whittell and his servants received rewards when Leicester was in his shop around the time of the Coronation.<sup>99</sup> In addition there was a constant ferrying of Whittell, or one of Leicester's wardrobe staff, between Whittell's shop and Leicester's place of residence.<sup>100</sup> What is also clear from the account is that Whittell made gowns for the nobility, 'Partridge being sent to Whittill for my Lord of Pembrokes gowne vjd.'. <sup>101</sup> Unfortunately Whittell's surviving bills are dated from 1561 and therefore post-date the coronation.<sup>102</sup>

Further dress-related expenses include a lock for the wardrobe door at the cost of '16d.' (see Appendix 2.7).<sup>103</sup> The need for such a measure on the wardrobe at Woodstock hints that there were some issues with theft. Certainly Lord Lisle encountered theft from his wardrobe, while also suffering various other losses.<sup>104</sup> There is no such evidence available for Leicester's wardrobe though elements of his wardrobe were no less desirable than his brother's, indeed probably more so. Leicester's wardrobe was an asset that required certain steps to ensure it was secure; the lock assisted in this purpose.

The exact nature of numerous entries for 'certain necessaries for the wardroppe' as they occur in the Chancy account and 1584–6 disbursement book is unclear.<sup>105</sup> The entries refer to bills submitted by the payee but the contents of these bills are not

---

96 TNA, E 101/429/3, unfoliated. It is not known what happened to these garments following the coronation.

97 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 48.

98 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V., ff. 27–28.

99 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 46. Unfortunately no date was ascribed to this visit to Whittell's shop although it occurs in the account with other coronation related expenses.

100 Ibid., pp. 42, 52, 61, 72.

101 Ibid., p. 52.

102 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V., ff. 44–86, 262.

103 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 293.

104 Bod. MS. Add. C. 94, ff. 1, 1v., 2, 3, 5, 5v., 6v., 7, 7v., 8, 8v., 9, 11.

105 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 63, 66, 262.

illuminated. The implication of the entry is that elements of dress are not included in the ‘necessaries’. Consistent with such a category may have been items such as brushes for cleaning clothing or associated furniture as are evident in Lord Lisle’s inventory<sup>106</sup>, or perhaps paper and ink for record keeping and the writing of warrants to Leicester’s suppliers.<sup>107</sup> Whatever these ‘necessaries’ were expenditure on them rose from 19s.8d in the Chancy account to £3.3s.10d in the disbursement book (see Appendix 2.7). This perhaps reflects the growth in Leicester’s wardrobe, and its staff, with his position at court. Without the evidence to determine the exact nature of these necessities no conclusions can be drawn on their practicalities or excesses, apart from the fact that they were clearly required to run the wardrobe.

Board and wages for the wardrobe staff, along with further charges for their food, as they are found in the 1584–1586 disbursement book, are also considered as an additional dress-related expense (see Appendix 2.7).<sup>108</sup> As Leicester was more mobile during this period so his wardrobe and its staff required accommodation. The high cost of £10 for board and wages reflects an extraordinary expense for four men for forty-four days at Utrecht. Yet the charges for board and wages and food are expenses that had not previously occurred in the accounts in this manner but are directly relative to wardrobe expenditure. Interestingly the inclusion of the fortnightly cost of meat for servants of the wardrobe at 56s.8d. (£2.16s.8d.) a fortnight are for a period when Leicester was still in and around London, although he was spending time at Wansted, Nonsuch and Greenwich.<sup>109</sup> They reflect the true cost of managing Leicester’s wardrobe in a way that had not been demonstrated before. Previous evidence of these types of expenses are found in the Book of Servants’ Wages for 1559–1561.<sup>110</sup>

John Powell ‘of the wardrobe’ is the only servant directly linked to the wardrobe in the account.<sup>111</sup> His charges include board and wages and reimbursement of four other

---

106 Bod. MS. Add. C. 94, ff. 12, 14. Lisle’s wardrobe furniture included a ‘*standing frame whare in sertaine of my lords aparell hangeth*’ and ‘*a long table and two tressles wheron muche of my lords apparell lyeth*’. A ‘*white brusshe for veluet*’ is recorded alongside other wardrobe elements such as ‘*reband poyntes*’.

107 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V., ff. 300–444 plus two unfoliated warrants were written by Leicester’s wardrobe staff to suppliers of good and services.

108 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 63, 66, 262.

109 Ibid., p. 270. The first time this expense occurs the charge is 5s.8d. for 28 June to 11 July 1585. The next occurrence is for 11 July to 25 July 1585 and is for 56s.8d. The next six charges for the same expense that occur in the account are for 56s.8d. This may indicate the first entry may have been entered wrongly in the account and should have been for 56s rather than 5s.

110 ‘The Book of My Lords Servants Wages and Boord Wages’, 1559–1561 is printed in Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 399–418.

111 Ibid., p. 482. John Powell was in Leicester’s household from 1559–1561 and also received livery and a badge in 1567.



bills, of an unspecified nature, totalling £19.15s.0d. for the period of the book.<sup>112</sup> Powell's bill for board and wages formed £4 of his total payment. This figure is very much in line with a similar payment made to Richard Fawlconner, huntsman, who received £4.14s.10d for his board and wages, and with that paid to George Lewes, cook, at 70s. (£3.10s.).<sup>113</sup> It is clear that any movement away from Leicester's main residence added to the expense of running his wardrobe, however there was ultimately a base line cost for wardrobe servants' board and wages. This cost would increase relative to the number of people engaged in wardrobe activities. Certainly at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign the board and wages for a member of Leicester's wardrobe staff were commensurate with other servants of his household. The wardrobe servants who accompanied Leicester to the Netherlands were receiving payments of 50s. (£2.10s.0d) each for a forty-four day period. This would reflect a yearly payment of £20 for board and wages which is a considerable increase from the 1559–61 payment to Powell. However the extenuating circumstances of their being in a foreign country clearly added to the cost incurred for board and wages.

As we have seen spending on items of dress can be found throughout the household accounts and disbursement books. These expenses have been tabulated by object type and corresponding expenditure for further analysis (see Appendices 2.8, and 2.11 to 2.20). An examination of the sums expended on these separate wardrobe elements is illustrative of the degree to which Leicester was investing in his appearance. However the fragmentary nature of the evidence, and how it is recorded immediately impacts on the findings. Leicester's spending on jerkins, doublets and hose has been calculated from these accounts at a total of £46.7s.2d. for the 1558–9 Chancy account (see Appendix 2.8). The difficulty with these figures is that rarely is one single item listed on its own. Entries such as 'Item to the Spanishe teyler for making your lordship iij dobletts weltyd with velvet and on[e] of gold canvas} ixli.vs.iiijd.',<sup>114</sup> do not itemise the cost for each of the four doublets, but do offer an insight into one aspect of doublet expenditure in the 1558–9 account. Further entries provide different information such as the doublet of canvas made for Leicester at a cost of 11s.2d. which demonstrates the use of a variety of fabrics for doublets and the range of costs of garment construction.<sup>115</sup> Also reflected is the varying use of each garment and indicates that Leicester was choosing to purchase cheaper elements of dress alongside expensive pieces, clearly for different purposes. The remaining doublets that occur in this account are recorded with other items of dress such as hose or jerkins, 'Item to the Spanish teyler for making of girkins trymmed with silver lace and for the making of ij sattin doublets per bill}

---

112 Ibid., p. 405.

113 Ibid., pp. 406, 412, for George Lewes and Richard Fawlconner.

114 Ibid., p. 91.

115 Ibid., p. 88. The entry reads 'Item to my Lord of Penbrokes servant for the making of your lordship's canvas doblett xjs.ijd.'

lvijis'.<sup>116</sup> This record also reflects the ambiguity of many of the entries.

The cost shown may only convey the cost of the workmanship rather than the whole cost of the garment including fabric, embroidery and any further embellishments such as buttons, lace or ribbon points. For this information the bills are required, which are not known to exist. Yet from the bills that do exist it is clear that each person involved in the production of a garment supplied a separate bill. It is also evident that in some cases the tailor, hosier or embroiderer sourced some of the fabrics themselves rather than relying on a fabric merchant to supply them through Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>117</sup> David Smith, embroiderer, in his bill running from 1561-1566, itemised each of the processes for which he charged.<sup>118</sup> These included the cutting (i.e. decorating the fabric with cuts or slashes) of a coat with a diamond pattern at a cost of 8s., quilting a pair of sleeves with sweet powders and lining them with new fabric for which he charged for the cotton and the workmanship at 12s., and the quilting of a waistcoat for which he charged for the bumbaste (stuffing or padding), silk (thread) and workmanship 25s. (£1.5s.). It is highly likely that these types of charges were not included in the household account entries for the doublets, jerkins and hose above. Incidentally Smith's bill also illustrates the ongoing maintenance of garments. The sleeves received new lining fabric and perfume to replace the old, thus indicating the value placed on prolonging the life of a garment and a concern with body odour. These types of charges may well be found in the lump sum bills paid to known dress-suppliers in Appendix 2.5. However without the itemised bills the true cost of each garment can only be speculated at.

We can nevertheless get an indication of the quantity of fabric necessary to make a doublet, a jerkin and a pair of hose from warrants written to Mr Peacock, fabric merchant, in 1566.<sup>119</sup> The itemised bill of William Chelsham, mercer, from 1558-9, meanwhile provides details of the type of fabric, the quantity supplied and cost.<sup>120</sup> Armed with this information a closer approximation of the cost of fabric for a garment can be calculated. Thus the warrant to Peacock dated 27 May 1566 includes a requisition for one ell of purple taffeta to line a jerkin for Leicester and one ell of white

---

116 Ibid., p. 87.

117 The warrants that exist show that, at least in the 1560's, fabric was being supplied to the artificers directly from the mercer or fabric merchant. Later some fabric appears to be delivered out of Leicester's wardrobe, although this may be more in the style of the record keeping than an actual change in practice.

118 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 98-100.

119 Ibid., ff. 303, 308, 313, 317, 324, 325, 331, 332, 334, 335, 336, 340, 343, 345, 348, 350, 351, 355, 357, 359, 361, 371, 372, 376, 377, 381, 382, 385, 384, 387, 388, 389, 390, 392, 394, 401, 403, 406, 408, 410, 411, 412, 413, 418, 420, 422, 424, 425, 427, 428, 429, 431, 433, 436, 437, 438, 444. Although these warrants itemise the quantities of fabrics to be supplied and the garment the fabric is to be made into it gives no indication of cost.

120 Ibid., ff. 5-6.

taffeta to make a doublet and to edge it, along with one ell and a quarter to line the white taffeta doublet.<sup>121</sup> A further warrant requests three yards of black velvet for a pair of hose and three yards of black satin to line the hose.<sup>122</sup> Chelsham's bill includes numerous entries for satin, velvet, sarcenet, taffeta, English worsted but no canvas or gold canvas. Black velvet shown in the bill varied in price from 16s. to 23s.4d. (£1.3s.4d.) a yard depending on the quality, while white velvet is charged at 18s. a yard. Satin varied in price depending on the colour and quality. Black Jean satin was charged at 13s.4d. a yard, yellow satin at 11s., white satin at 10s.6d., russet bridge satin at 5s.10d., white bridge satin at 5s.10d., yellow bridge satin at 5s.10d., russet satin at 11s., black satin at 11s., white bridge satin at 2s.6d., and crimson satin at 13s.4d. Sarcenet also varied in price with colour and quality from 6s.8d. an ell for yellow sarcenet to 6s. an ell for black taffeta sarcenet and 5s.4d. an ell for white sarcenet. Chelsham clearly had access to a wide range of different quality silk fabrics; whether these were sourced from his own store or from the wider mercer community will be discussed in the following chapter. In suggesting a total cost for the fabric of a lined doublet, along with a pair of lined hose, we can take figures found in Peacock's warrants and the cost per yard or ell for fabric supplied by Chelsham. These calculations are found in Appendices 2.9 and 2.10.

The basic fabric cost for a white satin doublet for Leicester in 1559–1560 was approximately £1.2s.1½d. and approximately £1.15s.10d. for a black velvet doublet. Hose required a greater quantity of fabric and this was reflected in the cost. Fabric for a pair of white satin hose cost approximately £2.10s.0d., while black velvet hose cost approximately £4.2s.0d. However these figures lack the cost of constructing the garment or any embellishment such as embroidery, decorative finishing such as pinking or cutting, lace, buttons or ribbon points. William Whittell's charges for fashioning Leicester's doublets varied between 3s. and 6s.8d. although it may have been more if extensive embellishment was required.<sup>123</sup> This was in-line with the charges of the unnamed tailor to Walter Devereux, earl of Essex at 6s.8d. for fashioning.<sup>124</sup> Neither Leicester's nor Essex's tailor constructed hose, therefore the approximate cost of hose construction has been drawn from Maynard Buckwith's second extant bill.<sup>125</sup> Buckwith also charged, according to the intricacy of the garment, anywhere from 6s. to 40s.

---

121 Ibid., f. 332. An English ell is equivalent to 45" or 1 ¼ yards.

122 Ibid., f. 401. This warrant is dated 29 December 1566.

123 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 44. Whittell charged 'xxx.' for the fashioning of a canvas doublet heavily stitched all over.

124 LHA, Devereux Papers, DE Vol.III, f. 14v. The entry reads '*Item for the making of a doublet of white satten cut & lyned w[i]t[h] sarsenett } vjs.viijd.*'

125 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 209–214 and ff. 152–157. Buckwith's first extant bill does not show charges for the fashioning of a pair of hose, instead charging for board and wages.

(£2) for the fashioning.<sup>126</sup> Each surviving bill provides a list of expenses related to the construction of one garment which are indicative of the types of charges Leicester faced in addition to fabric costs. For example Whittell's bill itemised the following charges;

<i>It the xiiijth of Aprell for making your dublet of satten cutt &amp; lyned with sarsenet</i>	<i>vjs.viijd.</i>	
<i>It one ell di holond at ijs. thell</i>	<i>iijs.</i>	
<i>It for silke for the same</i>	<i>ijs.vjd.</i>	
<i>Item for bumbast to it</i>	<i>xijd</i>	
<i>It course canvas to the same</i>	<i>xijd.</i>	
<i>It ij dozen di buttons at viijd.</i>	<i>xxd.</i>	<i>xvs.xd.</i> <sup>127</sup>

The total for a relatively straight-forward doublet might be closer to £1.17s.11d. if satin was used, or £2.11s.8d if it was constructed of velvet. A pair of hose cost in the region of £3.10s.6d. to £5.2s.0d for fabric and fashioning. However, it is clear that the total cost of a garment varied considerably dependant upon fabric quality, embellishment and the amount of workmanship involved in its production. This is true of all of the garments in Leicester's, and every other courtier's, wardrobe.

This is also exemplified in the undergarments such as the shirt. Mrs Barker, shepster, supplied Leicester's shirts during the years 1562–1564. The cost of each shirt varied in price from £6 for a linen shirt wrought with gold and silver and cutwork to 50s. (£2.10s.) for a linen shirt with Flanders cuffs.<sup>128</sup> An investment in good quality shirts not only adhered to current court fashion trends but also provided a launderable barrier layer between the body and the non-launderable doublet. The visibility of the embellishment on a shirt worn at court would be largely limited to the collar and cuffs. Yet surviving shirts from the period show embroidery on the body of the garment indicating their visibility in the privacy of one's dwelling and elsewhere.<sup>129</sup> Hayward has suggested that Henry VIII played tennis in his shirt and hose.<sup>130</sup> Leicester may also have followed this fashion as a keen participant in the sport. Mrs Storer (alias Cowdrye), shepster, was making the same type of shirt for Leicester as she was for Ambrose Dudley, earl of Warwick, each paying the same price for the shirts.<sup>131</sup> This indicates a familial supply network, which will be examined more closely in the next chapter. In addition it demonstrates a similar taste in clothing, and its embellishment, by the brothers. However without further information on Warwick's wardrobe expenditure his investment in his wardrobe cannot be calculated. Leicester's expenditure on shirts in his accounts has been calculated and tabulated (see Appendix

126 Ibid., ff. 210–210v.

127 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 45.

128 Ibid., f. 142.

129 Arnold, Tiramani and Levey, *Patterns of Fashion*.

130 Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry the VIII*, p. 108.

131 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 166.

2.11). The information in the accounts is clouded by the method of record-keeping that shows the total paid for one or a series of bills and therefore defining how many shirts were purchased at exactly what cost is not possible. Lord Lisle was consuming an average of 7.5 shirts per year according to his wardrobe inventories (see Appendix 2.3). It can be expected that Leicester followed a similar consumption pattern as his brother, as he did with doublets. However his consumption of shirts may perhaps have reached a higher level following that of his father Northumberland who owned twenty-one shirts at his attainder in 1553.<sup>132</sup> Leicester's expenditure on shirts, seen in Appendix 2.11, demonstrates the use of high quality materials and embellishment, as would be expected by, and for, a courtier though the exact number or embellishment cannot be determined.

Fourteen gowns featured in Leicester's 1588 wardrobe inventory, but very little evidence for their cost is shown in the accounts.<sup>133</sup> The costs shown are £4.16s.0d. for fabric and £4.10s.0d. for fur (see Appendix 2.12). Gowns were clearly still an important garment in the courtier's wardrobe in the 1580's, as they had been thirty years earlier; Northumberland was in possession of twelve gowns at his attainder, while Lisle had seven gowns in 1550.<sup>134</sup> Unfortunately the cost of Leicester's gowns cannot be fully established.

There is similarly little information for expenditure on coats and cloaks in the accounts (see Appendix 2.13). Yet the 1588 inventory demonstrates that Leicester owned twenty-four cloaks of varying designs and no coats, though this might simply be a nomenclature issue in the description of coats.<sup>135</sup> The lack of hard data for expenditure on such items may be explained through their cost being hidden in large payments to known suppliers without any indication of to what the payment pertained. However the general rule of quality of fabric and degree of embellishment applies to these garments; the higher the quality the greater the cost. This is evidenced by the cost of goldsmith's work, £30, delivered to the embroiderer for the coat that Leicester wore to meet John, Duke of Finland in 1559.<sup>136</sup>

The addition of fur to a garment, principally gowns and cloaks, added an additional cost which was determined by the quantity and type of fur used. Leicester's spending on fur and skinner's wares has been tabulated (see Appendix 2.14). Here again the large sums found are amounts for undetermined quantities of fur and skins for

---

132 TNA, E 154/2/39, ff. 11-12. See Appendix 2.21.

133 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII, ff. 2-2v.

134 TNA, E 154/2/39, ff. 6v., 15. See Appendix 2.21 for an inventory of Northumberland's wardrobe at his attainder. Also Bod., Ms Add. C.94. See Appendix 2.3 for a summary of John Dudley, Lord lisle's wardrobe inventories.

135 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII, ff. 3, 4, 4v., 5.

136 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 106.

unknown purposes such as 'Item peid to Lucas the skynner as appearithe by his bill } xliiijli.xiijs.iiijd'.<sup>137</sup> However there is a corresponding bill that shows further information on one entry in the Chancy account of 1558–9. The bill in question, from Thomas Allen, skinner, shows a range of dates and fur types purchased. The entry for the '15th of March 1558 [1559] for ij ty[m]ber of xx sable skyns at 30-0-0'<sup>138</sup> is reflected in Chancy's entry 'Item peid to Allen the skynner uppon his bill of xxxli. the sum of xxli.'<sup>139</sup> The bill also reflects the fact that the sables were to be put into a gown. The use of sables in garments before his election as a Knight of the Order of the Garter indicates that Leicester was probably given special dispensation by the Queen, as their use was reserved for royalty or no one below the rank of earl in the 1533 act of apparel.<sup>140</sup> Two of the furs found in the accounts, 'leuzardes' and 'jennitt', were also reserved for high-ranking nobility or Knights of the Order of the Garter. This is in contrast to Northumberland who had his gowns furred with either squirrel or black budge. He chose to use only small amounts of expensive furs such as sables and black jennettes in the trimming of garments, although he also faced gowns with less expensive coney and marten.<sup>141</sup> Lisle also used less expensive furs, trimming his gowns with coney.<sup>142</sup> It appears that Leicester was investing in high quality, and expensive, furs in the first years of Queen Elizabeth's reign. This expenditure may have decreased over the years, certainly the later disbursement books show a considerable decrease in fur expenditure. As these accounts are incomplete, however, it is not possible to determine a change in fur consumption.

Spanish skins are the only leather types itemised in the accounts. The figure of £1.2s.0d., seen in Appendix 2.14, does not demonstrate Leicester's consumption of Spanish leather which featured in jerkins, hose, gloves and shoes. It can only be assumed that the leather forms part of the sum paid to various skimmers in the accounts. Leicester's use of imported skins speaks of the overseas networks in which he and his wardrobe suppliers were involved; these networks will be discussed in the following chapters.

The work of Leicester's goldsmiths is similarly reflective of the overseas supply chain, but also of the creative and financial networks of alien and English goldsmiths in the City of London and its Liberties. Leicester's expenditure on goldsmiths' work for his wardrobe, as shown in his accounts, has been summarised and tabulated for further analysis (see Appendix 2.15). Goldsmiths' work definitively for Leicester drops

---

137 Ibid., p. 89.

138 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 8.

139 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 89.

140 Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, p. 29.

141 TNA, E 154/2/39. See Appendix 2.21.

142 Bod. MS. Add. C.94.

slightly from the Chancy account at £130.0s.7½d. to the £101.10s.0d. total for the 1584–1586 disbursement book. The incomplete nature of the final disbursement book is reflected in the figure of £6.0s.0d. expended on goldsmiths' wares for Leicester's wardrobe. The chief difficulty faced when analysing these figures is the lack of evidence for the spending on goldsmiths' work by his contemporaries for comparable lengths of time. However some evidence can be found in Sir Henry Sidney's papers. In 1565 Sidney paid £42.12s. for two chains for his son Phillip.<sup>143</sup> This eclipses Leicester's spend on the most expensive chain, £16, itemised in the Ellis account.<sup>144</sup> However the 1584–6 account records a chain with pomander purchased by Leicester for £52.<sup>145</sup> Sidney's 1565–66 account shows spending on goldsmiths' work and money paid to goldsmiths to a value of £613.15s.<sup>146</sup> Of that figure £4.8s. was for silver buttons. Unfortunately there is no further breakdown of the figures in order to determine if wares were dress-related items. While a proportion of the figure may be for Sidney's personal dress use it may also have included repayment of loans or outstanding bills, or gifts that without further evidence are hidden within the lump sum. Sidney did give goldsmiths' work as gifts. He purchased Leicester's 1578/9 New Year's gift of a George and the emblem of St Michael from Peter Vanlore, jeweller, although the price was not included in the account.<sup>147</sup>

Leicester too spent money on goldsmiths' work for gifts in the household accounts. Those recorded in the Chancy account total £26.5s.0½d. By 1563/4 he was spending a great deal more on goldsmiths' work for New Year's gifts.<sup>148</sup> However he was also receiving a considerable quantity of goldsmiths' work in return. It is certainly clear from the New Year's gift lists that the court spent liberally on goldsmiths' work for each other and the Queen. The difficulty of determining how their expenditure on goldsmiths' work for personal use compared to Leicester is exacerbated by a lack of evidence. Portraits of Leicester show the goldsmiths' work he chose to be depicted wearing was largely limited to jewels on his hat, a chain from which hung a lesser George, jewelled buttons, and a jewelled garter. Less obvious was the goldsmiths' work

---

143 CKS, U1475 A4/1, f. 7v.

144 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 127.

145 *Ibid.*, p. 341.

146 CKS, U1475 A5/4, f. 3.

147 CKS, U1475 A4/6, f. 5v. There is as yet no evidence that Peter Vanlore was a supplier to Leicester. However the fact he was supplying jewels to Sidney for Leicester will be explored further in the discussion on the familial wardrobe supply networks in the following chapter. Sir Peter Vanlore (c.1547-1627) was a merchant from Utrecht who arrived in England circa 1568. He was supplying jewels to the Court through the 1590's and into the reign of James I; see V Larminie, 'Vanlore, Sir Peter (c.1547-1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 20 Nov 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66557>>

148 BL, Add. 78172 Vol. V, ff. 1–4. See also Nichols, *Progresses and Public Processions*, p. 527, for a list of gifts, much of it goldsmiths' work, that Leicester gave the Queen for New Year's gifts.

used in embroidery, and aglets which are not visible in any of the portraits examined. Portraits of Leicester's contemporaries show similar amounts of goldsmiths' work depicted (see Appendix 1.2). This would suggest that Leicester's contemporaries were indeed investing in goldsmiths' work for their own personal use, in addition to gifts.

Leicester's preference for knitted stockings is clearly demonstrated in the surviving accounts (see Appendices 2.16 and 2.17). Although evidence of his spending on stockings exists for only three of the four periods covered by the accounts, Leicester's stocking expenditure was reasonably consistent. The total for the Chancy account is £6.17s.4d., while the Ellis account is £5.5s.0d. In the first account consumption of silk and non-silk knitted stockings was similar, with eight silk stockings identified and ten other knitted stockings purchased. The preference for silk stockings over other types was clearly demonstrated in the Ellis account. Although there was a predominance of silk-knitted stockings, Leicester also wore knitted wool stockings. Silk stockings appear to have been more widely worn at Court in the 1560's. Sir Henry Sidney paid a bill from Mrs Holborne, who also supplied Leicester, for thirteen pairs of silk netherstocks at a cost of £25.10s.<sup>149</sup> It has not been determined if these stockings were knitted in England or imported as finished products; however, Mrs Holbourne was lengthening stockings for Leicester which implies the ability to knit the product in the first place.<sup>150</sup> The origin of these products and their place in the network of wardrobe suppliers will be discussed in the following chapters. Sidney's consumption of silk stockings compares favourably with the eight pairs shown in the Chancy account and the twenty shown in the Ellis account. However the definitive identification of who was the ultimate recipient of any of these pairs of silk stockings is open to conjecture. Chancy ascribed nine pairs of stockings to Leicester. Of these three pairs were 'Gernsey' (knitted wool) while another four were priced as Gernsey. This leaves only two pairs of silk stockings explicitly purchased for Leicester. While it is likely the remainder were also for Leicester, further evidence is necessary to safely draw this conclusion.

The Ellis account shows a marked drop in the consumption of Gernsey stockings, with only one pair purchased compared to the twenty silk pairs. Unfortunately Ellis does not record for whom the stockings were purchased, but he does identify the majority of suppliers, which is useful for the discussion of the wardrobe network that follows. The main conclusion that these figures enable to be drawn is that from the first to the second account there is an increased consumption of silk-knitted stockings by 250% within the household. Regrettably no further information on stocking purchases is found in the later accounts, which limits any examination of the rise in consumption.

---

149 CKS, U1475 A4/1, f. 7.

150 TNA, SP 12/35. ff. 81–84v., is a 1564 list of goods imported into the Kingdom. Silk hose were listed as being imported from Spain. See also Appendix 4.1.



There may be a relationship between the amount of time Leicester was spending at court, and increased financial resources that resulted in the higher consumption of silk stockings. However the use of boothose, which were worn inside boots to protect stockings, indicates the wearing of silk stockings was not limited to periods at court. Unfortunately there is too little evidence for Leicester's consumption of boothose in the household accounts to make a meaningful comparison possible (see Appendix 2.20). The extant bills show that boothose formed part of the work of the shepster. Francis Barker supplied four pairs on 14 July 1563 at a cost of £4, and a further four pair on 29 July 1564 for the same amount.<sup>151</sup> Stockings and boothose itemised in Leicester's 1588 wardrobe inventory shows eight pairs of silk and one pair of worsted stockings, alongside sixteen pairs of linen and seven pairs of worsted boot hose. Comments in the inventory such as '*woren out ye tops remaining*' and '*past servoice*' beside a number of these items demonstrate the intensive use they were put to.<sup>152</sup> This would indicate that Leicester wore his clothes until they became unfit for further wear when they were recycled in some way. There is evidence for the earl of Essex wearing silk stockings in the 1570's; however the record reads '*Noxton millener for silk stockings gloves points etc* £11.15s.' which makes further breakdown of the figures impossible.<sup>153</sup> More evidence of the consumption of silk stockings by Leicester's contemporaries is needed to firmly place Leicester's consumption in context. What we have seen is that Leicester had a preference for silk stockings and was paying the same price as his brother-in-law, Sidney, for a pair.

The type of footwear that Leicester was purchasing reflected the various functions he was performing at court and elsewhere. An increase in the consumption of shoes from the Chancy to the Ellis account is clearly demonstrated when the sums are tabulated (see Appendix 2.18). Unfortunately, as with many of the entries for footwear, the majority of sums expended are for bills from shoemakers; £12 in the Chancy account and £60 in the Ellis account. It is the inclusion of a bill from James Crokeham, shoemaker, pasted into the Ellis account that provides details of footwear expenditure definitively for Leicester. The portion of the bill pertaining to Leicester's footwear, at £14.11s., provides a valuable insight into the proportion of indoor and outdoor footwear consumed.<sup>154</sup> Of the thirty-two pairs itemised in the bill, nineteen were velvet shoes, moyles or slippers while the remaining eleven were boots, buskins or arming shoes.<sup>155</sup> This would suggest a series of scenarios. The increased time at court required a higher number of indoor shoes, although the life expectancy of a pair of velvet shoes is unknown at this stage. Also the high consumption of shoes for outdoor use clearly

---

151 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. f. 142v.

152 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII, ff. 18, 18v.

153 LHA, Devereux Papers, DE Vol.V. f. 43v.

154 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 175.

155 Arming shoes were worn beneath the sabatons (foot coverings) of a suit of armour.

demonstrates Leicester's active participation in outdoor activities as would be expected with his position as Master of the Horse, along with his passion for hunting and riding. The inclusion of arming shoes indicates the participation in a martial activity perhaps the tilt where armour would be worn.

The same bill itemises ten pairs of velvet shoes for Lady Dudley, double soled shoes and 'pompes' for the footmen and a pair of 'bouts for Dereynge'.<sup>156</sup> The most explicit reference to shoes for a specific purpose are tennis shoes which are evident in Leicester's 1588 wardrobe inventory.<sup>157</sup> There are numerous records of payments relating to tennis found in both the Chancy and Ellis accounts. These are largely charges for balls, and rewards to the keepers of the tennis courts.<sup>158</sup> The accounts also record two of his tennis opponents, John, duke of Finland and the earl of Sussex.<sup>159</sup> There are no records of any other dress specifically for tennis. Hayward highlighted King Henry VIII's engagement with tennis, though no specific footwear was noted.<sup>160</sup> The evidence available for Lisle's footwear consumption shows fifty pairs of velvet shoes, eighteen pairs of buskins, and fifteen pairs of boots over the period of the inventory.<sup>161</sup> The forty three items of footwear that Crokeham supplied Leicester was more than half of Lisle's total consumption for up to six years. This may be attributed to a lack of shoes following the attainder, a high turnover of shoes, or the need to have a variety of shoes at hand. However in Leicester's 1588 wardrobe inventory there were sixty-seven pairs of assorted footwear in his wardrobe.<sup>162</sup> Leicester clearly kept a selection of shoes. A lack of similar inventories for his contemporaries makes any comparison impossible.

Accessories to Leicester's dress included gloves and sundry other extras which have been tabulated for further analysis (see Appendices 2.19 and 2.20). For each of these accessories there was a rise in expenditure from the Chancy account to the Ellis account. Leicester's gloves were supplied, cleaned and perfumed by a number of people, who included haberdashers, milliners, glovers and perfumers. This highlights the difficulty of identifying a trade or Company allegiance by the type of goods supplied. In addition gloves and other accessories may be hidden in larger sums paid out in the accounts for which no bill is extant. Leicester predominantly purchased Spanish and perfumed gloves in the first two accounts, and perfumed gloves in the 1584–1586 account. The totals expended for gloves in Appendix 2.19 show that those purchased for an unknown recipient (probably Leicester) more than doubled over

---

156 Ibid.

157 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII. f. 24.

158 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 67, 70, 74, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157.

159 Ibid., pp. 117, 133, 153.

160 Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry the VIII*, p. 108.

161 Bod., MS. Add. C.94.

162 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII. f. 23-24v.

the period of the first two accounts from £2.5s.10d. to £4.19s. The figure recorded for Leicester's glove consumption in the 1584–1586 account suggests that gloves remained a continual expense within the household. While only one portrait shows Leicester holding a pair of gloves, the records for cleaning gloves indicate he wore them regularly.<sup>163</sup>

Leicester's expenditure on caps and hats followed the same pattern as for the gloves (see Appendix 2.20). The figures more than doubled from £3.0s.6d. in the Chancy account to £7.4s.10d. in the Ellis account. The 1584–1586 figure of £16.19s.0d. follows the trend for continued consumption of headwear as for gloves. Caps and hats too were supplied by haberdashers and milliners, along with cappers. Throughout the period covered by the accounts Leicester's hats were predominantly velvet to which were applied jewels and feathers. Leicester wore some type of headwear in every extant portrait. This is true of the majority of his contemporaries who exhibit similar headwear, jewelled and feathered in the same way. The 1588 wardrobe inventory itemises thirty-nine hats made of a variety of materials including beaver, velvet, taffeta and felt. Many of the hats are recorded as past service implying that they were well worn and remained in the wardrobe.<sup>164</sup> In 1550 Lord Lisle had twenty two hats and caps in his wardrobe and it might be expected this figure would increase with his continued presence at court. Without further evidence for the consumption of headwear by Leicester's contemporaries it is difficult to draw meaningful comparisons.

Additional expenditure on accessories demonstrates that Leicester's eyesight was failing in the 1580's when he was purchasing spectacles (see Appendix 2.20). The constant expenditure on points, laces and ribbon indicates the continual wearing of these accessories to fasten garments and to suspend a lesser George when it was not hung on a chain. Rapiers, girdles and hangers also feature as a constant expenditure. The high figure found in the 1584–1586 account, £27.10s.2d, reflects the embellishment of a series of rapiers, girdles and hangers which had not been demonstrated in the earlier accounts. How this figure compares to Leicester's contemporaries is unknown due to lack of data. Portrait evidence would suggest that the style of girdle and hanger, and their embellishment, was similar to those worn by other courtiers. However without the quantifiable data it is difficult to conclude if Leicester's expenditure on these accessories outstripped those of his contemporaries.

## **Conclusion**

Evidence for Leicester's spending on his wardrobe is considerable when compared to his fellow courtiers. While this demonstrates the value of these surviving documents,

---

163 The c.1565 portrait is located at Waddeston Manor and can be seen reproduced in Appendix 2.2: Figure Sixteen.

164 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII. ff. 16-17.

and portraits to the study of consumption of material culture by courtiers in the early modern English court, it also presents the danger of singling Leicester out for his consumption in a way that is not possible for his contemporaries. The challenge is to analyse the data for Leicester placing his spending and dress in the early modern court context. Through the use of portraits of high ranking courtiers along with other evidence for their spending and carefully considered questions this chapter has reflected on the courtier wardrobe and its cost. In returning to the questions posed at the outset of this chapter it has been possible to assess how Leicester was viewed both by his contemporaries and more recent commentators.<sup>165</sup> It has become clear that his dress displayed his nobility and position to contemporaries and so far no contemporary comments at all have been discovered which indicate that his dress was considered to be excessive. It is later commentators who have made judgements on the ostentatious nature of his display, influenced no doubt by unflattering characterisation through his biographies such as Wilson. Leicester's appearance and presentation of himself had been largely taken out of context by these later commentators. The returning of Leicester to his place beside the Queen amongst his fellow courtiers has shown he was dressed in a fashionable but conservative style very much in keeping with his position.

Having determined the broad requirements of a courtier's wardrobe it has been possible to show that the contents of Leicester's wardrobe were not disproportionate when compared to those of other nobles for whom evidence survives. Leicester clearly understood the importance of dressing for one's position, evidenced not only in his accounts but in portraiture too. These portraits also demonstrated his ancestral lineage, something that also figured in elements of his wardrobe. Leicester's wardrobe expenditure has been criticised by many as high. These commentators have failed to consider the extenuating circumstances that existed for Leicester in his meteoric rise at court from an attainted and condemned man to Master of the Horse, a leading Privy Councillor, patron, and the Queen's chief favourite. Through this examination it has also been possible to establish that Leicester's expenditure on his wardrobe was considerable although within the elevated social sphere in which he moved it was not extraordinary. Comparable sums were spent by contemporaries on elements of dress such as silk stockings and goldsmiths' work. Derby's expenditure on his wardrobe was almost certainly considerably higher than Leicester's. However further breakdown of the figures for Derby's spending will be required to firmly establish this.

Was this expenditure warranted? Certainly for Leicester if he was to maintain his position at court, and present himself as a possible consort his dress needed to be up to the task. At the court of Queen Elizabeth where the splendour of display, and the magnificence of the court was conveyed to all who visited it was necessary to wear

---

165 The questions are: How is Leicester perceived now and in his lifetime and was it justified? What did he spend on his clothes? Was this expenditure warranted?

suitable apparel. Investment in one's wardrobe confirmed one's position to all who viewed it. It appears, then, that the expenditure was indeed warranted, and expected by those who formed Leicester's peer group. These findings are very much in-line with Kuchta's thesis presented at the beginning of Part One: Consumption. At the court of Queen Elizabeth consumption befitting one's position and nobility was entirely expected.

## **Part Two: Production**

Part Two of this dissertation includes the bulk of the remaining chapters. Leicester as the consumer was the trigger for the production of the vast majority of the elements of dress in his wardrobe. While it appears that a small proportion of goods may not have been constructed specifically for Leicester, such as gloves and stockings, the majority overwhelmingly were. The following chapters primarily explore Leicester's domestic network involved in the production and supply of items of dress. That production tied into, and impacted upon, a broad cross-section of citizens, non-citizens, and aliens living in and around the City of London. It demonstrated the many links between the court and the City in terms of the patronage of master craftspeople. Such patronage enabled the perpetuation of skills and knowledge through the master engaging journeymen and apprentices. Furthermore, production of Leicester's wardrobe demonstrates the transfer of skills from Europe to England. Additionally, for key members of the production and supply network, the impact of Leicester's patronage on their standing within their various communities can be clearly detected. The production of Leicester's wardrobe, then, highlighted the interconnected nature of the many people who participated in that process, and their dependence both on each other and on their patron.



### **Chapter Three: A collaboration of supply: Leicester's wardrobe networks within England.**

The previous chapter outlined the importance of dressing for one's position in the court. For Leicester his dress exhibited his status and his aspirations. Those involved in the production of Leicester's wardrobe also had to have a clear understanding of what was appropriate attire for Leicester. Indeed, his network was expected to source and provide suitable materials to produce his clothing. Within the network requisite skills were necessary to construct and embellish the garments. Such a network also had to adapt to the demands of their client, or clients, whilst being flexible enough to deal with issues of supply and demand. Death and disease within their workforce, piracy, and possible intermittent cash flow could affect any one of them, and in turn impact on the network itself. Whatever its component parts each member of the network had to produce and supply the goods or risk failure. This resulted in a reliance on other members of the network to produce the required products so that the next link in the chain could execute their part in the sequence.

As Ian Archer has pointed out, the relationship between the courtier and his suppliers was also one 'of mutual dependency'.<sup>1</sup> For Leicester his suppliers provided more than the goods and services; they also financed his wardrobe, and other activities, particularly in the early years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It was not only the most wealthy of his suppliers that provided this service but his artificers who billed annually, thus enabling Leicester to live and dress on their credit. This reliance on his suppliers financially and for their knowledge of his dress requirements engendered loyalty by both Leicester and his supply network.<sup>2</sup> Yet the records would suggest that Leicester was open to new participants in his network. Numerous people appear fleetingly in accounts, notably 'strangers' who were perhaps supplying the more exotic goods in comparison to his regular suppliers. However it is clear that Leicester relied heavily on his London-based supply network to create and maintain the image that his dress conveyed to all those who observed him.

The present chapter will explore Leicester's extensive network of suppliers to his wardrobe based within England. While this network reached beyond the shores of the kingdom to source materials suitable to dress Leicester, its powerhouse was centred in London. This chapter seeks to identify the participants in the network and broaden the understanding of the contribution each individual made. It will explore the relationships between the various members of the network along with their trading practises. How the network proved beneficial to all parties through rewards and

---

1 Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption', p. 54.

2 Ibid., p. 50. Archer discusses customer loyalty amongst the aristocracy and the gentry, using Leicester's patronage of two tailors, a haberdasher and a capper as one of his examples.



privileges will be discussed. In addition any links between Leicester's suppliers with other members of the court will be explored.

The questions formulated to investigate these issues are; Who was involved in the network of supply to Leicester's wardrobe? How was Leicester's wardrobe supply network established? What was their relationship to other members of the network? How exclusive was Leicester's wardrobe supply network?

An indication of those people involved in the supply network to Leicester's wardrobe can be found in surviving household accounts.<sup>3</sup> Further names can be added through the examination of surviving bills and warrants, along with a fabric disbursement book.<sup>4</sup> The list of names compiled from the accounts, bills and warrants does not do full justice to the intricacy and interdependence of the supply network (see Appendix 3.1). The list of names could be expanded to include those who gave Leicester garments, fabric, and accessories as gifts. However the evidence for these names does not, as a rule, reflect the actual supplier or artificer who created or sourced the product, therefore these names have not generally been included.<sup>5</sup> There are also difficulties in determining if a named payee was receiving money for goods and services or for the repayment of a loan.<sup>6</sup> This is particularly evident for financiers who were included in the textile and dress supply network. However it could be argued that those people financing Leicester were also providing the means for him to pay for his wardrobe. Where their names have been included in the list their contributions have been clearly identified as financial loans until further evidence can be found that will change this status. For the purposes of this discussion only those who can be definitively identified as a supplier of an item of dress will be discussed.

---

3 Adams, *Household Accounts*. This is, of course, not a definitive list by any means, it is constrained by the available evidence which suffers from the presumed loss of material associated with wardrobe management, household bookkeeping and correspondence, not to mention the ephemeral personal communication that took place at face to face meetings.

4 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V and LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. XII.

5 Where it is clear who the supplier of the product was, their name has been added to the list and identified with the giver of the gift in the discussion within the chapter. See for example, CKS, U1475 A4/6, f. 5v., for Sidney sourcing a New Year's gift for Leicester from Peter Vanlore, jeweller. See also, BL, Add. MS 78172 Vol.V, f. 1, for New Year's gifts given to Leicester where no source is given other than the giver. For example Lady Gray gave Leicester a '*faire wrought shart w' black silk & gold*', Lady Cecil gave Leicester '*A black shert faire wrought*', and Lord Henry Howard gave Leicester '*A paire of swete gloves*'.

6 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 118, 119, 47, 50, 115, 121. For example Mercers William Leonard, Thomas Nicholson, and Thomas Ryvet all loaned money to Leicester. There is no evidence for them supplying textile materials – however due to the patchy nature of the surviving evidence this does not mean they were not also suppliers of goods. The same is true for Haberdasher Thomas Aldersey, Goldsmith Robert Brandon, and Skinner Philippe Gunter.

### **Those involved in the network of supply to Leicester's wardrobe.**

The list of names includes a wide cross-section of specialists, from the wealthy fabric suppliers who dealt largely in high quality fabrics, to the less affluent artificers whose mastery of their craft had earned them a place in the wardrobe network. Yet it appears that Leicester also engaged some suppliers early on in their careers.<sup>7</sup> The list of suppliers' names, shown in Appendix 3.1, have been ascribed a specialism by their description in the accounts, or where the profession is not stated by product supplied. Where membership has been confirmed, a Livery Company affiliation has been included. However Company membership can be misleading for a number of the suppliers were occupied in supplying goods outside the traditional remit of their Company, or do not appear in the Company records examined.<sup>8</sup> For example Richard Pecock was a leading member of the Leathersellers' Company of London.<sup>9</sup> Yet he is not found supplying Leicester's wardrobe with the sort of goods expected to be furnished by a member of that Company.<sup>10</sup> Pecock was supplying Leicester's wardrobe with quality silk fabrics, such as silk satin, taffeta and velvet (see Appendix 3.2).<sup>11</sup> Many of the fabrics listed in the transcription were lining materials and therefore not the most expensive of fabrics, but they were of a reasonable quality none the less. Numerous surviving warrants show Pecock delivered varying quantities and qualities of silks

---

7 William Whittell was made free of the Merchant Taylors' Company in 1554 and was working for Leicester by 1558 see, Chapter Five. Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 106. Roger Tempest was called 'your lordship's hossier' in the 1558-9 household account, and was made free of the Drapers' Company in October 1555 see, DC, WA 4 1547 to 1562, bound together, folios numbered from 1 at each new account, The account of Henry Rychards, Henry Le, John Quarles and Arthur DedyCott wardens, f. 1 and P Boyd, *Roll of The Drapers' Company of London, Collected from the Company's Records and Other Sources*, The Worshipful Company of Drapers, London, 1934, p. 180. William Tempest, Roger's brother, was made free of the Drapers' Company in 1557 and was working for Leicester's household by 1561.

8 London Livery Company records were consulted in order to determine membership of those listed in Leicester's supply network. The specific records are outlined in the References and Bibliography and included: The Goldsmiths' Company, The Mercers' Company, The Drapers' Company, The Haberdashers' Company, The Leathersellers' Company, The Armourers and Brasiers' Company, The Grocers' Company, The Skinners' Company, The Cordwainers' Company.

9 Leathersellers' Company Archives, Liber Curtes ACC 1/1, ff. 139, 190, 226. Richard Pecock served as Fourth Warden for the Company in 1563-1564, as Second Warden 1567-1568, and as Master of the Company 1571-1572; Lang, *Two Tudor Subsidy Assessment Rolls*, p. 161. Richard Peacocke was recorded as living in the parish of St Peters & St Mary Magdalen Milk Street in the 1582 subsidy roll for London.

10 See LA Clarkson, 'The Organization of the English Leather Industry in the Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *The Economic History Review*, vol.13, no.2, 1960, pp. 245-256, p. 252. Clarkson defines members of the Leathersellers' Company as having at one time been 'working craftsmen themselves, 'Michanicks Glouers, Purses, and Longcutters'', but by the end of the sixteenth century they were 'controlling most of the supplies of raw skins and also supplying working glovers with leather'.

11 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 262-262v.

directly to Leicester's artificers.<sup>12</sup> This was an important link in the supply network that establishes a direct relationship between the fabric supplier and the artificer. The evidence for Pecock suggests that a greater proportion of fabric was delivered to the artificer than to the household itself. The surviving document that forms Appendix 3.2, was part of the paper trail generated to enable this bypassing of the household and will be discussed along with the wider paper-based evidence demonstrating how the network functioned in Chapter Four.

Pecock was not alone as a silk dealer outside the traditional Company supplying silks: the Mercers. The wardens of the Mercers' Company put together a list of merchants dealing in silks in late 1561 where Pecock's name is listed.<sup>13</sup> This list is of interest as it contains the names of further suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe (see a full list in Appendix 3.3).<sup>14</sup> Both Sutton and Archer suggest this list most likely shows retailers of silk.<sup>15</sup> Indeed Pecock has not yet been identified as an importer of silk.<sup>16</sup> However others on the list such as Thomas Aldersey, listed under the Haberdashers, and Benedict

---

12 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, see for example ff. 317, 324, '*Mr pecoke I prey you dd to maynard j ell qtr of wht sarcenet tafta to lyne a peyre of lether slope hosse and a qtr d of porpull tafta to lyne a peyre of bott hosse and d ell of black tafta sarcenet to mend the lynynge of the panes of hosse thys xiiij of march 1565 yours Antho forster*', and '*Mr Pecok I pray you delyuer to whyttell my lordes taylor on ell of blak taffata to lyne the slevs of my lordes gowne of satten so fare you well thys xxvj of Aprell 1566 your frend Antho forster*'.

13 Sutton, *Mercery*, particularly p. 450 where Sutton discusses the circumstances of this list's creation. See also *The Mercers' Company, Acts of Court 1560-1595*, ff. 23v.-25 for the account of the meeting between the wardens of the Company and the Privy Council. In the account, dated Wednesday 27 December 1561, the wardens identify areas of the City where silk retailers, who are not mercers, sold their wares, specifically '*London Bridge, Cheapsyde, Mylkestrete ende and Woodstrete*'. Richard Pecock was recorded as living in Milk Street see footnote 9 above.

14 TNA, SP 12/20, 63, ff.135-136, '*Marchaunts of Divers Companies tradinge and occuyinge of Silkes*'. Richard Pecock was named as one of eight Leathersellers dealing in silks on f. 135.

15 Sutton, *Mercery*, p.450; Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability*, p. 105.

16 B Dietz, (ed.), *The Port and Trade of Early Elizabethan London Documents*, London Record Society, London, 1972. Pecock is not found in the 1567/8 records of goods imported into London. He is also not found in the 1565 Port Book for London, see TNA, E 190/3/2. He does however appear in G D Ramsay, (ed.), *John Isham. Mercer and Merchant Adventurer*, Northamptonshire Record Society, Gateshead, 1962, pp. 21, 46, 52, 111, 116, 163. John Isham imported silks and dealt with others on the list of Leicester's wardrobe suppliers.

Spinola, listed under Merchant Strangers, were importing silks, and selling them on.<sup>17</sup> Certainly Spinola was selling silks to Leicester, while evidence can presently only be found for Aldersey lending Leicester money.<sup>18</sup> Whether either man had a shop to retail their fabrics or sold to selected customers from a storehouse has yet to be established. It is clear, however, that those named on the Mercers' list were likely to be a combination of importers and retailers. While no other Leathersellers can be identified within the suppliers to Leicester, John Ellyote, identified in the 1561 list as trading in silk, is found in Leicester's accounts standing bond for a loan from Richard Poynter, Draper.<sup>19</sup> Whether these Leathersellers also traded in leather goods, or were exclusively silk traders has not yet been established. None have been identified as suppliers of leather to Leicester's wardrobe. Leicester's use of a non-Mercer to supply his silk fabrics is interesting given that he was made a freeman of the Mercers' Company in 1562.<sup>20</sup> He was also a member of the Privy Council, though he joined after the presentation of the

17 For example see Dietz, *The Port and Trade*, pp. 3, 8, 9, 20, 21, 22, 33, 433, 44, 67, 68, 72, 73, 74, 86, 87, 91, 92, 93, 98, 99, 101, 105, 113, 118, 119, 129, 130. In 1567/8 Thomas Aldersey (1521/2–1598) was importing into London: from Antwerp 250 ells sarcenet, 70 yards satin, 35 yards damask £84.8s.4d.; from Antwerp 325 yards sarcenet, 40 yards velvet valued at £84.3s.4d.; from Antwerp 110 yards satin, 30 yards damask valued at £61.10s.; from Antwerp 60 yards of velvet £45; from Antwerp 40 pieces program £53.13s.4d.; from Antwerp 115 yards damask, 56 yards taffeta, 46 yards velvet £63.13s.4d.; from Antwerp 38 yards velvet £28.10s.; from Antwerp 40 pieces program camlet, 26 yards velvet £72.3s.4d.; from Antwerp 420 ells sarcenet £70; from Antwerp 65 pieces Genoa fustian, 70 ells sarcenet, 40 ells taffeta sarcenet valued at £61.13s.4d.; from unspecified 60 pieces Genoa fustian £40.; from Antwerp 40 pieces single program £53.6s.8d.; from Antwerp 40 single pieces of mockado, 30 yards of satin, 25 yards of damask, 210 ells of sarcenet to a value of £85.3s.4d.; from Antwerp 55 yards Lucca velvet to a value of £41.5s.; from Antwerp 60 pieces of mockado, 145 yards of velvet £148.; from Antwerp 65 pieces of program camlet, 57 yards program silk £105.13s.4d.; from Antwerp 115 yards of satin, 27 yards of damask £96.1s.8d.; from unspecified location 437 ells sarcenet £72.16s.8d. valued at £72.16s.8d.; from Antwerp 240 ells sarcenet £40.; from Antwerp 64 yards of velvet £48; from Antwerp 65 yards of satin, 57 yards of damask, 50 pieces of grograin camlet valued at £110.15s; from Antwerp 80 pieces of mockado valued at £53.6s.8d.; from Antwerp 210 yards sarcenet valued at £35; from Antwerp 45 pieces single program camlet; from Antwerp 40 pieces program camlet valued at £53.6s.8d.; from Antwerp 80 pieces of mockado valued at £53.6s.8d.; from Antwerp 320 ells sarcenet valued at £53.6s.8d.; from Antwerp 90 pieces of mockado £60; from Antwerp 120 yards of velvet £90.; from Antwerp 340 ells of sarcenet valued at £56.13s.4d. For Benedict Spinola's bill see LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 146–150, particularly f. 148 for 6 pieces of satin 'of bridges' charged in Flemish currency and converted to English money costing £11.13s.0d.; f. 148v. for diverse silks for Leicester's use costing £203.6s.8d. although it is not clear in the bill if these fabrics were used for dress items.

18 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 146–150, particularly ff. 148, 148v., for Spinola. See Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 113, 118, for financial dealings with Aldersey.

19 TNA, SP 12/20, 63, ff.135. John Ellyote is named as a Leatherseller trading in silks; Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 120, is the record of John Ellyot and John Whight standing bond for a payment of £200 to Richard Poynter.

20 MC, Acts of Court 1560-1595, ff. 33–33v. Leicester (then Lord Robert Dudley) was made free of the Company on 20 July 1562, along with the earl of Pembroke and the earl of Bedford. The new freemen then said '*that they wolde haue a daie appointed to go ^to^ the gelde haulle nd appointe w[i]t[h] the lorde maior to be free of the cittie of london*'. See also Sutton, *Mercery*, p. 508.

Mercers' list to the Council.<sup>21</sup> Both these positions suggest Leicester was well aware of the Mercers' Company displeasure with traders from other Companies dealing in silk. Yet the evidence indicates that Pecock remained a key supplier of silk fabric to Leicester and his household until at least 1567.<sup>22</sup> The fact that Pecock was given a cloak for his attendance at Leicester's funeral in 1588 demonstrates that their relationship was long-standing and significant.<sup>23</sup> Indeed we may see this as a demonstration of the strength that a personal relationship achieved through the supply network, overcoming any conflicts presented by Livery Company membership and pressure from the City.

While Pecock may not have been supplying leather to Leicester's wardrobe, the consumption of tanned skins in the wardrobe was linked to dress and accessories. This is reflected in the people found supplying leather skins for dress. For example the glover and perfumer Thomas Cook<sup>24</sup> and William Whittell, Merchant Taylor (whose career is discussed in Chapter Five) were both recorded as supplying leather for the production of garments. Thomas Cook may have been expected to supply leather and skins through his occupation and in theory purchased these from a Leatherseller, although there is no evidence for who was supplying Cook.<sup>25</sup> He clearly had access to high quality skins for the gloves he was producing for Leicester. His extant bill lists numerous skins he furnished for Leicester's own use and to give away.<sup>26</sup> Whittell also supplied numerous skins to Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>27</sup> Where Whittell sourced the skins

---

21 Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*. Leicester was not made a member of the Privy Council until October 1562.

22 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 438. The last evidence of Pecock supplying Leicester is dated 26 April 1567. The warrant reads: '*Mr Pecok I pray you delyver unto willim whyttle two yards & a quarter of russett Spanish taffata forto lyne a gyrkine of camose lether ymbrothered and three nales of velvet to furnish the same gurkynye and a quarter of chrymsyn velvet to lyne the collar of my L felt cloke & so fare you well from dureham house this xvjth of Aprell 1567 I pray you delyver unti maynard my L hosier asmuche taffetat as well serve to lyne my L hose yours Antho Forster*'.

23 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 456.

24 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 69–70, 426. Thomas Cook the perfumer and glover has proved difficult to identify. Leicester's accounts locate him in St Martins. The vagary of a description that is simply St Martins – which could be any one of several different parishes within the City, St Martins in the Fields, or St Martins Le Grand – has so far hampered attempts to locate Cook. Cook was clearly tied to Leicester's household and received livery cloth c.1567–8.

25 There is no evidence, as yet, that shows Cook importing Spanish skins or gloves. Cook is not found in the 1565 Port Book for London, TNA, E 190/3/2; nor in Dietz, *The Port and Trade*.

26 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 121–125, especially f. 125, which lists skins supplied.

27 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 134, 138, January 1560, 'Item paid for ij skynnes unto William Whittle taillior xvjs.'; May 1559, 'Item paid unto William Whittle taillior for iiij skynnes for your lordship xxxvijs.'. See also LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 44–85, Whittell's bill, particularly f. 44, '*It a buffe skyne to make your lordships jerkin layd on with goolde lace xxvs.; It the same day for ij white skines to make you a jerkin xvjs.; It th[e] vth of Aprell for iiij Spanish white skynnes to make ij white jenkins thone laced with syluer & thother with goold ixs. the skin*'.

is not known, however his close contact with Pecock would have provided ample opportunity to access the high quality skins required through Pecock's network.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore a note written by the examiners in the margins of Whittell's extant bill queries if the two Spanish skins had already been charged for by either Cook or Best.<sup>29</sup> This suggests that Cook and Best, most likely John Best haberdasher, were regular suppliers of skins to Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>30</sup> Therefore it was clearly understood by the examiners of the accounts that either of these two men could have been supplying Whittell with skins to construct elements of dress. The auditors' comments aside, what this highlights is the role of the artificer in supplying goods, alongside their skills, to manufacture items for the wardrobe. It also demonstrates that classing a supplier simply as an artificer, or a supplier of fabrics, is misleading as the ability to provide both commodities can be seen in the bills that survive from Leicester's craftspeople. This in itself indicates a resourceful and well-connected aspect of Leicester's wardrobe network, reflecting the underlying web of interconnected inhabitants of the City and Liberties.

Artificers can, themselves, cause confusion when attempting to locate them in the City particularly those that might have Company affiliations. William and Roger Tempest were both practising hosiers supplying Leicester and his household with garments chiefly for the lower body.<sup>31</sup> They were also members of the Drapers' Company of London.<sup>32</sup> Yet these two men were artificers who supplied their craftsmanship and additional oddments with very little in the way of the Drapers' traditional fabrics.<sup>33</sup> Other hosiers named on the list of suppliers (Appendix 3.1) can not, however, be identified as members of any Company. It is not possible, for example, to associate Maynard Buckwith, Leicester's main hosier for the years supported by much of the

---

28 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 262, is the receipt for fabrics delivered by Richard Pecock to William Whittell. Pecock surviving warrants illustrate the constant contact of these two suppliers.

29 Ibid., f. 44.

30 GL, HC, Register of Freedom Admissions, MS 15857/1, unfoliated. On 10 July 1555 Edmond Creswell was apprenticed to John Best. See Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 147. Best, haberdasher, occurs once in Leicester's 1559–1561 household accounts supplying a pair of sweet gloves at a cost of £1.4s.0d. None of Best's bills survive amongst the Dudley papers.

31 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 106, 129. Roger Tempest is called 'your lordship's hossier'; LHA, Dudley Papers, Box V, ff. 116–119, William Tempest's bill.

32 DC, Alphabetical Lists of Freemen; See also Boyd, *Roll of The Drapers' Company*, p. 180. Roger Tempest was apprenticed to Thomas Woode and made free in 1555. He in turn enrolled apprentices, Robert Frende in 1558, and was the second master of Thomas Harrison in 1559. William Tempest was made free on 12 May 1557 by Ralf Bynkes. He took on two apprentices in 1558, Robert Sanden and Thomas Rychardson, and in 1559 took on his third apprentice Nicholas Ball. See TNA, PROB 11/44/264, Roger Tempest's Last Will and Testament, proved 5 July 1561; TNA, PROB 11/50/283 William Tempest's Last Will and Testament, proved 8 October 1568.

33 Boyd, *Roll of The Drapers' Company*, Preface. Members of the Company were often traders in woollen cloth and the Company itself 'controlled the trade in woollen cloth'.

surviving evidence, with a Livery Company.<sup>34</sup> It is possible other artificers, such as Leicester's shoemakers, may have been members of the Cordwainers' Company of London. Unfortunately the surviving records for the Company do not cover the period under examination.<sup>35</sup> This limits conclusions that can be drawn on Leicester's shoemakers' careers. However a Thomas Harrys, called a freeman '*old worker*', was paying quarterage fees to the Company in 1596.<sup>36</sup> This is probably Leicester's supplier Thomas Harrys called 'your lordship's shomaker' in 1585.<sup>37</sup> The exact date he began supplying Leicester is unknown, as are his origins prior to appearing in Leicester's accounts. Of the names listed as suppliers 52% can be firmly tied to a Livery Company. This figure, in part, reflects the paucity of membership records for some City Companies. It is also an indication that a number of Leicester's suppliers were trading outside the Livery Company system. Chief amongst those suppliers outside this system were the strangers found as suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>38</sup>

Strangers were found amongst both the merchants and artificers that provided goods and services to Leicester's wardrobe. Where it has been possible to determine the nationality of a supplier these have been recorded in Appendix 3.1. Of Leicester's merchant suppliers 73% were English, 17% strangers and 10% of unknown origin. The artificers show a greater proportion of strangers with 25% of those involved in constructing elements of Leicester's wardrobe recorded as aliens or strangers. This is compared to English artisans at 40%, while the number of those with no identified origin stands at 35%. What is striking to note is that 38.5% with a known ethnicity were not English. Luu has posited that the approximate number of aliens living in the City, Middlesex and Surrey in 1553 was 12.5% of the total population for the same area, dropping to 10% in 1571.<sup>39</sup> Leicester's wardrobe network therefore demonstrates a greater use of strangers than the proportion of strangers indicated in population statistics living in London and its environs. The lack of data on a number of the artificers is clearly a reflection of the level of information available for those who were less financially successful and in many cases worked outside the City Livery Company system.

The number of strangers in Leicester's wardrobe network may reflect Leicester's desire

---

34 There is no evidence for Buckwith being a member of the Merchant Taylors' Company or the Drapers' Company, the two City Livery Companies to which a hosier was most likely to belong.

35 GL, Cordwainers' Company Audit Book, MS 7351 begins in 1596.

36 Ibid., unfoliated, 7 leaves from the front of the volume.

37 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 178, 208, 257. Harrys was recorded as being given a reward of 5s. on 19 April 1584, a reward of 10s. on 1 January 1585 and his bill of £33.19s. was paid in full on 30 May 1585.

38 'Stranger' and 'alien' were both terms used by contemporaries to describe immigrants, see Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, pp. 142–143.

39 Ibid., p. 92, for Table 4.1 that sets out the numbers of aliens in London, 1483–1621.

to embrace the skills and difference that a stranger might contribute to his wardrobe, or simply that they possessed the requisite skills at the time when they were required. Of the aliens who were artificers to Leicester thirteen were described as Dutch, two Spanish, two French, one German, one from Milan, one from Augsburg, and two classed simply as strangers. The high proportion of Dutch is interesting when considering Leicester's later sympathies for the plight of Protestants in the Netherlands and his Governor Generalship in the 1580s.<sup>40</sup> What is also intriguing is that a number of artificers who had intimate access to Leicester for fittings over an extended period were Dutch. In particular this was true of Maynard Buckwith, hosier, who was part of Leicester's household in the early 1560s and remained his hosier at least until the mid-1570s.<sup>41</sup>

Archer has pondered on the relationship between the supplier and their client, highlighting that the 'key point is that the tradesmen had access'.<sup>42</sup> Quantifying that access may provide a further perspective on this relationship. Buckwith clearly had intimate access to Leicester dating from before his first appearance in the 1559-61 household accounts when he was called 'your lordship's hossier'.<sup>43</sup> Their relationship was evidently successful for both parties, as is demonstrated by the length of time Buckwith was in Leicester's employ.<sup>44</sup> Buckwith was charged with producing high quality garments which would have involved not only face to face communication with Leicester to discuss design aspects, but several fittings of a toile (test garment) and further fittings of the garment to Leicester's body.<sup>45</sup> Buckwith's first surviving bill indicates that these fittings would have taken place at court or at Leicester's residence.<sup>46</sup> Indeed the bill shows that Buckwith was lodged in the same general vicinity as Leicester, whether he was at Greenwich or Hampton Court and that he

---

40 Leicester agitated for some time for England to become more involved in the support of those in the Netherlands. He was made Governor General of the Netherlands on 15 January 1586. See, Adams, 'Leicester', *ODNB*; Oosterhoff, *Leicester and the Netherlands*, particularly p. 32.

41 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152-157, 209-214 are Buckwith's bills. See also, Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 427, Buckwith also received livery cloth c.1567-8. Other Dutch artificers who would have had fittings with Leicester to ensure elements of dress were correctly sized included the shoemakers James Crokeham and Rowland Frees, the hosier Joyce Dethryke, and the jerkin maker Francis Dirickson.

42 Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption', p. 54.

43 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 129, 140-141, 160.

44 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, f. 33v. The last evidence for Buckwith supplying Leicester was 1 March 1574.

45 A pattern for the hose to be constructed was most likely to have been made in a low cost fabric to produce a toile to facilitate fitting, before the cutting and constructing of the garment using expensive fabric. For a discussion of the tailor's practise and pattern making see, Arnold, *Patterns of Fashion*, p. 4.

46 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 152-157, particularly f. 152v.



undertook various dress related errands.<sup>47</sup> The bill, which begins on 10 August 1561, indicates that for the remainder of the month Buckwith had the opportunity to deal with Leicester on at least four occasions.<sup>48</sup> By 4 January the following year Buckwith had delivered nine pairs of hose to Leicester, two pairs of boot hose, had changed the lace decoration on a pair of hose, added pockets to another pair, and mended a coat.<sup>49</sup> He had also constructed hose for two of Leicester's footmen and two pairs of hose for William Killigrew.<sup>50</sup> For the three months from March to June 1561 a similar pattern continued. A minimum of six face to face sessions would have occurred, although the number was more likely twelve or greater.<sup>51</sup> Each of the garments constructed for Leicester, and those that were altered, would have placed the two men together for fittings throughout the process. These fittings would have been made more expedient by Buckwith lodging in close proximity to Leicester.<sup>52</sup> The privacy of these fittings and the conversation that passed between the two men can only be speculated, but it is clear Buckwith had privileged, and very intimate, access to Leicester.

Buckwith's second surviving bill demonstrates a shift in his circumstances.<sup>53</sup> He was no longer charging for board and wages. This was clearly the reflection of his new status of denizen as the date of the bill coincided with the granting of his letters patent.<sup>54</sup> Even though he was still associated with Leicester's household, being given livery c.1567–8, it is likely that this denization provided Buckwith with the opportunity to set up his own business.<sup>55</sup> However this change in Buckwith's situation did not diminish his relationship with Leicester. On the contrary over the following ten months Buckwith

---

47 Ibid., f. 152v. The first entries in the bill are for boat hire from Greenwich to London, and Hampton Court to London for errands relating to elements of dress.

48 Ibid.

49 Ibid., ff. 152v.–153v.

50 Ibid., William Killigrew also received livery in 1567.

51 Ibid., ff. 154–154v. The dates mentioned were 9 March and 7 June. Between these two dates Buckwith supplied 1 pair of netherstocks (these are likely to be sewn fabric lower leg coverings as opposed to knitted stockings or hose), 1 pair of black velvet hose, inserting new lining in 9 pairs of hose, 1 pair of yellow velvet hose, 1 pair of russet satin hose, altering the pair of black velvet hose, 1 pair of green leather hose, along with 2 pair of livery hose for members of the household.

52 Ibid., ff. 152v.–155v. Buckwith charged for board and wages for himself by the day. There is no indication of where he lodged.

53 Ibid., ff. 209–214.

54 Ibid., f. 209. The bill commenced on 23 April 1565; JH Collingridge & RB Wernham, (eds), *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Prepared under the superintendence of the Deputy Keeper of the Records, Elizabeth I, Volume III, 1563–1566*, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1960, p. 297. Buckwith received his letters patent of denization on 20 January 1565 at a cost of 13s.4d.

55 There has been some debate by scholars on the benefits of gaining denization see Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, pp. 142–144. The benefits for Buckwith would have been the ability to set up a shop and service a wider clientele, and engage up to four alien journeymen. He was also able to hold land, see his last will and testament TNA, PROB 11/81/189.

made twenty five pairs of hose for Leicester along with twelve pairs of canions.<sup>56</sup> By the 1570's the number of personal interactions had increased to a minimum of thirty seven if only one fitting was involved, but more likely at least twice that number of face to face meetings over a one year period.<sup>57</sup> He was indeed in an enviable position having a continual personal contact with Leicester over many years. The only other person in the supply network to achieve a similar relationship was Leicester's tailor Whittell. Whether Buckwith exploited his close relationship with Leicester has yet to be established. The extent to which the individual artificers' constant contact with Leicester influenced their political and religious viewpoints is difficult to determine. From the beginnings of Elizabeth's reign Leicester was considered a stalwart of the Protestant faith.<sup>58</sup> His religion would have been apparent to those in his wardrobe network. However the impact of Leicester's beliefs in shaping his network of suppliers presents a challenge and would require a much wider survey of each person's ties to public and private religion.<sup>59</sup> Buckwith was recorded as attending the English Church, which would align his faith with Leicester.<sup>60</sup> Evidence for Buckwith being a religious refugee has not been found.<sup>61</sup> He did however leave money to the poor of both his parish and the Dutch church of London in his will.<sup>62</sup> To be able to maintain such an intimate relationship over an extended period of time must have involved some concordance of opinion. Whether this was established prior to the engaging of Buckwith as hosier or was the result of their continued relationship is open to interpretation. The question this raises is the issue of how a recent immigrant might become a hosier to the nobility.

For a stranger, who immigrated to England around 1553, to achieve such a highly prized position as Leicester's hosier may indicate some prior connection, perhaps

---

56 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 209–214.

57 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 1–11v.

58 Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, pp. 151–175; see also Wilson, *Sweet Robin*, particularly pp. 104–5; P Collinson, 'Letters of Thomas Wood, Puritan, 1566–1577', in P Collinson (ed.), *Godly People, Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, Hambledon Press, London, 1983, pp. 45–108.

59 While the examination of the wardrobe network from the perspective of its participants' recorded religion could provide an interesting topic for study, it has not been attempted here.

60 REG Kirk and EF Kirk (eds), *Returns of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London From the Reign of Henry VIII to that of James I, Parts I to IV*, Aberdeen, 1900–1908, *Part II*, p. 375, and *Part III*, p. 415. Both record Buckwith as attending the English church in the years 1568 and 1583.

61 There is no reason given for Buckwith's immigration to England in any of the published returns of aliens.

62 TNA, PROB 11/81/189, Buckwith bequeathed '*vuto the poore people within the parishe of the Strond and Savoye twentie shillinges in money. And to the poore people of the Dutche churche in London ten shillinges*'.

through a third party.<sup>63</sup> Leicester may have been actively recruiting master craftsmen from the Low Countries in the 1550's; he certainly attempted to recruit a tailor from Antwerp in the 1560's.<sup>64</sup> His close relationship with merchants such as Sir Thomas Gresham and Benedict Spinola could have facilitated any such dealings.<sup>65</sup> Buckwith may have arrived in the country as a member of the household of a notable figure as Nicholas Kendall had done. Kendall, a Dutchman and shoemaker, had been attached to the household of Anne of Cleves when she came to England; by 1571 he was a servant in the household of Thomas Russell.<sup>66</sup> The date of Buckwith's immigration coincides with an increase in religious and political refugees arriving in England following the 1550 charter for the establishment of stranger churches.<sup>67</sup> However with the accession of Queen Mary in 1553 these establishments were closed and their congregations encouraged to leave the country. The churches only reopened once Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558. There is no evidence to suggest Buckwith left the country during Mary's reign.<sup>68</sup> Determining the exact date of his arrival in England might help to suggest if he was part of this wave of religious or political refugees. However the information in the returns of strangers, which suggests the year 1553, but not exactly when in that year, is currently the only such information available.<sup>69</sup>

---

63 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 375. The 1583 return recorded Buckwith as having been in England 30 years, and denizen for 18 years, this would suggest Buckwith arrived in England in circa 1553.

64 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 148v. Benedict Spinola charged fees for Mr Pole the Flemish tailor travelling to England to serve Leicester, but he did not stay.

65 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 41, 65, suggests that Leicester's close relationship with Gresham dated to the reign of Edward VI. The 1558-9 entry for Spinola in the household accounts would suggest they had an established relationship before this time. Spinola's network in Antwerp included his three brothers Francisco, Pasquale and Giacomo. Pasquale features prominently in Benedict Spinola's surviving bill, LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 146-150; see also Bennell, 'Spinola', *ODNB*.

66 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 112. Nicholas Kendall was located in the parish of St Saviours, Southwark, his age was recorded as forty three years. Anne of Cleves arrived, with her household in late December 1539. If his age is recorded accurately Kendall emigrated as a small child with his parents attached to the household of Anne of Cleves. It is unclear if he was still a practising shoemaker in Thomas Russell's household. Thomas Russell is recorded as an Englishman. It is likely that he was Thomas Russell (1529-1593), citizen and draper who bequeathed £50 for the building of a school in Barton-under-Needwood, Staffordshire, see G Carey, *Thomas Russell, Draper (1529-1593)*, 2000, online accessed 23 November 2012 <<http://www.agecarey.com/Russell/Index.asp>>; For Anne of Cleves see, RM Warnicke, 'Anne [Anne of Cleves] (1515-1557)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, online accessed 2 April 2013, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/558>>.

67 Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, p. 88. See also, JE Olson, 'Nicolas des Gallars and the Genevan connection of the stranger churches', in R Vigne & C Littleton (eds), *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750*, Sussex Academic Press, Brighton, 2002, pp. 38-47, see particularly pp. 38-39.

68 A Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986, p. 120. Pettegree posits that there was not a 'general exodus' of strangers from the City.

69 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 375.

Buckwith may have found his way into Leicester's wardrobe network by some association with Roger Tempest, Leicester's hosier before 1558, perhaps working as a journeyman. Tempest was recorded as Leicester's hosier before Buckwith appears in the household accounts, and following his death it may have been a fairly straight-forward decision to use someone Leicester already had an association with through Tempest.<sup>70</sup> The fact that Roger Tempest's brother William is also found in Leicester's wardrobe network after Roger's death lends some validity to this argument.<sup>71</sup> However without further information on Roger's workshop and employees this line of enquiry is stalled.<sup>72</sup> The hosier Hance may also provide a means through which Buckwith was introduced to Leicester's wardrobe network. Having been referred to as 'your lordship's hossier' in the early accounts Hance was also paid for board, wages and bedding which suggests he worked as part of the household.<sup>73</sup> This is a role that Buckwith filled. He appears to have succeeded, both Hance and Roger Tempest, in becoming Leicester's personal hosier. It is clear that Buckwith could have only attained the position if Leicester had personal knowledge of his ability, or a trusted acquaintance had recommended him. The evidence for how he actually achieved this position remains elusive as does the impact of his ethnicity on Leicester.<sup>74</sup> It does however suggest that Leicester invested his patronage upon master craftspeople, including many strangers, who suited his purposes and to whom he remained a loyal patron over extended periods.

What is perhaps more evident is the impact the stranger artificers had on the styling of Leicester's dress. The stranger artificers brought their skill and design knowledge with them when they emigrated from their countries of origin. However there is some difficulty in defining exactly which elements were influenced by the strangers' difference. While Spanish men's fashion was still pervasive in the court in the early part of Elizabeth's reign, the written evidence for Leicester's wardrobe records a degree

---

70 TNA PROB 11/44/264. Roger Tempest's last will and testament was written on 16 November 1560 and was proved on 5 July 1561.

71 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 116–119 is William Tempest's bill for 1561–1564.

72 DC, Records of Freeman, unfoliated arranged alphabetically by surname, then date of apprenticeship/freedom. Roger Tempest is recorded as presenting his apprentice Robert Frende in 1558; there is no further information on Tempest's wider workforce.

73 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 91, 107, 129, are the references to Hance or Hanse. Hanse was paid for the construction of, and associated materials for, a pair of crimson velvet hose £3.0s.0d., he delivered a pair of hose Coke had embroidered £0.19s.0d., his bill for board and wages was £5.19s.10d..

74 Buckwith's career is discussed further in Chapter Six.

of overseas influenced styling.<sup>75</sup> From the written evidence which is available it would appear that Dutch styling became more prevalent within Leicester's wardrobe from the mid-1560's; although Spanish styling was still evident. Re-use of garments and fabrics might see a particular garment remain in Leicester's wardrobe for a number of years. How it was described in written documentation was influenced by the scribe's knowledge. Visual sources too, are open to interpretation, and do not necessarily reveal to current researchers what Leicester's contemporaries might identify as foreign styling.<sup>76</sup> What is discernible is that there is no great shift in style visible across these images of Leicester. His dress exhibits a slow evolution of fashionable court dress, very much in line with his contemporaries. This raises the question - what was the makeup of the wardrobe supply networks of these contemporaries? And did they show the same proportion of stranger engagement or was Leicester's network unusual by comparison? These aspects deserve further examination.

---

75 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 89, 90, 91, 140, 175, Leicester paid for a Spanish ribbon to hang his George upon, a Spanish chain, and a pair of Spanish gloves, gold buttons in the Spanish fashion, three pair of Spanish hose, two pair of Gernsey hose, a pair of Spanish gloves, a pair of Spanish boots; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 19v., 20, 27, 40v., 41, 66v., 67, 73v., 76, 76v., 78v, 81, 81v., 122, 123, 142, 142v., 148v., 196, 327, 383, 411, 443 demonstrate overseas goods and/or styles. John Guy supplied a Spanish plume of black feathers on 2 December 1562, and two Milan caps, one on 23 February, the second on 2 March 1562(3). Wylkinson supplied buttons with '*stalkes and lowpes of russet silke and silluer wrought after the Spaynesh fasshion*' on 22 November 1558. John Lonyson charged for 'colorising' and mending a chain of Spanish work on 20 January 1560(1), and for taking apart a Spanish chain and reassembling it on 26 February 1560(1). Whittell's bill recorded the construction of a wide range of outer garments for the upper body. Those which reference foreign styling include a Spanish cape on 27 September 1563, a Spanish cape on 15 November 1563, a Dutch cloak on 24 April 1564, a Spanish cloak on 5 October 1564, a Dutch gown on 14 October 1564, a further Dutch gown of 27 December, a cloak with a Spanish cape, a Dutch cloak on 13 May 1565, replacement of the lining and borders of a Dutch cloak on 30 August 1565, and a cloak with a Spanish cape on 15 October 1565. Thomas Cook supplied numerous Spanish gloves in 1562/3, although it is unclear if this described the leather or styling of the glove or both. Francis Barker supplied a shirt with Flanders cuffs on 15 July 1562, 2 shirts with Flanders cuffs on 12 September and altering six bands with Spanish work on 15 November, along with the maintenance of eighteen shirts of cut work and Flanders pearls on 27 March 1563. Benedict Spinola charged for two shirts bought in Flanders on 26 October 1564. Richard Hynton supplied a Milan cap on 8 March 1564(5). Alice Mountague supplied three dozen Milan buttons of gold and purple silk and three dozen Scottish buttons for Leicester's jerkin on 30 May 1566, silver Scottish buttons on 24 September 1566, along with the lace and buttons for a Dutch cloak for Leicester's page, Andrew, on 28 April 1567. Mr Pecock supplied black velvet to guard a Spanish cloak on 16 January 1566(7); LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 5, 15v., 26v., 28v., 29, records garments constructed and altered including the lining of a Dutch cloak on 26 June 1571, lining the front of a Dutch gown on 9 June 1572, attaching borders to the inside of a Dutch cloak on 12 July 1573, attaching borders inside a Dutch cloak on 30 September 1573, and lining a Dutch cloak 3 October 1573; BL, Add 78177, f.32v., records a Dutch cloak in a 1582 household inventory; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII, f. 15v., f.16v., records buttons of Spanish work, and a high Dutch hat; BL, Harley Roll D.35.I-XI 1062D, ff. 15-16, itemises eleven Dutch cloaks.

76 Roze Hentschell, 'Treasonous Textiles: Foreign Cloth and the Construction of Englishness', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol.32, no.3, 2002, pp. 543-570. Hentschell examines contemporary literary references to foreign fashion in her examination of Englishness in dress.

Unfortunately establishing the names of wardrobe suppliers for Leicester's contemporaries at court presents a challenge. Few personal papers that would supply the data are known to exist for men like Sir Christopher Hatton and Sir Walter Raleigh. However occasional references to the client and the artificer can be found in supporting material. Indeed the 1582–3 survey of strangers in the City show that Sir Christopher Hatton engaged a stranger hosier, John Baker, in his household.<sup>77</sup> While this confirms Hatton's use of a stranger in his wardrobe production it fails to provide quantitative information that might support further analysis. Documents relating to the wardrobe networks of Walter and Robert Devereux, earls of Essex, are sparse, but those that survive provide a useful series of names of suppliers for limited periods.<sup>78</sup> While clearly not a comprehensive list, the repetition of suppliers' names in both Walter Devereux and his eldest son Robert's wardrobe network show a continuity of supply following the first earl's death. None of those named in the Devereux papers can immediately be identified as strangers. The only supplier who appears in both the Devereux and Dudley papers is William Denham, goldsmith. It is also noteworthy that no suppliers to the Great Wardrobe appear in the Devereux papers. This may have changed when Robert Devereux, earl of Essex became Master of the Horse which would have brought him into closer contact with the Great Wardrobe.<sup>79</sup>

The calendar of the Seymour papers would also suggest a lack of strangers in Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford's wardrobe network, apart from the appearance of Peter

---

77 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 267. The entry under the heading of the 'Warde of Creplegate' reads 'John Baker, servaunte to the right honorable Sir Cyr'ofer [sic] Hatton, knight, &c., and vseth the trade of a hosier, of the Englishe Church'.

78 See, for example, Walter Devereux, earl of Essex's extant papers that include Bod. Ms Douce 171, ff. 7, 9v., 10. The accounts of Essex following his death (in 1576) named a number of suppliers to whom debts were owed: Thomas Skynner for silk £14.13s.0d., Vincent Norrington for lace £3.10s.2d., Noxton milliner £3.7s.0d., haberdasher £1.5s.0d., Taylor £4.16s.9d., shirts £9.8s.0d., Mr Burbage, skinner £17, Peter Noxton, milliner, and supplier of silk knitted hose £10, Mistress Croxton supplier of shirts and handkerchieves £9.6s.8d, John Cox, saddler, for saddles £3.12s.6d., William Denham, goldsmith £68, Thomas Cosgrave, merchant £245.14s.0d.; LHA, Devereux Papers, DE Vol.III, ff. 14–24 is an unnamed tailors bill for 1558–1560; LHA, Devereux Papers, DE Vol.V, ff. 9, 9v., 10, 23, 23v., also named wardrobe suppliers due payments on Essex's death including Thomas Brabache skinner, Simon Croxton, John Cox saddler, Peter Noxton milliner, William Denham goldsmith, Vincent Norrington silkman, Mistress Croxton; LHA, Devereux Papers, DE Vol.V, ff. 34, 43, 48, 53v., 54, 54v., 55, 67, named suppliers to Robert Devereux, earl of Essex's wardrobe from 1576–1584 including Thomas Skynner mercer, Vincent Norrington silkman, Peter Noxton milliner, Mr Tennt haberdasher, Mr King tailor, Mistress Croxton shepster, Burbach skinner, William Denham goldsmith, Mr Ashby embroiderer, Edward Rider milliner, Mr Anthony Bigotes shepster, Cox saddler.

79 PEJ Hammer, 'Devereux, Robert, second earl of Essex' (1565–1601), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 2 March 2010, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7565>>. Robert Devereux became Master of the Horse on 18 June 1587 when Leicester was made Lord Steward.

Vanlore's name.<sup>80</sup> However given the paucity of data for Hertford few conclusions can be drawn regarding the engaging of strangers in his wardrobe network. Snippets of information are extant for other members of the nobility. The fragment of data for the wardrobe suppliers to Lady Elizabeth St Loe, later the Countess of Shrewsbury, similarly shows little use of strangers.<sup>81</sup> Surviving wardrobe papers of the duchess of Suffolk and her household for 1560-62 provide very little information on suppliers.<sup>82</sup> The accounts largely name the members of the household as they were reimbursed for purchases rather than the supplier, although the occasional supplier does appear.<sup>83</sup> Of those named two strangers can be identified, Katherine Bowlyne and Hobbert Johnson.<sup>84</sup> The figures named in the Devereux, Hertford and Lady St Loe wardrobe supply networks demonstrate a degree of interconnectedness towards the supplying of the court. William Denham and Vincent Norrington supplied the Devereuxs and Hertford with their specialised products. William Chelsham, Nicholas Hilliard, William Denham and Peter Van Lore provided their goods and services to Hertford and Leicester. Mrs Holborn, Mrs Smyth and Mr Gilbert were supplying Leicester and Lady St Loe. The Suffolk papers also demonstrate the use of London and provincial suppliers to the wardrobe of the duchess's household. The duchess also dipped into the pool of court suppliers using the services of Adam Bland. While there was clearly a shared group of suppliers to court wardrobes, the ability to demonstrate the use of stranger artificers within this group is hampered by insufficient evidence.

It might be expected that Leicester participated in closer connections to the wardrobe networks of his immediate family, which would reflect the use of strangers within

---

80 M Blatcher (ed.), *Report on the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable The Marquess of Bath Preserved at Longleat, Volume IV, Seymour Papers 1532-1686*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1968. See particularly pp. 202-205 where the following suppliers were named: Peter Vanlore goldsmith, William Chelsham merchant, Vincent Norrington silkman, Denham goldsmith, Hilliard goldsmith, Bates silkman, Pryn goldsmith, Stockdale silkman. Peter Vanlore supplied goldsmith wares to the court, see, Larminie, 'Vanlore', *ODNB*.

81 FSL, Cavendish-Talbot Manuscripts, 1333-1705, call number X.d. 428 (133). This account of payments made for household expenses includes a quantity of wardrobe expenses for September 1559. The suppliers named were: Mestres Holbourne (black silk netherstocks for Sir William St Loe), Rychard Dobson (for velvet), Master Gylbrte goldsmith, Heron tailor, Mestres Smyth silkwoman. For Elizabeth St Loe, later Talbot (nee Hardwick) see, E Goldring, 'Talbot, Elizabeth [Bess of Harwick], countess of Shrewsbury' (1527?-1608), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, online accessed 24 November 2012 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26925>>.

82 LA, Ancaster Papers, ANC/7/A/2, ff. 9-20.

83 *Ibid.*, ff. 13-20. The suppliers named were: Clement Newce mercer, Katherine Bowlyne silkwoman, Hobbert Johnson shoemaker of thantlope in Saint Martins, Mr Bland skinner, John Comper tailor, Mistress Rugge shepster, Gallier shoemaker of Stamford, Browne capper, Mistress Hall shepster/linen draper, William Wheatley hosier of Stamford.

84 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part I*, p. 355. In 1567 Katherine Bowlyne, widow, was listed as Dutch, a denizen and living in the Creplegate Warde having been in England 53 years. *Ibid.*, *Part III*, p. 434. In 1568 Hubbert Johnson was listed as Dutch, a denizen and living in 'St Martyns Le Graunde' with his wife (unnamed).

that workforce.<sup>85</sup> The wardrobe network of Ambrose Dudley, earl of Warwick is unknown.<sup>86</sup> Adams has suggested that Leicester and Warwick shared ‘the same pool of officers, lawyers and ‘men of business’ throughout the first three decades of Elizabeth’s reign’.<sup>87</sup> This use of the same figures outside the household may have extended to the use of a similar wardrobe network, including the use of strangers within that workforce. Warwick did indeed share Leicester’s shepster, Katherine Storer, on at least one occasion.<sup>88</sup> He also shared Leicester’s shoemaker James Crokeham.<sup>89</sup> However without further evidence that might support any firm conclusions, Warwick’s full scale use of Leicester’s wardrobe network, or otherwise, remains an untested theory.

The surviving Sidney papers offer some insight into aspects of the wardrobe supply network of Leicester’s sister Mary and brother-in-law Sir Henry Sidney.<sup>90</sup> However these papers cover a limited period and are not comprehensive, with the name of the supplier not necessarily identified when a payment was made. This is demonstrated in the 1560–61 declaration of disbursements which itemises eight payments to wardrobe suppliers. Of those only two suppliers were named, Osborn the hosier and Arnold the shoemaker.<sup>91</sup> The papers do however offer names that widen the pool of suppliers

---

85 Leicester’s immediate family post 1558 were his brother Ambrose and sisters Mary Sidney and Katherine Hastings, Lady Amy Dudley (Leicester’s wife from 1550 until her death in 1560), and Lettice, Countess of Leicester (Leicester’s wife from 1578 until his death in 1588).

86 Few personal papers for Ambrose, earl of Warwick are known to exist, see S Adams, ‘Dudley, Ambrose, earl of Warwick’ (c.1530–1590), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 25 February 2012 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8143>>. Also Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, pp. 151–175.

87 *Ibid.*, p. 153.

88 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 166. Mrs Storer charged for two shirts for Leicester. Warwick clearly admired the shirts as he also had some made in the same style by Mrs Storer.

89 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 122. The entry records a payment to Crokeham for £62.7s.0d. that included £12.7s.0d for ‘my Lord Ambrose’.

90 CKS, U1475.

91 CKS, U1475 A5/1. Arnold may be Barry Arnold, Dutchman or Henry Arnold from Germany, denizen. See, Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part III*, p. 337 for Barry Arnold. Henry Arnold appears in, *Ibid.*, *Part I*, p. 407 and *Ibid.*, *Part II*, p. 334.



to the court and demonstrate a familial link between wardrobe networks.<sup>92</sup> They also demonstrate that Sidney used strangers in his wardrobe network, but to a lesser extent than Leicester.<sup>93</sup> However it must be emphasised that this is incomplete data from which only limited conclusions can be drawn. Nevertheless it is also interesting to note that Sidney had strangers within his household.<sup>94</sup> Further familial similarities might be found in the Huntingdon papers which may show wardrobe suppliers to Henry Hastings, earl of Huntingdon and his wife Katherine and their household. Unfortunately these are not known to have survived.<sup>95</sup> This distinct lack of evidence prevents the drawing of any firm conclusion as to whether Leicester engaged more strangers in his wardrobe network than his contemporaries, including his family. It is clear, however, that those strangers named in the accounts were merely indicators of a much wider involvement of aliens within the network.

In addition to those strangers who were the master craftsmen named in Leicester's wardrobe network were those alien journeymen who worked within a number of the English suppliers' businesses.<sup>96</sup> Where evidence can be found for the engaging

---

92 CKS, U1475 A5/1 gives two names of wardrobe suppliers for 1560–1, Osborn the hosier and Arnold the shoemaker. *Ibid.*, A5/4, ff. 3–3v. names some wardrobe suppliers for 1565–6 including goldsmiths Lonyson, Gilbert, Sanshawe the Frenchman, Bodlow, those who contributed to the apparel are listed with limited information as follows Rowe, Mr Holborne, Benedict Spinola, Mr Roberts, Massye Byside, Kympton draper, Mistress Barker shepster, Richard Aylworth capper, Edney tailor, Robert Wright, Pavye, Mr Chelsham mercer, embroiderers Mr More and Andey, Mr Osborne hosier, Mr Cooke milliner, the skinnners Mr Blanne, Ledsham & Richard Bromeley, Robert Davye. *Ibid.*, A4/1, ff. 1v., 6v., 7, 7v., 14, 14v., 24, give some names of wardrobe suppliers with dates from 1565–69, these names include William Chelsham mercer, Robert Davie tailor, James Foster tailor, Mistress Tempest hosier, William Roodmaye hosier, Adam Bland skinner, John Holte skinner, Richard Alesworther capper, Dirick Vancliff jerkinmaker, Matthew Bisud silkman, Cooke haberdasher, Mistress Holborne haberdasher, John Craken shoemaker, William Rasyn cutler, Edward Moore embroiderer, William Kympton draper, George Blondworth shepster. *Ibid.*, A4/2, ff. 4, 5v., gives the names William Frauchane silkmonger, Richard Ellesworth capper, Richards Rodney hosier, Robert Pavie tailor, Mistress Pavie shepster, Richard Barnes draper, James Foster tailor. *Ibid.*, A4/6, ff. 4, 5v., records the names of wardrobe suppliers for 1578–9 including, Mr Thrupton mercer, William Rowe mercer, Adam Bland skinner, Thomas Cope skinner, Rychard Aylesworth hatter, Thomas Cooke myllenor, Thomas Thorne haberdasher, Davie tailor, Veale tailor, Peter Ven Lore goldsmith. See also, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place, Volume 1*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1925, p. 247, 270, which records William Ormiston mercer in the surviving 1572–3 account, along with Morrrys and Anthony Blount (mercers) in 1577, and Richard Udale (tailor) in 1577 and 1578.

93 Sanshawe the Frenchman, Dutchmen Dirick Vancliff jerkinmaker, and Peter Van Lore.

94 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 51. In 1571 Cosmus Stroche, a Florentine was recorded as a gentleman born and 'doth belonge' to Sir Henry Sidney.

95 Personal communication (email) with Mary L. Robertson, William A. Moffett Curator of Medieval & British Historical Manuscripts, The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, 28 April 2011.

96 See Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, p. 132. Interestingly in Table 4.10 Luu does not show any alien servants with Englishmen for the 1571 or 1593 returns of aliens, however there are numerous listed in the 1571 return including William Whittell's two Dutch servants.

of strangers these have been entered into Appendix 3.1. Both English and stranger suppliers used aliens in their households or business. Goldsmiths were prominent amongst those who used stranger labour.<sup>97</sup> However other wardrobe suppliers, including Leicester's English tailor William Whittell and the English merchant Sir Thomas Gresham, used strangers in their workshop/business.<sup>98</sup> Further exploration of the use of stranger labour is hampered somewhat by insufficient evidence. Those identified as engaging alien labour in the returns such as those published by Kirk and Kirk and Scouloudi are clearly limited.<sup>99</sup> These returns are not a general catch-all of strangers working in English masters' workshops due to their intermittent use by officials and their varying geographical coverage. The Goldsmiths' Company records exhibit the monitoring of the goldsmith activity within the City and the identifying of strangers within their members workforce. Derick Anthony, born in London of a German immigrant father, engaged alien journeymen and English apprentices.<sup>100</sup> These men were identified in the published returns and in the Company records.<sup>101</sup> John Lonyson, a member of the Goldsmiths' Company by redemption was employing Dutch journeymen in 1562.<sup>102</sup> The two strangers Lonyson employed were not identified in any returns of aliens. This highlights the dangers of relying on sources such as the returns for information on the occurrence of strangers in an artificer's or merchant's workshop. It is interesting to consider the possibility that each of the merchants and artificers named in Appendix 3.1 used journeymen

---

97 Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, pp. 219–220. For a discussion on 'wanderjahre travels' as part of a broader experiential training for a crafts person within Europe, see also GC, Court Minutes, Book K.

98 Both are recorded as employing strangers in the published returns. See Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 88 for Whittell. See *Ibid.*, *Part III*, p. 350 for Gresham.

99 *Ibid.*, *Parts I to IV*; I Scouloudi, (ed.), *Returns of Strangers in the Metropolis 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639. A Study of an Active Minority*, Huguenot Society of London, Quarto Series, Volume LVII, London, 1985.

100 GC, Catalogue of Members of the Goldsmiths Company, record cards. Derick Anthony was the son of an immigrant, and was apprenticed to an English master goldsmith Rychard Stake, being made free of the Goldsmiths' Company on 12 October 1543. Anthony kept numerous stranger journeyman in his workforce, the earliest recorded was 1544. His apprentices appear to have been English.

101 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part I*, pp. 163, 179; GC, Catalogue of Members of the Goldsmiths Company, record cards, Derick Anthony.

102 GC, Catalogue of Members of the Goldsmiths' Company, record cards. John Lonyson was admitted to the Goldsmiths' Company by redemption, paying 40s., on 3 July 1551. On 16 November 1562 Lonyson was licenced to keep two Dutchmen, who had been working for him for an unspecified time, until New Year's day, unless they could produce testimonial letters. If the letters were forthcoming they might stay. The men were not named. The New Year's day date for the termination of the licence suggests that the journeymen were required to complete orders for New Year's gifts. See also, Susan M Hare, 'The Man Behind the Portrait', *Goldsmiths' Review*, 1987/1988, Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths, London, pp. 52–53. Hare describes Lonyson (or Lanyson) as 'the son of William van Pontsendall, alias Lonyson, of the Kempen in Brabant province, Spanish Netherlands'. Hare also suggests Lonyson trained in his father's goldsmith workshop in Lynn, Norfolk. A 1565 portrait of Lonyson is located in the Goldsmiths' Company Hall.

within their business. This then expands the number of those involved in Leicester's wardrobe supply network considerably. However for the vast majority there exists little information on business practise and whom they employed, be they English or strangers.

The use of strangers in the network went beyond the bounds of the kingdom, while remaining tied to London. John Lonyson clearly felt the need to supply his client with goldsmith wares that showed the latest Low Countries styling. This is demonstrated not only by his engaging Dutch journeymen but also in his 1565–6 bill that records his sourcing of jewels for Leicester in Flanders.<sup>103</sup> The use of these strangers situated in workshops overseas within the wardrobe network, increases the percentage of aliens involved in dressing Leicester. How far these overseas based workshops can be identified has yet to be tested and deserves further analysis in the future.

The durability of Leicester's wardrobe supply network might be found in the continuity that a long-standing supplier would contribute. For some suppliers, such as Ferdinando Sola, their name only appears once in the extant evidence, which might suggest only a brief encounter with the supplier.<sup>104</sup> However this may be misleading as the lack of evidence for a supplier may also reflect the paucity of surviving papers. Other suppliers had long-standing relationships with Leicester. Thus Benedict Spinola, denizen and Genoese merchant based in London, supplied all manner of goods including materials for Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>105</sup> Spinola was also paying wardrobe suppliers' bills, enabling Leicester to consolidate his debt and keep the artificers

---

103 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 226–226v. The bill records that Lonyson went to Flanders sometime after 2 October 1565 when he had repaired a garter for Leicester. He sent jewels back from Flanders on 3 November and 23 December. On 1 January he appears to have been back in London and charged for numerous jewels which were probably New Year's gifts.

104 Adams, *Household Accounts*. For example see p. 128, Ferdinando Sola, a stranger, supplied a pair of silk hose and pearls to a value of £7.10s.0d. Sola does not occur anywhere else in Leicester's surviving papers. Sola had, however, been resident in the parish of St Clements, in the Liberty of the Duchy of Lancaster, in 1549 and 1550 when he was included in the Middlesex Lay Subsidies Assessment of 25 April 1549 for the first payment of the Relief granted on 4 November 1548, and the 17 April 1550 assessment for the second payment of the Relief grant. See Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part I*, pp. 151, 193. On both occasions Sola, or de Sola, was recorded as having apprentices, two in 1549 (unnamed) and one in 1550, Anthony Depreyce. Sola was assessed to a value of £15, paying 30s. for the 1549 assessment, his apprentices were charged 16d. in total, the same sum they were assessed for. This suggests they too were strangers, paying the poll of 8d. each. The 1550 assessment showed a rise in Sola's assessed value to £20 on which 40s. was paid. Again Sola's apprentice was charged the poll of 8d.

105 Benedict Spinola (1519/20–1580) see Bennell, 'Spinola', *ODNB*.; Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 41, 53, 161, are the entries for Spinola in the Household Accounts; LHA, DU Box V, ff. 146–150v., is Spinola's bill for a variety of activities and goods. Entries that are wardrobe related are, *Ibid.*, ff. 147, 148v., 149v., including three pounds of Venice gold for embroidery in 1564 at a cost of £9.6s., two shirts brought in Flanders and wrought with white work costing £9.5s., two doublet cloths and slops, purchased from a Flemming, costing £6.5s.

solvent.<sup>106</sup> The strength of their relationship is demonstrated in Leicester's letter to Sir Thomas Walsingham of November 1572 in which he described Spinola as '*my deare friend & the best Italian I knowe in England*'.<sup>107</sup> James Crokeham too appears to have been a long-term supplier. Crokeham supplied shoes to Leicester and his household through the early accounts.<sup>108</sup> Crokeham was listed in Lay Subsidy Returns as living in Kings Street, Westminster, where he was identified as a stranger denizen.<sup>109</sup> He appears to have been well located in Westminster to supply other members of the court and reference to him is made in Sir Henry Sidney's papers in the 1560s.<sup>110</sup> Due to a lack of evidence it is not known exactly when Crokeham ceased supplying Leicester's footwear. It appears he was in failing health by 1570 and he died in June 1572.<sup>111</sup> As has been previously demonstrated, Buckwith, Leicester's hosier, was also a long-term supplier and is the subject of discussion in Chapter Six. Whittell, Leicester's tailor, shared similar dates to Buckwith, supplying Leicester from around the time of the coronation. The fact that Buckwith and Whittell remained the main artificers of Leicester's outer garments for an extended period may have contributed to the measured change in Leicester's styling. Ambrose Smith, mercer, appears in Leicester's household accounts from 1558–9, 1559–61 and 1584–6.<sup>112</sup> He also supplied fabric recorded in the early 1570's wardrobe disbursement book.<sup>113</sup> This would suggest that merchants and artificers could remain long-term suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe forming relationships not only with Leicester and his household, but with each other. They also reflect the importance of stability, and good relations between all those involved for

106 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 147. Spinola paid both William Tempest's bill of £12.14s.6d. and William Whittell's bill of £7.14s.6d. on 10 June 1564. The bills were for making garments for nine footmen.

107 BL, Harley MS 260, f. 363, Leicester to Walsingham, 2 November 1572. Quoted in GD Ramsay, 'The Undoing of the Italian Mercantile Colony in Sixteenth Century London', in NB Harte and KG Ponting (eds), *Textile History and Economic History, Essays in Honour of Miss Julia de Lacy Mann*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1973, pp. 22–49, p.43.

108 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 43, 45, 62, 104, 122, 174, 175.

109 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part I*, pp. 68, 105, 111, 125, 148, 189, 192; *Ibid.*, *Part III*, pp. 321, 399. Crokeham was first identified in the 1542 Lay Subsidy Assessment for Westminster in 1542 valued at £2. paying 2s. His servant John Defo was charged the poll at 4d. The 1544 assessment shows the figure of £6, paying 2s. and 1d. for his two servants Cornelys and Gilbert. In 1545 he was assessed again at £6, paying 2s. The 1547 assessment showed a value of £8, paying 5s.4d. Two new servants appeared in the 1549 assessment. Crokeham was valued at £10 paying £1, while Rike Johnson (apprentice) was charged 8d. and Franciscus Tylman (servant) paid 12d. In 1550 the assessment remained the same for all three men.

110 CKS, U1474 A4/1, ff. 7, 24v.; Also *Ibid.*, A5/6.

111 AM Burke (ed.), *Memorials of St Margaret's Church Westminster*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1914, pp. xiii, 424. Crokeham was granted a license to eat flesh during lent in 1570. He was buried on 30 June 1572. Elizabeth Crokeham, James's wife, was buried on 9 March 1589.

112 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 87, 88, 89, 123, 177.

113 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 1–3v., are the records of fabric supplied by Ambrose Smith, the garments that were constructed, the date and the artificer.

maintaining a consistent supply. These aspects were crucial to the smooth functioning of the network and indeed the metropolis in which it existed.

Leicester's patronage of goldsmiths shows he engaged the services of a wide range of craftsmen. Nineteen goldsmiths are named in relation to Leicester's wardrobe and have been included in the list of suppliers in Appendix 3.1.<sup>114</sup> Establishing long-term relationships between Leicester and his goldsmiths is hampered by the intermittent survival of the evidence. Bills are extant for eight of the nineteen goldsmiths.<sup>115</sup> Of those for whom bills survive, Derick Anthony, William Denham and John Lonyson appear in both the early household accounts supplying wardrobe-related goods.<sup>116</sup> Robert Brandon appears in the earliest surviving household accounts and again in the 1584-6 accounts.<sup>117</sup> While Anthony, Denham and Lonyson clearly supplied items for Leicester's wardrobe the evidence for Brandon is less conclusive. Brandon is found supplying financial assistance, plate for New Year's gifts in 1566 and presenting Leicester with fabric for a gown in 1585.<sup>118</sup> It is most likely that Leicester and Brandon's relationship was not grounded in the supply of wardrobe materials, whereas Anthony, Denham and Lonyson supplied items of jewellery alongside items of plate and carried out repairs to both. The evidence would suggest that these three men were the core goldsmiths Leicester used for his wardrobe in the early part of Elizabeth's reign. Indeed this notion is reinforced by Denham's bill which demonstrates he was supplying products for Leicester's dress to other members of the network including William Whittell, Norse the embroiderer, and John Guy the haberdasher.<sup>119</sup> However goldsmiths were certainly not the only suppliers of jewels to Leicester's wardrobe. Merchants too might be found supplying goldsmiths' wares. For example in 1558 Francis Bartie, a merchant originally from Antwerp and denizen of London, was dealing with goldsmiths in Antwerp on Leicester's behalf to supply six dozen gold buttons – three dozen set with stones and three dozen set with pearls to a cost of

---

114 Additional goldsmiths' names are found in Leicester's household accounts, however these people appear to be supplying chiefly tableware or objects such as silverware for furniture and have therefore not been included in this study. See, for example, Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 91, 126-7, 133. Ballett the goldsmith supplied 2 little white cups; Anthony Elspyt supplied silver knobs for a bed; Jacob the goldsmith supplied knobs for a chair; Gregory Pryncell supplied a seal.

115 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 96-96v., 276, 254, 252, 26, 92-95, 207-208, 245, 38-41, 198-199, 226, 12, 224, are the bills for Derick Anthony; Robert Brandon; John Bush; William Denham; Hans Frank; John Lonyson; Peter Richardson; Peter Trader.

116 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 90, 91, 132, 133, 90, 121, 157, 45, 88, 94, 119, 124, 427 are the references to Derick Anthony; William Denham; John Lonyson.

117 *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 50, 224.

118 *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 50, 224; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 252.

119 *Ibid.*, ff. 92, 93, 93v. Denham supplied Whittell with hooks and eyes, 80 silver rose buttons and 72 gold buttons for a cloak; Norse with silver embroidery materials; John Guy with five dozen gold buttons for a cap (Guy charged for attaching the buttons in his bill f. 18).

£23.12s.6d.<sup>120</sup> In addition gifts to Leicester included jewels and supplemented those he sourced himself.<sup>121</sup> While it is clear Leicester relied on a core of suppliers of goldsmith wares for his wardrobe he was open to goldsmith work from a range of sources.

Pinpointing long-term suppliers of headwear is hampered by lack of evidence. Thomas Cook, Christopher Carcano, John Guy, Richard Hynton and Thomas Sheppard all supplied headwear. Cook, Guy and Hynton alone appear to have specialised particularly in the supply of headwear. Cook was recorded as chiefly supplying silk knitted and velvet nightcaps through the 1584-6 household accounts.<sup>122</sup> Hynton does not occur in any of the surviving household accounts, but a bill for the headwear he supplied from November 1564 until December 1565 survives.<sup>123</sup> Hynton supplied a variety of headwear and associated feathers. His bill demonstrates he delivered these to Leicester either at Whitehall or Windsor.<sup>124</sup> Guy too supplied a variety of headwear, and its associated elements, to Leicester and his household.<sup>125</sup> He also produced ribboned aglets.<sup>126</sup> Christopher the milliner occurred regularly in the early household accounts.<sup>127</sup> Adams suggests this Christopher is Christopher Carcano for whom a bill survives.<sup>128</sup> Hayward has also suggested that the 'Christopher Miller' found supplying the Great Wardrobe was Christopher Carcano.<sup>129</sup> Carcano supplied a range of goods to Leicester including spurs, horse harness, pomander, swords, shirts of '*maille*' and a number of hats. He is perhaps better defined as a merchant and the reference to him

---

120 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 7. Francis Bartie's bill itemised the supply of 122 gold buttons to a total cost of £68.19s.6d. It also described an earlier bill of £41 and was dated from the first year of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

121 BL, Add.MS 78172 Vol.V, ff. 1. At New Year's 1564 Leicester received: a George set with diamonds, a ring with a diamond, a brooch, a George set with emeralds, a brooch set with stones, a George set with stones, a brooch with an agate, a George in a garter with a pearl, a ring with a diamond, a ring set with a ruby, a George set with diamonds with a pearl pendant, and 120 buttons set with diamonds and pearls. Further research is needed to determine from whom those who gifted jewels to Leicester sourced them.

122 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 180, 242, 243, 271, 287, 340, 353. Cook is recorded supplying 26 nightcaps in the 1584-6 household accounts, along with 1 pair of gloves.

123 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 196-197.

124 Ibid.

125 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 88, 98, 110, 121, 173, 174, 422. Note in particular the bill pasted into the 1559-61 account which is pp. 173-4; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V ff. 17-22v. is a further bill for 1559-1563. Associated elements for the headwear found in the bills are hatbands, lace and feathers.

126 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 18.

127 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 76, 86, 89, 144, 147.

128 Ibid., pp.76, 119. A Christopher Calcarne, who received a payment for £60, was most likely Christopher Carcano. The bill is LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 4.

129 M Hayward, "The Sign of Some Degree?": The Financial, Social and Sartorial Significance of Male Headwear at the Courts of Henry VIII and Edward VI, *Costume*, no.36, 2002, pp. 1-17, see particularly p. 7.

as a milliner is likely due to his being originally from Milan.<sup>130</sup> Carcano was listed as a stranger in numerous Lay Subsidy Assessments living not in the Liberties as Sola, Crockeham and Buckwith were, but in Langbourn Ward, St Nicholas Acons parish (see the map in Appendix 3.4). This map demonstrates the spread of suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe within and without the walls of the City. Carcano's inclusion in the list highlights a further element of Leicester's wardrobe supply network; it was peppered with figures who also supplied the Great Wardrobe.

Given Leicester's role as the Master of Horse it is not surprising to see a relationship between his personal wardrobe network and that of the Queen. The Master of the Horse was ultimately responsible for ensuring all horse furniture for the Queen and her household was in order, which included the associated highly decorative textiles.<sup>131</sup> These goods were sourced through the Great Wardrobe.<sup>132</sup> A select group of individuals supplied these goods – to whom Leicester clearly had access given this cross-over between the Stables and the Wardrobe (see Appendix 3.5). Janet Arnold's discussion of the artificers to the Great Wardrobe names figures engaged by the Queen to produce her dress, and that of her household, including the Stables.<sup>133</sup> As Arnold and Archer have pointed out, others at court also had access to these people.<sup>134</sup> They argue that the Queen's artificers were used by others to produce gifts for the Queen. However the notion that they were able to engage the Queen's artificers in the production of their own personal wardrobe needs further exploration. Individuals such as Adam Bland, David Smith and Alice Mountague, who were central to the Queen's Wardrobe, were also prominent among the artificers supplying Leicester from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign.<sup>135</sup> Bland's surviving bill of 1565-66 records the supply of fur along with the furring and maintenance of furred garments.<sup>136</sup> These are the same types of procedures he was carrying out on the Queen's garments.<sup>137</sup> David Smith was engaged in embroidering garments for Leicester, livery for his household, horse

---

130 See TNA, KB 27/1075 E1530 C, where Christopher de Carcarno is described as a merchant from Milan.

131 Warrants for all manner of material related to furnishing a horse were written directing goods to be delivered to the earl of Leicester or his deputies, see for example, TNA, LC 5/33, ff. 23–34. See also RO Bucholz, 'The stables: Master of the Horse 1660-1837', *Office-Holders in Modern Britain: Volume 11 (revised): Court Officers, 1660-1837*, 2006, pp.603-604, online accessed 16 September 2012 < <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=43902>>.

132 TNA, LC 5/33, f. 26. The warrant for the Stables is directed '*To o[u]r trustie and welbeloued John ffortescue Esquire m[aste]r of o[u]r great warderobe in London or to his deputie or deputies there*'.

133 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 176–240.

134 Ibid., p.179; Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption', especially p. 51.

135 See Appendix 3.5.

136 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 247–249v.

137 BL, Egerton MS 2806, f. 5.

and dog furniture and embellishing household textiles.<sup>138</sup> Again these were similar tasks to those Smith carried out for the Great Wardrobe.<sup>139</sup> Alice Mountague is first recorded in Leicester's accounts as 'Mrs Smith silkwoman'.<sup>140</sup> Unfortunately there are no surviving bills for Mountague amongst Leicester's papers, but a number of warrants exist for the 1566–1567 period.<sup>141</sup> Here again Mountague is supplying similar products to those she was supplying to the Great Wardrobe.<sup>142</sup> David Smith and Mountague were dealing closely with Leicester's tailor Whittell and hosier Buckwith. This is demonstrated particularly through Mountague's surviving warrants.<sup>143</sup> Bland too would have dealt with Whittell and Buckwith although perhaps on a less regular basis. This ties Leicester's wardrobe network very firmly to that of the Great Wardrobe. As has been demonstrated earlier in the chapter, several of the suppliers to the Great Wardrobe are found in the wardrobe accounts of other courtiers, in particular Adam Bland. It is notable that the artificers chiefly concerned with the production of the Queen's Wardrobe are not found in other courtiers wardrobe accounts producing garments for their consumption, apart from Leicester's. While this may have a great deal to do with survival of evidence it does point to Leicester being in a privileged position, with access particularly to those of the Queen's Wardrobe artificers who supplied the Stables.

It is also interesting to note that at least two artificers in Leicester's wardrobe network went on to work for the Queen: John Parr and William Whittell.<sup>144</sup> There is no doubt that Leicester's patronage of both Parr and Whittell was the catalyst for such an appointment. However it also appears that the Queen took an interest in the clothing, and who created it, more widely within her court. Indeed Arnold suggests that Arthur Middleton was working for Elizabeth Knollys before being seconded to the Great Wardrobe.<sup>145</sup> The appointment of these men to the Great Wardrobe is an indication that the mastery of their craft was evident in the garments they were creating for their clients. It would also suggest that their relationships with their clients had been successful and that they had proved trustworthy in a manner that would recommend their services. The impact on Leicester's wardrobe of his tailor carrying out work for

---

138 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 45, 102, 106, 120, 127, 128, 171; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 14–16, 98–100.

139 TNA, LC 5/33, ff. 16–19.

140 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 120. Alice Smith, widow, married Roger Mountague, skinner, in 1562.

141 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 302, 304–307, 309, 311, 314–316, 318–321, 323, 326–330, 333, 337–339, 341–342, 349, 352, 354, 356, 358, 363, 365, 367–370, 373–375, 378–380, 383, 386, 391, 393, 395–397, 399–400, 402, 405, 407, 409, 414–417, 419, 421, 423, 426, 430, 432, 434, 435, 439–443, unfoliated 31 May 1566, unfoliated 2 August 1566.

142 TNA, LC 5/33, ff. 8–13.

143 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. For example see ff. 302, 304, black lace to be delivered to Buckwith and white lace to be delivered to Whittell.

144 See Appendix 3.5.

145 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 180.



the Wardrobe is unknown as there is scant evidence for any of Leicester's tailors past the beginning of 1574.<sup>146</sup> However Parr continued to carry out embroidery for Leicester alongside his work for the Queen.<sup>147</sup> It is possible that Whittell too was able to retain his position as Leicester's tailor whilst supplying the Queen. This notion is explored further in Chapter Five when the makeup of Whittell's workshop is discussed.

Suppliers of fabric to the Great Wardrobe were also found amongst those supplying Leicester. William Chelsham, Francis Pope and William Dane supplied materials to the Great Wardrobe from Elizabeth's coronation.<sup>148</sup> They are also found supplying Leicester from the beginning of the reign. Ambrose Smith, who also supplied Leicester with fabric from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, can be found supplying the Great Wardrobe in the 1570's.<sup>149</sup> Chelsham's surviving bills demonstrate the types of fabrics and the great quantities he had access to when considered alongside the materials

---

146 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, f. 33v., 3 March 1574 is the last reference to William Whittell in Leicester's extant accounts. No tailor is named as Leicester's tailor in the household accounts for 1584-6 or 1585-7.

147 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 199, 266, 329.

148 See TNA, LC 5/33 for a series of warrants written to Frances Pope and William Dane to supply fabric, for example *Ibid.*, ff. 16, 52, 130 for Pope and Dane; *Ibid.*, ff. 56, 72, 91, 116 for Dane; TNA, LC 5/32, f. 325 for Chelsham; TNA, E 101/429/4 lists the sources of fabric for the coronation. Chelsham is listed supplying 2 yards di of cloth of gold crimson at 33s.4d. the yard, 24 yards di di quarter of cloth of silver with 'woorkes' at 40s. the yard, 15 yards  $\frac{3}{4}$  di of cloth of silver with 'woorkes' at 30s. the yard, 18  $\frac{3}{4}$  yrds of cloth of silver with 'woorkes' at 35s. the yard, 17 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  di of cloth of silver plain at 40s. the yard, 10 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  di of cloth of silver plain at 33s.4d. the yard, 5 yards of cloth of silver plain at 25s. the yard, 44 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  di of red 'Jayne' velvet at 16s. the yard, 53 yards di of black 'Jayne' velvet at 16s. the yard, 101 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Crimson 'Luker' velvet at 27s.8d. the yard, 1002 yards of Crimson 'Luker' velvet at 26s.8d. the yard, 96 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson velvet at 26s. the yard, 43 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson velvet at 24s. the yard, 75 yards di of crimson velvet at 24s.6d. the yard, 54 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson velvet at 23s.4d. the yard, 40 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson velvet at 22s. the yard, 27 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson velvet at 19s. the yard, 47 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  di of crimson 'Luker' velvet with 'woorkes' at 26s.8d. the yard, 31 yards di di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson velvet with 'woorkes' at 26s. the yard, 17 yards  $\frac{3}{4}$  of crimson velvet with 'woorkes' at 25s. the yard, 134 yards of red velvet at 20s. the yard, 13 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of red velvet at 18s. the yard, 8 yards di of russet velvet with 'woorkes' at 28s. the yard, 14 yards  $\frac{3}{4}$  of russet velvet at 14s. the yard, 47 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  or purple velvet at 26s.8d. the yard, 20 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of blue velvet at 20s. the yard, 54 yards black velvet at 23s. the yard, 35 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of black velvet at 21s.6d. the yard, 53 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of black velvet at 20s.6d. the yard, 32 yards black velvet at 20s. the yard, 78 yards di di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of black velvet at 19s.6d. the yard, 245 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  di of black velvet at 16s.8d. the yard, 231 yards di black velvet at 71s. the yard, 26 yards  $\frac{3}{4}$  of black velvet at 18s.6d. the yard, 32 yards of crimson satin at 13s.4d. the yard, 81 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson satin at 13s. the yard, 47 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  crimson satin at 12s.8d. the yard, 226 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson satin at 12s.6d. the yard, 37 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  di of crimson satin at 12s.4d. the yard, 41 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson satin at 11s.8d. 88 yards  $\frac{3}{4}$  di of black satin at 9s.6d. the yard, 12 yards di of blue satin at 10s.4d. the yard, 55 yards  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson damask at 12s.8d. the yard, 102 yards di of crimson damask at 12s.6d. the yard, 340 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of crimson damask at 13s.4d. the yard, 42 yards  $\frac{3}{4}$  of crimson damask at 12s. the yard, 46 yards di  $\frac{1}{4}$  of russet damask at 9s.8d. the yard, 75 yards of crimson sarcenet at 7s.6d. the yard, 63 yards of white sarcenet at 4s.2d. the yard, 48 yards of red sarcenet at 4s. the yard.

149 TNA, LC 5/34, ff., 336, 338, 340.

he delivered for the coronation.<sup>150</sup> Indeed the first surviving bill, dated to 1558-9, includes fabrics delivered before Queen Elizabeth's coronation.<sup>151</sup> This would suggest that Chelsham had ready access to quantities of fabric within London and through agents abroad.<sup>152</sup> However the quantities needed for the Queen's coronation exceeded that which Chelsham's stock, his personal network within the Mercers' Company, and the Great Wardrobe could satisfy, as evidenced by the Privy Council directing the Customers of London to hold all crimson silks that entered the port.<sup>153</sup> None of the silks Chelsham supplied Leicester before the coronation were crimson. Chelsham's second surviving bill of 1562-64 itemises the fabrics alongside the garments that were to be constructed from them and to whom the fabric was delivered.<sup>154</sup> The names of those receiving the fabrics included the artificers Whittell, Buckwith, Mr John Gerworth and Norse the embroiderer along with members of Leicester's household such as John Dudley and Mr Christmas.<sup>155</sup> It is not known if Chelsham was delivering the fabric to those named in the bill or sending one of his employees or apprentices to carry out the task.<sup>156</sup> However Chelsham was clearly familiar with those in Leicester's supply network, in particular the artificers and members of Leicester's household concerned with the wardrobe. The demand for Chelsham's products evidently

150 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 5-6v., and ff. 158-165. See footnote 148 above for fabrics he delivered for the coronation.

151 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 5. The coronation was on 15 January 1559. Prior to this date Chelsham's bill itemises the delivery of 9 yards of scallop shell velvet,  $\frac{3}{4}$  di scallop shell russet (24 November 1558), 10 yards of russet velvet, 10 yards black Jean satin, 10 yards black velvet, 3 yards russet velvet and  $\frac{3}{4}$  yard of black taffeta (12 December 1558).

152 Ramsay, *John Isham Mercer*, pp. 31, 33, 53 for entries relating John Isham's dealings with William Chelsham. More research needs to be conducted on Chelsham's importing and retailing activities. He is not listed as importing fabric in the year 1567/8 in Dietz, *The Port and Trade*. He is also not found importing fabrics in TNA, E 190/3/2. William Chelsham, mercer, was buried on 14 February 1573, see, WB Bannerman (ed.), *The Registers of St. Mary le Bowe, Cheapside, All Hallows, Honey Lane and of St. Pancras, Soper Lane, London. Part I – Baptisms and Burials*, The Harleian Society, London, 1914, p. 176. Chelsham's will is TNA, PROB/11/55/304.

153 Archer, *City and Court Connected*, p. 174; JR Dasent (ed.), *Acts of the Privy Council of England, New Series, Volume VII: AD 1558-1570*, Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005, p. 10. The entry dated the last day of November 1558 reads 'A letter to the Customers of London to staye all sylkes of the coulour of crymosyn as shall arryve within that Porte untyll the Quenes Majestie shall first have had her choyse towards the furnyture of her Coronacion, and to geve warning if any suche shall arryve there to the Lordes of the Counsell, and to kepe this matter secrete, &c'.

154 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 158-165.

155 Ibid. For example see ff. 159, 162, 158v., for Whittell, Buckwith, Gerworth, Norse, John Dudley and Robert Christmas. For John Dudley and Robert Christmas see also, Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 17-18, 425, 468. The appearance of Christmas in Chelsham's bill on 29 May 1563 places him in Leicester's household prior to 1565 the year that Adams suggests he became a 'central figure' of the household.

156 TNA, PROB 11/55/304. In his will, proved 1 July 1573, Chelsham names servants – Jane Damber, Jane Briske, William Croskeres and George Rolls and the apprentice Morrie Vaughan. The number of people working for Chelsham at the time of his bills to Leicester is currently unknown.

extended beyond the court into the City elite. He was also supplying fabrics to the City Livery Companies, particularly when special fabrics were required for ceremonial or celebratory occasions.<sup>157</sup> For example he supplied two yards of crimson raised velvet to the Drapers' Company to 'new alter' (i.e. renovate) the garlands used in the ceremony of choosing the Master and Wardens.<sup>158</sup> Chelsham also supplied the crimson velvet to cover the Drapers' Company new Master's chair.<sup>159</sup> Richard Pecock and Richard Barnes were also found supplying materials to Livery Company elite for the pageant surrounding the installation of Sir Thomas Rowe as Lord Mayor.<sup>160</sup> This demonstrates the multifaceted nature of members of Leicester's wardrobe network and the tendrils that connected the court and the City. It also shows that while Leicester's wardrobe network appears to have been unique to him, for the vast majority of his wardrobe suppliers he was just one of a number of their largely unknown clientele. Even those who were chiefly concerned with the actual construction of garments for Leicester and his household may have had a wider client base, however there is currently limited evidence to support this theory.

Francis Pope too was a leading supplier to the court and Leicester.<sup>161</sup> He is found supplying fabrics for livery to Leicester for some members of his household.<sup>162</sup> Pope appears to have supplied a mix of fabrics including cotton, velvet and cloth (wool) and was involved in the construction and embroidery of garments for members of the Queen's Household.<sup>163</sup> Pope, as a member of the Merchant Taylors' Company, was able

---

157 This is demonstrated in the Drapers' Company Archives and the Merchant Taylors' Company Archives.

158 DC, WA 5/8, f. 9. The velvet cost £1 the yard to a total of £2.

159 Ibid., ff. 9, 10. Chelsham supplied a yard and a half of velvet at £1.5s.0d. the yard, and a yard and a quarter of 'Bridges' satin to line the back of the chair costing £0.3s.0d. Chelsham also supplied the fabric for a cushion – a yard and a quarter of crimson velvet at £1.5s.0d. the yard, at a total cost of £1.11s.3d.. and for a yard and a quarter of 'Bridges' satin costing £0.3s.0d.

160 Both suppliers to Leicester, Pecock and Barnes, called mercers though neither were members of the Mercers' Company, were recorded as supplying silks to the Merchant Taylors' Company in 1568 for streamers and banners. See, RTD Sayle (ed.), *Lord Mayors' Pageants of the Merchant Taylors' Company in the 15th, 16th & 17th Centuries*, Merchant Taylors' Company, London, 1931, p. 49. Richard Barnes supplied 9 ells ¼ of blue sarcenet for banners, the upper part of the trumpet banners and 'wayte' banners. Richard Pecock supplied 17 ells di of crimson taffeta sarcenet for the lower part of the trumpet banners and 2 streamers.

161 GL, MTC, MS 34035/1, unfoliated arranged alphabetically and by year of admission. Pope was made free of the Merchant Taylors' Company on 28 January 1540(1) having served his apprenticeship with Master Hobthorne. He was elected to the livery in the 1546/7 year, see GL, MTC, MS 34048/4, f. 42, listed under new brethren '*It of ffraunces Pope xxx*'.

162 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 282 identifies Pope as having delivered 87 yards of cloth for livery hose circa 1559.

163 TNA, LC 5/33, f. 130, is the warrant written to Francis Pope to supply a variety of materials including 10 yards of white '*cotonid*' half a piece of bayes, half a piece of cotton and 6 yards of '*rugge*', along with making and embroidering a coat of marble cloth for George Webster the master cook, and a red cloth coat for John West.

to accommodate both the supply of fabric and the construction of garments within his workshop/warehouse, or had the connections to out-source the tailoring. He is also found supplying fabric for the funeral of King Edward VI in 1553 and obsequies of the Emperor in 1564, again supplying cotton fabric and broadcloth.<sup>164</sup> Adams identified Pope as the possible purchaser of Leicester's house at Kew by 1565.<sup>165</sup> However both before and after the purchase Pope was found in Subsidy assessment rolls in St Mary Abchurch Parish which would indicate he did not purchase the property as a personal residence.<sup>166</sup> The intertwining of Leicester's wardrobe network and his wider financial dealings is undeniable, reinforcing his reliance on the elite of the City to support his lifestyle. The strength of this relationship can also be seen in the will of Margaret Dane. William Dane chiefly supplied linen to Leicester and the Queen's household. On Dane's death his wife, Margaret, continued supplying the Queen's household, and Leicester, until at least May 1578.<sup>167</sup> Dane's surviving bill in Leicester's papers showed that the couple maintained the linens they supplied, including '*making and marking and washing all of this stuffe*'.<sup>168</sup> Margaret Dane clearly felt a strong connection to both Leicester and the Queen who each received bequests in her will.<sup>169</sup> Pope and Dane do not appear to have supplied fabrics to the Stables, however there is a conclusive

---

164 TNA, LC 2/4/1 f. 7, 7v., 9v. Francis Pope supplied £76.1s.4d. worth of black cotton and £46.17s.6d. worth of broad black cotton, £35.4s.8d worth of narrow cotton for the funeral of Edward VI. Pope was also paid for 35 days at £0.1s.8d. a day for '*the praylinge of the blacke Clothe boughte for the sayde Buriall*', Thomas Ackeworthe and John Bridges both received the same payment. TNA, SP 12/34, f. 188, Francis Pope supplied £251.6s.7d. worth of '*broade clothe and Black cottons aswell Broade as narrowe*'. The memorial service for Emperor Ferdinand took place at St Pauls Cathedral early October 1564.

165 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 25. Leicester had been granted the house at Kew at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign.

166 LMA, CLC/281/MS02859, f. 24v., is the 20 June 1559 assessment. It recorded Francis Pope in St Mary Abchurch Parish, assessed at £150; LMA, CLC/281/MS02942, f.22v., is the 1572 assessment that records Pope in the same parish, assessed at £50; Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 25. The house at Kew was in the possession of Thomas Gardiner, goldsmith, by 1574.

167 TNA, LC 5/35, f. 93 demonstrates Margaret Dane continued supply of the materials to the Great Wardrobe. LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.V, f. 7, demonstrates Margaret Dane was still supplying Leicester in May 1578.

168 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 31.

169 TNA, PROB 11/61/539. Margaret Dane bequeathed '*vnto my singular good Lorde and lovinge frend the Lorde of Leicester a chaine of golde of the velue of one hundred poundes*' and to '*my souereigne good Ladie and gracious mistresse the Queenes maiestie a cheyne of golde of the velue of twoe hundreth poundes*'. Mrs Dane's will was proved in 1579. AW Hughes Clarke (ed), *The Registers of St Mary Magdalen Milk Street 1558–1666 and St Michael Bassishaw London 1538–1625*, The Harleian Society, London, 1942, p. 108. William Dane, a member of the Ironmongers' Company, and Margaret Kempe were married on 22 May 1542 at St Michael Bassishaw, London. Margaret was the daughter of Edmond Kempe, mercer, of London, see JJ Howard, & GJ Armytage (eds) *The visitation of London in the year 1568: taken by Robert Cooke, Clarenceux King of Arms*, The Harleian Society, London, 1869, p. 10. Margaret asked to be buried in her parish church of '*Sainct Margaret Moyses in Frydayestrete*', London, near to her husband's body.

link between suppliers to the Great Wardrobe and Leicester's wardrobe. This ability for Leicester to tap into the Great Wardrobe supply network was clearly a result of his position as Master of the Horse.

Very few women appear in the list of suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>170</sup> The few that do appear are largely found in categories related to handcrafts. In a brief examination of these women suppliers a number of points become apparent. They had an active role in business. When that business was run in conjunction with their husband they appear to have retained some degree of autonomy.<sup>171</sup> Additionally if their husband died they continued to trade. Those women named in the accounts appear to have been trading as femme sole. For example Mrs Barker was associated with her husband Francis Barker the merchant taylor.<sup>172</sup> While she is not explicitly mentioned in the surviving bills she does appear in the household accounts of 1558-9 and 1584-6 supplying the same types of products itemised in her husband's bills.<sup>173</sup> Francis Barker died in 1580, but this clearly did not stop his wife from continuing the business.<sup>174</sup> The fact that both Mr and Mrs Holborne are named in Leicester's two early household accounts demonstrates that each played an active role in the supply network. They are found supplying the same types of products, knitted stockings along with the occasional pair of gloves.<sup>175</sup> Mrs Holborne also charged for lengthened a pair of white silk stocking which would suggest that she had the necessary knitting

---

170 See Appendix 3.1.

171 Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, pp. 36–42, particularly p. 37. Rappaport discusses the status of women in London and posits that married women were able to trade as femme sole under London customary law.

172 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 87, 258, 129 are the entries for Mr and Mrs Barker; GL, MTC, MS 34035/1, unfoliated arranged alphabetically by surname and year of freedom. Francis Barker was made free of the Merchant Taylors' Company of London by apprenticeship by Nicholas Wilford on 30 January 1544(5).

173 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 97, 108, 127, 141–145 are the surviving bills from Francis Barker.

174 TNA, PROB 11/62/551. Francis Barker's will was proved on 8 December 1580; Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 258, dated 3 June 1585 the entry reads 'To Mrs Barker the iijth of June for ruffes for a xj shirtes that my lady bought for your lordship vjli. xiijs. iiijd'.

175 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 87, 122, 138, 139, 142, 146, 147 for William Holborne; *Ibid.*, pp. 87, 89, 91 for Mrs Holborne. Holborne is called a haberdasher in the household accounts, but can not be found in the Haberdashers Company records as a freeman, see GL, HC, MS 15857/1. Very little information has come to light on the Holbornes. They may be the Holbornes whose children were baptised at St Mary Le Bowe on Cheapside from 1548-1553, see, Bannerman, *The Registers of St. Mary le Bowe*, pp. 3, 4, 5. However they may also be associated with the William Holborne of Chelsey, gentleman, who was indicted as a recusant in 1583 and 1586, see, PEC Croot (ed.), *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 12: Chelsea*, Victoria County History, 2004, p. 259.

skills, or had access to a master knitter, to complete the task.<sup>176</sup> Leicester visited the Holborns' shop on five identifiable occasions in the 1559–61 account between 14 April and 27 November.<sup>177</sup> This demonstrates Leicester took an active interest in the act of shopping and perhaps that the shop was located conveniently for Leicester to visit. Unfortunately the household accounts give no further evidence that Leicester's visit to the Holborns' shop involved any other visits to shops or workshops in the same area. It is tempting to locate this shop in the vicinity of Cheapside and align the Holborns with those Holborns who are found in the registers of St Mary Le Bow. Such a situation would put their shop in close proximity to other suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe such as William Whittell whose shop Leicester also visited.<sup>178</sup> It would also place them near a further workshop that Leicester is recorded as visiting, that of David Smith which was also situated in or near the same general area where he lived in St Bennet Paul's Wharf Parish.<sup>179</sup> However there is scant evidence available for the location of the Holborns' shop, and the Holborns themselves, which limits the exploration of this aspect of Leicester's wardrobe network.

Further evidence of a woman trading with and apart from her husband can be found in the records of Leicester's dealings with Mrs Margaret Dane. She, too, was found closely associated with her husband's business in Leicester's household accounts. She was recorded receiving payment for hemming nine dozen napkins.<sup>180</sup> She clearly continued the business following her husband's death, and as previously stated she continued to supply Leicester.<sup>181</sup> The same pattern can be seen with Mr and Mrs Cowdry. The shepster Mr Cowdry appeared in Leicester's household accounts in 1560 where several payments made to him were recorded.<sup>182</sup> His wife, Mrs Cowdry, is found

---

176 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 89. There is some debate about the practice of knitting silk stockings in England, in particular pinning down a date when they were produced locally rather than imported. See, J Thirsk, 'The fantastical folly of fashion: the English stocking knitting industry 1500-1700', in N B Harte & K G Mann (eds), *Textile History and Economic History: Essays in Honour of Miss Julia de Lacy Mann*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1973, pp. 50–73; R Rutt, *A History of Hand Knitting*, London, BT Batsford Ltd, 1987. See also Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, 1988, particularly p. 206–207, for a discussion on where Queen Elizabeth obtained her knitted silk stockings.

177 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 138, 139, 142, 146.

178 Ibid., p. 46, 'Item in reward to Whittell's servants your lordship being in his shoppes'.

179 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 45, 'Item in reward emong Smythes the embroderear's servants your lordship being present xs.'; See also, Archer, 'Smith', *ODNB*.

180 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 147.

181 Ibid., pp. 119, 147; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.V, f. 7. The 1580 inventory records 12 ells of course canvas being the remainder of 100 ells supplied by Margaret Dane which had been used to make a wall at Wansted in May 1578. William Dane died at the age of 56 years on 5 September 1573, as recorded by John Stype, 'A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster, The Parish Church of St Margaret Moyes', online accessed 12 August 2012 <[http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/stype/TransformServlet?page=book3\\_205&display=normal](http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/stype/TransformServlet?page=book3_205&display=normal)>

182 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 166, 168; Adams *Household Accounts*, p. 119, records the payment the Mr Cowltrye, shepster, for £140.0s.0d.

in the earlier account.<sup>183</sup> Her first extant bill was dated 14 July 1562 where she was referred to as ‘*Katheryn Cowdry widdow and silkwoman*’.<sup>184</sup> While no evidence has been found for the date of John Cowdry’s death his wife was clearly still supplying goods to Leicester following his death which occurred sometime before July 1562. At the end of her second bill, which includes summaries of Leicester’s debt to her from 1561-1566, she signs herself ‘*Catarin Storar*’ on 26 February 1565(6).<sup>185</sup> This suggests that she continued to run her own successful business following her marriage to William Storer, saddler.

How much input Mr Storer had in Katheryn’s business is not known. What we do find, however, is that there are several further indicators of the continued successful running of her business. The first is demonstrated by an entry in the ordinary court minutes of the Merchant Taylors’ Company and the second in William Storer’s will. Mrs Storer was recorded on 7 February 1567(8) as presenting and making free her apprentice John Hill.<sup>186</sup> Given the date of the presentment it is most likely that Hill was enrolled when John Cowdry was an active member of the Company.<sup>187</sup> Her ability to retain and continue the apprentices who were training indicate a degree of business acumen. However she was not alone as a widow presenting a deceased husband’s apprentices in the records of the Merchant Taylors, or indeed enrolling new apprentices with the Company.<sup>188</sup> The second suggestion of Katherine Storer’s abilities to manage financial situations, and what she brought to the marriage, which included her business, are found in William Storer’s will.<sup>189</sup> Storer makes her his sole executor and records the debt he owes her

*To whom in recompence of that w[i]ch she broughte me when I married her she being then a widdowe and in reco[m]pence of her diligente traveile and carefull paines w[i]th me taken long tyme heretofore and for the satisfaction to be made by her of suche debtes as I shall owe at ther tyme of my deceasse I doo fullie whollie and most willinglie gyve and bequeathe all and singuler my gooddes cattells debtes howsholde stuff rightes and creditte whatso ever even in as lardge mannor as I anye ways may or can thinckinge and protestinge that it is farre to little to reco[m]pence her acordinge to her deserte.<sup>190</sup>*

---

183 Ibid., p. 53, records the payment of £6.10s.0d. on her bill.

184 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 168.

185 Ibid., f. 166.

186 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 321, the entry reads ‘*ffirste at this daye katheryne Storer wyffe of william Storer sadler And late before the wyff of John Cultry marchanttayllor deceased presented and made free John hill her late apprenytcy*’.

187 Ibid., f. 321. John Hill was made free on 7 February 1567(8).

188 For example see, Ibid., ff. 197, 275. Anne Body, widow of William Body (also a supplier to Leicester’s wardrobe), made free John Browne her apprentice on 19 October 1565. Katheryne Byrde, widow of William Byrde, made free her apprentice John Gyttyre Jn on 13 December 1566.

189 TNA, PROB 11/59/163. Storer’s will was proved on 28 January 1577.

190 Ibid.

Katherine Storer was clearly a competent business woman. Leicester's continued patronage of her services can be verified until the beginning of 1566 which suggests at least an eight year supply relationship, and points again to Leicester maintaining long-term relationships with women suppliers alongside his male suppliers.

The silkwoman Alice Smith, later Mrs Mountague, also appears to trade apart from her husbands. The identity of Mr Smith has not yet been ascertained, or indeed when he died. However Alice Smith is clearly identified as the silkwoman to the Queen from the beginning of the reign.<sup>191</sup> Smith supplied Leicester prior to her entry in the household accounts on 13 April 1560.<sup>192</sup> She is not referred to as a widow in any of the evidence examined except when a marriage licence is granted to enable her to marry Roger Mountague.<sup>193</sup> The exact products Alice supplied to Leicester prior to 1560 were not specified. However the fortunate survival of a series of warrants to Mrs Mountague in Leicester's papers give an indication of the variety of goods supplied; these goods were very much in-line with the products she was supplying to the Great Wardrobe.<sup>194</sup> The input that Roger Mountague had in her business is unclear, but on Alice's death he took over her role as the supplier of silk wares to the Great Wardrobe. Whether this indicates he was involved with the business prior to her death is difficult to determine.<sup>195</sup> There is no reason to assume that the supply relationship did not continue between Leicester and the Mountagues throughout his time as Master of the Horse.

It is clear that the women suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe, although few in number,

---

191 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 219.

192 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 120.

193 GJ Armytage (ed.) and JL Chester (extractor), *Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Bishop of London 1520-1610, Volume I*, Harleian Society, London, 1887, p. 24; GL, SC, Freeman and Apprentices, MS 30719/1, f. 90. Roger Montague, the son of Sir Edward Montague (one of the King's Justices), was apprenticed in 1550 to Henry Herdson for seven years. Mountague was made free of the Skinners' Company on 7 December 1558; Henry Herdson Alderman of the City and past Master of the Skinners died in 1555, see, AB Beaven, *The Aldermen of the City of London Temp. Henry III-1912, Volume II*, The Corporation of the City of London, London, 1913, p. 34. The Skinners' manuscript does not record who made Montague free of the Company. It was probably Barbara Herdson who appears to have continued her husband's business after his death, see, TNA, SP 46/9, f. 18. Roger Montague is mentioned having travelled to Danske with cloths to sell for Mrs Herdson in 1557.

194 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 302, 304–307, 309, 311, 314–316, 318–321, 323, 326–330, 333, 337–339, 341–342, 349, 352, 354, 356, 358, 363, 365, 367–370, 373–375, 378–380, 383, 386, 391, 393, 395–397, 399–400, 402, 405, 407, 409, 414–417, 419, 421, 423, 426, 430, 432, 434,–435, 439–443, unfoliated 31 May 1566, unfoliated 2 August 1566; TNA, LC 5/33, for example see, ff. 8–13.

195 Roger Montague, skinner, was a member of the Merchant Adventurers, as Herdson (his old master) had been. How this membership impacted on his life and business in London is not known, nor how often he travelled overseas. He is first called a Merchant Adventurer in the Skinners' Company records of 1564, see, GL, SC, MS 30719/1, f. 124 where the enrollment of two apprentices Nicholas Nightingale and Thomas Henson were recorded.



were more than capable of continuing trading apart from their husbands. Furthermore the fact that the vast majority of named suppliers were men masks the role that their wives played in their business. Two further examples have come to light which demonstrate that although only the husband is mentioned in the evidence for Leicester's wardrobe, the supplier's wife had an active role in the business. Margaret Tempest, the widow of William Tempest, hosier to Leicester and his household, was presenting his apprentices to the Drapers' Company after his death.<sup>196</sup> This would suggest that she too continued her husband's business following his death, though there is no evidence for a continued association with Leicester. It was not necessary for the death of a husband to provide evidence for his wife to play a role in the business. John Lonyson's bill confirms that his wife Mary was running the business while he was in Flanders sourcing jewels for Leicester.<sup>197</sup> Lonyson's shop on Goldsmiths' Row, at the sign of the Acorn, was located at the St Paul's end of the Row on Cheapside.<sup>198</sup> Maintaining a presence in the Row, particularly in such a prominent location, was probably Mrs Lonyson's job, more so when her husband was overseas. Indeed continuing trading in the shop in his absence was essential for business, particularly at a time when the court would be sourcing gifts for New Year, and for the continued managing of the apprentices and journeymen. Women clearly played a pivotal role in the wardrobe supply network although they were not necessarily explicitly mentioned in the evidence for Leicester's wardrobe. Women shared this largely unacknowledged role with the journeymen and apprentices that made up the workforce of the named suppliers in Leicester's accounts. If their names were known and could be added into the list of known suppliers the number involved in the production of Leicester's wardrobe would be expanded exponentially casting a wider net across the City of London and its Liberties.

## Conclusion

Establishing who was involved in the network of supply to Leicester's wardrobe relies on evidence that tells only a partial story. Indeed the patchy nature of the evidence

---

196 DC, WA 5/7, f.2. Margaret Tempest presented Lancelot Atkinson '*her apprentice*', before 3 August 1569; TNA, PROB 11/50/283, her husband's will had been proved on 8 October 1568. His business was not mentioned in his will however he did '*gyve vnto every one of my men servauntes a french crowne*'.

197 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 226v. Mary Lonyson received a payment of £42 from Anthony Forster, an officer in Leicester's household, as part of a payment on the bill. The payment was made while Lonyson was in Flanders sometime between 3 November 1565 and 1 January 1566.

198 Reddaway, 'Elizabethan London-Goldsmiths', particularly pp. 182–3. Reddaway's list of goldsmith shops includes the numbers on the Row that were ascribed to the properties in the eighteenth century. The numbers started at the Cathedral end. Lonyson's shop and house was, at number 3, close to the Cathedral. The land beneath the living section of the property was owned by the Cathedral, the Goldsmiths' Company owning the land beneath the shop and workshop. See Appendix 3.4.

provides names of suppliers for distinct periods of time. It has, however, been possible to draw from these sources a remarkable number of suppliers' names for further exploration. Through the examination of the people behind the names it has been possible to construct a skeletal picture of Leicester's wardrobe supply network.

Those involved in Leicester's wardrobe supply network made up a broad cross section of the inhabitants of the City of London and its Liberties. These figures have been identified as citizens and non-citizens, men and women, that ranged from the City elite to the humble artisan. We find individuals such as Richard Pecock, twice warden and later Master of the Leathersellers' Company rubbing shoulders with artificers such as Maynard Buckwith hosier and stranger denizen with no known Company affiliation. However not all suppliers are identifiable, named figures such as Thomas Cook and Mr and Mrs Holborne remain elusive. Nevertheless what these people all had in common was that they were required to supply products suitable to Leicester's wardrobe and work collaboratively to achieve a satisfactory outcome for Leicester. While many of the materials used in the construction of Leicester's wardrobe were sourced from overseas, his wardrobe network was very much centred in the City of London and its Liberties.

Surprisingly, Leicester utilised a considerable number of strangers in his wardrobe network. These people were occupied as both merchants and master craftspeople. How these people influenced Leicester's personal styling and politics is open to debate. However the number of Dutch people crafting elements of his wardrobe and Leicester's preference for a Dutch styling is undeniable. The link with Dutch masters who had intimate contact with Leicester through fittings provides food for thought. What is missing is the evidence of conversations that passed between the men on the subjects of politics and religion, in addition to the core business at hand – Leicester's dress. What is clear is that Leicester appreciated the mastery of the craft that these strangers offered and continued to patronise their services.

While few women were named in the wardrobe supply network it is evident they were a silent workforce within that network. Those that were named appeared to act as femme sole even though they may have been married. Others carried on their husband's business after his death, or appear to have been running the business in their husband's absence. These women were associated largely with handcrafts as silkwomen and shepsters. One in particular, Mrs Dane, developed a strong bond with Leicester leaving him a considerable legacy in her will.

It has been possible to establish that a number of Leicester's wardrobe suppliers continued to provide their goods and services to Leicester over an extended period of time. His tailor and his hosier were crafting his garments for at least the first fifteen years of Queen Elizabeth's reign. In addition, long-term relationships can be found with Leicester's fabric suppliers, goldsmiths, embroiderers, shepsters and silkwomen.

Establishing how many of these figures achieved a position in this network is a challenge primarily brought by paucity of information. However it is clear that Leicester's position as Master of the Horse gave him privileged access to suppliers to the Great Wardrobe, particularly as he was charged with ensuring all horse furniture for the Queen and her household was in order, including the luxurious textiles pivotal to ceremony. He was able to utilise these contacts in the production of his own wardrobe and more widely in his household. Few in the wider court were able to engage the Queen's artificers in the same way except perhaps in the construction of gifts for the Queen.

Identifying the relationships that developed between the members of the network is only possible to determine in part. The suppliers within the network supplied Leicester and each other for Leicester's wardrobe. The members relied on one another to deliver products and services that enhanced their own product where more than one supplier was involved in the production. This can be demonstrated by a garment for which the fabric was delivered to the tailor, which was passed on to the embroiderer, then back to the tailor, who might incorporate products from the silkwoman and the goldsmith. Each within the chain of supply expected the next in line to carry out their task with the skill of a master craftsman. Indeed two of his artificers were seconded to the Great Wardrobe demonstrating the mastery of their craft. Undoubtedly relationships of trust developed between members of the network and these will be explored further in the following chapter.

When considering how exclusive Leicester's wardrobe supply network was a number of points have been identified. Evidence for the wardrobe networks of Leicester's contemporaries is slim to nonexistent. The recurrence of a number of names within those identified suggests a shared pool of suppliers to the wider court though the exact makeup of a network might vary considerably. Figures such as William Denham and William Chelsham have been identified in a number of Leicester's contemporaries' wardrobe networks. Due to the paucity of evidence, there is some difficulty in determining the extent of stranger involvement in these networks. However there are indications that there was a presence of strangers in the wardrobe networks of these courtiers. While Leicester's network was unique to him, to the majority of his suppliers he was one of an unknown number of clients.

It is clear that Leicester's dress was the culmination of a complex supply network formed of stranger and English merchants and master craftspeople. Leicester's wardrobe network functioned smoothly, relying on each member to maintain meticulous records of all transactions and complete their task in order to achieve the desired end product. How this wardrobe network functioned, and Leicester's participation in its management, requires further exploration. An examination of the surviving evidence for its operation will form the basis of the following chapter.





## Chapter Four: Leicester's management of his wardrobe network.

The chief concern of Leicester's wardrobe network was to provide products that would dress their patron in a suitable manner. In satisfying their client they laid the foundation for a successful business relationship. As we have seen in the previous chapter the network was composed of a range of master craftspeople and merchants situated across the City of London and the Liberties beyond the walls of the City. Managing that network, which was a highly organised community of suppliers built on individuals running their own business, took diligence and accuracy. It also required the ability to relate well to the individual suppliers and understanding of the processes involved in procuring the most acceptable products. This chapter examines how Leicester managed his wardrobe network and how it functioned to achieve its aim of successfully providing the garments and accessories to dress him in a the requisite manner. It builds on the conclusions drawn in the last chapter that demonstrated the diversity of Leicester's wardrobe network where suitable products were sought from English and alien merchants and master craftspeople. It investigates how the disparate elements of one person's wardrobe were brought together and the transactions accounted for under Leicester's supervision. In order to frame the discussion a series of questions will be addressed. These are; To what extent did Leicester manage his wardrobe network? What were the dynamics of the supply relationship between the suppliers themselves and with Leicester? To what extent was Leicester's wardrobe procurement process also demonstrated in that of his contemporaries?

Leicester was the centre point of the wardrobe network. It was from him that the order was given for a garment to be produced. In part this process was managed by Leicester and members of his household, and in part by the network itself. Evidence for how this process operated can be found in the surviving warrants, wardrobe disbursement book, suppliers bills, household accounts and a number of letters.<sup>1</sup> This collection of documents provide a fair approximation of the paper trail that was produced when sourcing items for Leicester's wardrobe. The warrants often record the early stages of the process.<sup>2</sup> The wardrobe disbursement book evidences action by the mercer, or fabric supplier, in delivering fabric to the artificer.<sup>3</sup> The bills largely itemise items

---

1 Adams, *Household Accounts*; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII; TNA, State Papers, SP 15/26, f. 23; TNA, State Papers, SP 70/76, ff. 70, 73; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts Preserved at Magdalene College, Cambridge*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1911, pp. 44, 46, 50–51.

2 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. The warrants are ff. 300–444, and two unfoliated, these record the ordering of goods or services. See also, LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.IV, f. 18, for a warrant dated 14 January 1566 written by Anthony Forster to Richard Pecock.

3 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII.

supplied and demonstrate the final stages of the process.<sup>4</sup> The household accounts show the payment of suppliers' bills.<sup>5</sup> Due to the loss of the vast majority of bills that relate to these payments the entries in the accounts chiefly reflect an unknown supply period and unknown supplies.<sup>6</sup> The accounts also show that Leicester, and a number of members of the household, purchased individual items for his wardrobe which appear to have been paid for on the spot or on a bill submitted later by the household officer.<sup>7</sup> Surviving letters push Leicester's pursuit for suitable products beyond the borders of England. These documents add a different perspective to the face-to-face negotiations that occurred with suppliers in the City and its environs. Each of the surviving documents gives an insight into the supply process of one person's wardrobe and demonstrate not only that Leicester was central to the whole procedure, but also highlight the great care taken to record each transaction. They also clearly show the interconnected nature of the wardrobe supply network. Each member of the network relied on the next in the chain to ensure the product they supplied was ultimately delivered to Leicester and was suitable for his needs. Leicester relied on his suppliers to provide suitable products and to keep accurate and honest records. He also depended upon members of his household to ensure that the process ran smoothly and that accurate records were kept of each transaction within the network through examination of each supplier's accounts. This ties Leicester's household, particularly those in his wardrobe, firmly into the supply network through their accountability to Leicester and the personal relationships they formed with suppliers.

What is missing from the evidence are elements of communication between Leicester

---

4 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. The bills are ff. 1–299, and record goods delivered to the household/artificer, costs associated with the production of the goods and payments received from Leicester or his household. See also two bills pasted into published accounts Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 173–175. The bills are for goods supplied by John Guy, and James Crokeham.

5 Adams, *Household Accounts*.

6 Ibid., for example see p. 45, 53, 60 where payments were recorded to James the shoemaker (£3 on a bill), Mrs Cowdry (£6.10s. on a bill), Mr Barker (£12.10s. on a bill). For each of these individuals a bill does survive, but does not correspond to the entry in these particular accounts. See also Ibid., pp. 109, 123, for records of payment to William Chelsham, mercer. These payments relate to one of his bills that is LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 5–6v.; Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 88, is the record of a payment of £20 to Thomas Allen, skinner, which is also found recorded in his bill LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 8.

7 Adams, *Household Accounts*. For example the payment for a pair of 'Garnesey' hose 5s., p. 48; Ibid., p. 59, records payment for a pair of gloves 10d.; Ibid., p. 63, records the payment to Powell for necessaries for the wardrobe £0.6s.8d.; Ibid., p. 69, records the purchase of a scarf for Leicester by John Empson, a member of the household, for 9s.; Ibid., p. 76, records payment to Christopher Carcano for 3 pairs of gilt spurs for Leicester £1.8s.; Ibid., p. 86, records payment for knit hose for Leicester 4s.8d. Members of Leicester's household submitted bills for materials they purchased for Leicester, along with wages and any accommodation charges incurred, see, for example, those who have some connection to the wardrobe in Ibid., p. 400, for Thomas Eaglamby's bill; Ibid., p. 403, for George Gyles and John Empson's bills; Ibid., p. 405, for John Powell's bill.

and the supplier, and between the suppliers themselves; there can be no doubt that there was an ongoing dialogue. These conversations would have certainly demonstrated the level of Leicester's interest in his wardrobe. With no record of these conversations their impact must still be considered when examining the written and visual evidence for Leicester's wardrobe and its networks of production. Once Leicester had decided to have an element constructed for his wardrobe, such as a doublet, the styling would be agreed between Leicester and his tailor. The tailor would calculate the quantity of fabric required most likely through the production of a toile (or pattern) to avoid any wastage of the expensive outer fabric.<sup>8</sup> Patterns were certainly created by William Whittell, tailor, and David Smith, embroiderer.<sup>9</sup> This calculation would be communicated to Leicester in order for the necessary fabric to be delivered to the tailor. Any additional elements required to decorate the doublet would also be sourced and supplied to the tailor. Clear evidence for this process can be found in the surviving manuscript material.<sup>10</sup> However there is limited information on the communication that was conducted between the various artificers, such as the tailor and hosier, or the tailor and the embroiderer. There is no doubt that this communication took place and was necessary for the completion of a garment to the high standard required.

For garments that required embroidery, the fabric was delivered to the embroiderer following the marking of the pattern by the tailor, or hosier, but before the garment was sewn together.<sup>11</sup> Leicester would no doubt have considered the design of the embroidery in consultation with the embroiderer before its execution. The marking of the fabric pieces by the tailor or hosier prior to embellishment ensured that the expensive embroidery materials were limited to the areas of the fabric that were to be used in the garment and would be visible. This required the tailor, or hosier, and the embroiderer to cooperate in the production of a garment.

One of the pivotal relationships within Leicester's wardrobe network was that between the hosier and the tailor. Unfortunately we possess no material evidence about the communication between these two master craftspeople. However the strength of the relationship that developed between Whittell and William Tempest, hosier, was

---

8 For a discussion of the use of patterns for the production of garments for the Queen see, Arnold, *Patterns of Fashion*, p. 4; Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 183–184.

9 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 47, 48, 69. Whittell charged for making two livery coat patterns, three patterns for green coats and a pattern for a leather coat. See also LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, f. 6v. Whittell received watchet taffeta to made patterns for Leicester on 16 September 1571; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 98. David Smith charged for making patterns for livery coats.

10 For example see a selection of Mountague's warrants to deliver materials to Whittell in *Ibid.*, ff. 304, 307, 309, 316.

11 *Ibid.*, ff. 98–100. The only hint of the process is found in David Smith's bill where he charged for embroidering garments for Leicester along with the thread and canvas for setting the fabric to be embroidered on the frame, clearly demonstrating Smith was embroidering fabric before it was constructed into garments.



intimated in Tempest's will.<sup>12</sup> Whittell was named as one of two supervisors of the execution of Tempest's last wishes.<sup>13</sup> Communication between these two artificers was essential for the fit of both the hose and the doublet, as the hose were tied to the doublet by way of ribboned aglets. Without a cooperative approach the suit of clothes, joined through aligning eyelets, would not achieve the necessary high standard required.

Evidence of this communication between Leicester and his artificers, and between the artificers themselves may have been found in the patterns that were produced. These patterns formed a visual means of communicating ideas and were the basis for finalising a product's design, however none are known to have survived. Undoubtedly patterns were not limited to garments made from fabric. Patterns were made for other types of products within Leicester's wardrobe. This suggests a dialogue between Leicester and a wider group of craftspeople than those who fitted garments to his body. John Lonyson made patterns for a chain, a collar (probably for the Order of the Garter) and leg garter elements, for Leicester's approval before the final items were produced.<sup>14</sup> Patterns and drawings were also created for armour which can be seen in Jacob Halder's illustrations of armour.<sup>15</sup> Patterns tie Leicester into the heart of the design process. He clearly commissioned patterns which were probably a collaborative activity that combined Leicester's need to satisfy his desire to demonstrate his position of nobility, and the master craftsman's design and production skills. While Leicester would ultimately have the final say as to whether the object suited his needs, the input of the master craftsman in the design process is unquestionable. This process underscores the ongoing dialogue that took place between Leicester and his artificers.

Once the patterns were established generally the more expensive component parts of a garment or element of dress were sourced for Leicester by a member of his household before being delivered to the artificer for production into a garment. The artificer supplied less expensive materials themselves.<sup>16</sup> The components appear, in most

---

12 TNA, PROB 11/50/283, proved 8 October 1568.

13 Ibid., Tempest named his wife Margaret and his daughter-in-law Elizabeth his full executors. William Whittell and John Harford, both Merchant Taylors, were named as supervisors of the executors and each given a gold ring valued at £2 for their trouble.

14 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 38, 41. Lonyson charged £20 for the making of a chain and patterns that were produced in order to make it. He also made patterns for a collar charging 10s. In addition he made patterns in wax, lead, and gold for Leicester's garters.

15 Victoria & Albert Museum, D.593–1894, illustrated online at <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1069325/the-earl-of-leicester-design-jacob-halder/> accessed 12 December 2012.

16 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 44–85. Whittell supplied some of the oddments necessary for the construction of Leicester's garments himself including course linen canvas, bombast, sewing silk, other linen fabrics for lining and interlining, some buttons, lace and fringe, see Appendix 5.7. See also, LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152–157, Buckwith supplied silk sewing thread, thread, cotton fabric, linen fabric, kersey, small amounts of silk for decoration, and bombast, see Appendix 6.2.

cases, to have passed directly from the merchant to the artificers without entering the household. This delivery of the fabric or goods by the merchant directly to the artificer would help to cement a relationship between the merchant and artificer, particularly if both were long-term suppliers. Such a practice relied on accurate documentation by all parties involved. There is no evidence for a great store of fabrics in Leicester's household as there was in the Great Wardrobe.<sup>17</sup> The bypassing of the household is certainly true for the majority of silk fabric, silk wares and goldsmith's wares to be incorporated into items of dress.<sup>18</sup> William Chelsham and Richard Pecock delivered fabrics directly to the artificers. The exception to this system was the delivery of fabric for liveries to Leicester's wardrobe on 15 June 1572.<sup>19</sup> It is unclear in this case if the members of the household received the fabric to have the garments made up themselves, or if the garments were made up for them by Leicester's tailor who made patterns for the livery garments.<sup>20</sup> Fabric was also occasionally delivered into the wardrobe in order for Leicester to give it away.<sup>21</sup> Products such as those created by the silkwoman for attaching to a garment were also delivered directly to, or collected by, the artificer.<sup>22</sup> Gold buttons and aglets, examples of the goldsmiths' wares that were

---

17 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.V, ff. 2–16 is the 18 July 1580 inventory of Leicester House including wardrobe stuff, no fabrics apart from napery were mentioned; BL, Add. MS 78177, f. 32v. The only piece of fabric listed in Leicester's circa 1582 inventory was 8 yards (in 3 pieces) of cloth of silver copper with watchet ground branched with orange tawny silk. See also Elizabeth Goldring's partial transcription of BL, Add. MS 78176, the inventory that forms the basis for BL, Add. MS 78177, in Goldring, 'The Earl of Leicester's Inventory', no lengths of fabric for the wardrobe were mentioned; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XIII. There are no lengths of fabric itemised in Leicester's 1588 wardrobe inventory; BL, Harley Roll D.35. No lengths of fabric were itemised alongside the wardrobe elements, or elsewhere in the inventory; TNA, E 178/1446, unfoliated, an inventory of Leicester House taken after Leicester's death, no pieces of fabric were itemised in the wardrobe, there were also no items of dress apart from 2 garter robes of purple velvet in the earl of Warwick's chamber. For fabric stored in the Great Wardrobe see, Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, particularly pp. 163–167. See also Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, particularly pp. 25–36.

18 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 1–33v. Fabrics were ordered from a merchant who delivered them directly to the artificer including Whittell the tailor, Buckwith the hosier, Parr the embroiderer, Brown the shoemaker, Thomlinson the upholsterer, Cure the saddler, Glode the cutler, More the embroiderer, Hemming the laceman, Brown the haberdasher, Waller the tailor, and Jerland the tailor; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 300–444 & 2 unfoliated, are the warrants for Mrs Mountague and Mr Pecock to deliver products to the artificers; *Ibid.*, ff. 92–93, includes entries that record the delivery of William Denham's goldsmith's wares to Whittell, John Guy the haberdasher and Norse the embroiderer.

19 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 16v., 17, 17v., 18.

20 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 419–421 itemises the coats and hose given as livery to various members of Leicester's household in 1559. William Whittell, tailor, made the pattern for the coats, and the livery coats were probably produced in his workshop. The name of the hosier who constructed the hose is not recorded.

21 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 19v., 29, 32.

22 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, see for example ff. 314, 375, 380 for Alice Mountague's delivery of products to Maynard Buckwith, Edmund More and William Whittell. See also *Ibid.*, ff. 27–27v., for Wilkinson's delivery of a variety of lace to William Whittell and David Smith.

generally delivered straight to the artificers, were only very occasionally delivered to the household.<sup>23</sup>

There is less evidence for the chain of supply for leather to shoemakers or the various materials required for the production of headwear.<sup>24</sup> This suggests that for these types of products the artificer largely sourced their own materials unless a specific fabric was to be used, or particular buttons or chain to be attached.<sup>25</sup> The movement of the goods within the network without passing through the household suggests Leicester's understanding of the products each member was currently supplying and what they might have in stock or be able to produce quickly. This points to the use of sample books demonstrating the products available, thus enabling Leicester to choose the products most suitable for his wardrobe. The use of sample books is also implied in the extant warrants for Leicester's wardrobe which specify specific fabrics and silk wares.<sup>26</sup>

A warrant was required for each component part needed for the fashioning of a product for Leicester's wardrobe. Leicester was involved in the initial stages of the warrant production through ordering one of his household to write the document.<sup>27</sup> No warrant written by Leicester for his personal wardrobe is known to exist. Warrants were also used in the Great Wardrobe for the supply of goods to and from the Wardrobe.<sup>28</sup> The numerous original warrants that still exist for Leicester's wardrobe illustrate their part in the supply process. Although limited to two suppliers, Alice Mountague and Richard Pecock, these types of documents were clearly used throughout the wardrobe network. Those warrants that survive were written in two ways. The first is demonstrated by what is basically a memorandum written by Mountague to herself which has been turned into a warrant by Anthony Forster a steward of Leicester's

---

23 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 7, 12–13, 26, 27–27v. Francis Bartie delivered six dozen gold buttons to Leicester's household. Peter Richardson delivered gold and silver embroidery materials to David Smith. William Denham delivered gold aglets to William Whittell.

24 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 9, 10v., 11, 13v. Fabric was delivered to Browne the shoemaker to use in the construction of shoes for Leicester. This document is concerned with fabric delivery and does not record leather deliveries to the shoemaker. No fabric was delivered for headwear.

25 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 18. This is John Guy's bill in which he charged for caps and trimming the caps with buttons and chains, but he did not charge for the buttons or chains which were supplied to him by an unspecified goldsmith.

26 See warrants transcribed below.

27 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 382, is a warrant written by Richard Ellis, a member of Leicester's household, to Richard Pecock. In the warrant, which urges delivery of 9 yards of satin fabric previously ordered, Ellis wrote '*I pray you fayle not ^to ^ send presently for that longe sence ordered was gevyn by my L[ord] to Mr forster & me for the same*'.

28 TNA. For example see LC 5/32–37. These are copies of warrants written to the various suppliers to the Great Wardrobe. Few original warrants survive, a bundle relating to materials for the coronation of Queen Elizabeth are found at TNA, E 101/429/5.

household.<sup>29</sup> For example the warrant for products delivered to Maynard Buckwith, with the ultimate date 13 March 1565(6), begins:

*february*      14      Remember to call for a warrant for  
ye pasment lace of gold & parcell  
sylk for ye rydynges slopes of morry  
clothe & for j doz & d of bouttons  
& loupes of purpell & gold for ye same.<sup>30</sup>

Mountague clearly took her list to Forster in order to receive his endorsement. The verso of the warrant is inscribed with Mountague's record of when the warrant authorisation was granted.<sup>31</sup> This style of warrant demonstrates that Mountague kept a running record of items dispatched to various members of Leicester's supply network as they were collected or delivered, though in this case she does not specify all of the quantities.<sup>32</sup> She was certainly supplying goods before a warrant had been obtained. This warrant demonstrates the communication between Mountague and the hosier Buckwith. How much design control Buckwith had over elements incorporated into the garments he was producing was tempered by the products available from Mountague and Leicester's input. It is probable that Buckwith provided advice on what might be the most suitable products for embellishing a garment from those available, and that he and Leicester had established the decoration required prior to obtaining the goods from Mountague, and before Forster's finalisation of the warrant. Information on the decoration to be supplied had been clearly conveyed to Mountague by Buckwith, demonstrating the necessity for, and highlighting the importance of,

---

29 Anthony Forster (c.1510–1572) signed the majority of warrants that are known to survive amongst Leicester's papers, see LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 300–444 & 2 unfoliated. TNA, PROB 11/54/471 is Forster's last will and testament. Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 470, is a short summary of Forster's activities. See also Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, particularly pp. 152–153, 161. Forster was not necessarily one of Leicester's wardrobe officers, but dealt with the financial transactions concerned with the wardrobe.

30 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 314. The warrant continues:

27 *Remeber to call for a warrant for the*  
*Marche* – *white knet lace ye w[h]ich was for ye*  
*slope hose of shicmas [chamois] & for j doz*  
4 *& d of bouttons & loupes for ye same*  
*Remeber to call for a warrant for*  
*ye parsiment lace of gold & purpell*  
9 *sylke ye wich was for a peire of*  
*boute hose of mourry clothe*

*Mrs Mountagew I pray you delyuor to maynard thes parcells above wrytten thi xiiij of March 1565 yours Antho forster.* The first part of the warrant listing the products and dates was written in the hand of Alice Mountague while the final sentence was in the hand of Anthony Forster.

31 *Ibid.*, f. 314v. The inscription reads '*Re'd Mr Anthony ffosters warrant for maynards the xiiijth of marche 1565*'.

32 *Ibid.*, f. 318 is the same type of warrant written for deliveries to Whittell, tailor, and is dated 5 to 8 March 1565.

personal interaction within the process.<sup>33</sup> It also demonstrates the range of products that Mountague was able to produce. Furthermore it highlights that she held stocks not only of her products but also of the materials required to produce her silk wares on demand. Mountague's position as the Queen's silkwoman would have necessitated a reasonably sized store connected to her workshop, particularly when she was the recipient of any forfeited bales of silk, along with other materials supplied from the Great Wardrobe.<sup>34</sup> This probably worked in Leicester's favour as he had access to not only the master craftswoman Mountague but also her store of materials through his position as Master of the Horse which also, perhaps, benefitted his personal wardrobe.

This type of warrant was a key tool in the recording of products supplied. It also identifies to whom the goods were supplied and the garment for which the product was destined. Furthermore it also demonstrates the flexibility of the system where products could be supplied before a warrant was produced. A relationship of trust between Leicester and Mountague is evident in this documentation of the supplier/client transaction. The warrant also indicates Forster's knowledge of the garments under construction and Leicester's communications with his tailor concerning these products. What is also apparent is that Mountague kept track both of her products and of the dates that these were supplied, all necessary for the bills she would produce for submission to Leicester for payment. This ultimately highlights the reliance on the information contained in the warrant in the chain of supply for Leicester's wardrobe network.

A further variation on this type of warrant authored by Mountague demonstrates that portions of the order for the same product could be delivered to the artificer as they were produced. It also reflects a stock of products and the production rate within Mountague's workshop. The following extract of a warrant demonstrates this situation;

September 25 Remember to caule for a warrant for viij ozs iij qrtra  
of black Jene satten sylke frence xl yards for  
26 the panes of a peare of hose of black satten for

---

33 Ibid., f. 311, is a warrant for Mountague to supply lace and tassels for Leicester's trumpeter's banner which also demonstrates the communication between the person who conveyed the warrant and the artificer. The bearer of the warrant was to inform Mountague of the product needed – '*I pray you make for my lordes trumpeter laces with tassells of soche color sylke as and fasshyon as thys berer will enforme you*'.

34 TNA, SP 46/27, f. 89, is Sakevyle to Fanshawe dated January 1562 advising that the Queen orders that the bale of silk forfeited is to be granted to Mrs Smith (later Mrs Mountague), the Queen's silkwoman. She was to receive all such forfeitures in the future. The silk was to be used for the production of goods for the Queen, this most likely included the Stables.

A total of forty yards of Jene satin silk fringe was delivered over three days which would suggest Mountague supplied a combination of the fringe product from what she had in-stock and the remainder was constructed to complete the order. A further indication that Mountague kept quantities of her products in-stock is found later in the warrant when she delivered further large quantities of fringe to Buckwith for the same hose. It is interesting to note that, although for the same pair of hose, the fringes were supplied over a series of days. This may reflect Mountague's workshop focussing on one product at a time if a large quantity was needed to be produced urgently. However it may also demonstrate Leicester requiring further embellishment on the hose after a fitting or inspection of the garment. The quantities Mountague was supplying suggest a number of workers were engaged in the production of the fringe. It also demonstrates Mountague's store of the products necessary to produce the required fringe. What is evident here is that the warrant conveys information on production as well as quantity, colour and the purpose to which it was to be put. The delivery of the fringe throughout the day suggests that Mountague was based not too far away from Buckwith who was receiving the fringe, and that she had a runner to carry out the delivery.<sup>36</sup> The warrant further demonstrates an aspect of the functioning of the wardrobe network in that it clearly shows two master craftspeople cooperating to ensure Leicester's dress was completed using the necessary component parts.

There is no indication that Leicester had any input into the design of the products that Mountague supplied. This is primarily due to the lack of evidence for face-to-face conversations that took place between the two. However their communication on design elements can not be discounted. The fact that Leicester was ordering goods from Mountague's store of products would suggest that she made large quantities of products speculatively to sell on to her clients. The benefit of maintaining a store of products was that it would enable Mountague to provide her clients with samples of the goods she had available, as well as have work for her staff when she was not busy.

35 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 380, the warrant continues:

28 *It for xjozs qrtr of small chene frenge of leid*

28 *satten sylk Clwij yeards for ye same hose dd*

28 *at thre severall tymes.* The reverse of the warrant (f. 380v.) is inscribed: '*Rx'd mr fosters warrant for maynarde the /19/of/november/1566/.*

36 Bannerman, *The Registers of St. Mary le Bowe*, pp. 137, 174. The Mountagues were living, and probably working, in St Mary Bow parish in 1564–66. The first entry records Mrs Mountague as godmother to Isake Falloffylld, while the subsequent entries record burials of two people from the Mountague household – John Rowe servant to Mr Mountague and Jonne, Mrs Mountague's sister. LMA, CLC/281/MS02942, f. 9v., records Roger Mountague living in St Mary Bow parish. Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part III*, p. 415, Buckwith is recorded in the as living in 'The Libertye of the Duchye of Lancaster without Temple Barre'. He was still in the same area in 1589 see, *Ibid.*, *Part II*, p. 421. TNA, PROB 11/81/189. His last will and testament, locates him in the parish of '*Oure Ladye late in Strand in the countie of Midd.*' Buckwith lived and worked close to Leicester House.

The second style of warrant found in Leicester's papers was written before the goods were supplied. It is a style that can be substantiated by the majority of the warrants written by Anthony Forster to Richard Pecock. For example the warrant of 27 May 1566 reads as follows:

*Mr pecok I pray you delyver to Mr wyttell my Lords taylor iiij ells of grene taffeta s[arce]net to lyn ij Jerkins for my Lord and j for Mr Tamworth and j ell d porpell taffeta s[arce]net for lyne a jerkin for my L[ord] /and j ell d whyt taffeta to make my L[ord] a doblett and to egett and j ell qtr of porpell s[arce]net to lyne a doublet of canvas striped with red. qtr of ell taffeta to face my Lord a doblett this ffar you well the xxvijth day of maye ano 1566 More Delyver to Mr Wyttell j ell qtr of whyt s[arce]net to lyn my Lords whyt taffeta doblet and j ell of grene taffeta s[arce]net to make my Lord a skarff Your very frynde Anto forster.<sup>37</sup>*

These types of warrant provide evidence for the tailor having stipulated to Leicester the quantity of fabric required to make particular garments and hence a toile having been constructed. The warrant also demonstrates a shared knowledge between the supplier and client as to the types of materials available. This would indicate that Pecock, and most likely Mountague, used a sample book for their clients, though the text of the warrant only hints at this.<sup>38</sup> To create such a sample book Mountague would have supplied samples of her specialist products and inserted them into a book while Pecock would have collated samples of the fabrics which he had in his store. The arrangement of Mountague's sample book may have included a numbering system for specific silk wares although there is no evidence for this in Leicester's extant warrants.<sup>39</sup> No sample books that relate to any of Leicester's suppliers are known to exist.<sup>40</sup> However the use of samples was clearly a well established practice for the purchasing of cloth. Numerous contemporary letters and cases in Chancery refer to samples of materials provided before a purchase was made.<sup>41</sup> Indeed the use of samples within Leicester's

---

37 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 332.

38 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 220–222. Arnold illustrates a surviving sample book for braid which includes instructions on how to make the braids sampled, circa 1625. It is most likely that this is a book demonstrating the use of sample books in a domestic context rather than for commercial use, although equally it may be part of an apprenticeship training tool. The manuscript is in the collection of the Victoria & Albert Museum, London accession number T.313–1960.

39 TNA, LC 5/32, ff. 99–102, is the silkwoman's price list for products supplied to the Great Wardrobe, including the stables and the wardrobe of the robes. The ascribing of numbers to certain entries indicate a possible relationship between the written entry in this document and a sample of the product.

40 Although originating from 100 years later a clothier's sample book dating from 1673, or later, may provide the nearest known approximation of that which circulated in late sixteenth-century London, see TNA, C 113/32.

41 TNA, C 1/1027/46, suit between the plaintiffs William Lytcote and William Pecoke defended by Jerome Doria and the mayor and sheriffs of London regarding the price of sarcenet which was inferior to the sample provided. See also TNA, WARD 2/58/215/10iii letter from Sir Thomas Chamberlain in Antwerp to Harry Sharnington in London, dated 12 January 1556, discussing samples of Flemish linen and canvas sent.

wardrobe is confirmed in a letter written by Thomas Aglionby to Leicester in 1578.<sup>42</sup> Aglionby sent samples along with suggestions of how a garment might be trimmed and was clearly acting as an intermediary while Leicester was on progress.<sup>43</sup> Sample books were also used by goldsmiths to indicate products that were able to be produced and could be more widely circulated throughout the kingdom than the products themselves.<sup>44</sup>

Sample books were clearly available to the tailor and the hosier in order that they might advise Leicester on suitable fabrics and embellishments for garments. It was certainly in the fabric merchant's best interest to keep their clients informed of their merchandise to ensure that there was sufficient stock turnover to make a certain profit. Who compiled the samples from the various suppliers is not known. It may have been a task that was delegated to an apprentice. While Leicester obviously had access to sample books it is difficult to determine if these were put together and located in his tailor's and hosier's workshops or if a copy was held by his wardrobe staff.

A further warrant which highlights the communication between the tailor and the silkwoman is dated 18 December 1566. It begins thus: '*Mrs Mowntygewe I pray you deliver to this berrer whitle my L[ord's] man so moch ^fringe^ lace and buttons as will serve for a grogram cote for my L[ord]*'.<sup>45</sup> The warrant places Whittell in Mountague's shop describing verbally exactly what was needed. This warrant was clearly written following a consultation between Leicester and Whittell during which the garments to be constructed were discussed and embellishment finalised. Not only is this document evidence for communication between the silkwoman and the tailor, it also ties both Leicester and Whittell firmly together in the decision making process. The lack, however, of the specific amounts required meant Whittell, therefore, was to determine the quantities of the requisite materials required for the end product.<sup>46</sup> The

---

42 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.II, f. 183, Thomas Aglionby to Leicester 30 July 1578.

43 *Acts of the Privy Council of England: Volume X: AD 1577–1578*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie Publishing, Burlington, 2005, p. 295. Leicester was at Audley House in Essex on the 30th of July 1578 when the letter was written.

44 Bod., MS.Eng.hist.c.474, f. 159a, is a letter of 8 June (no year) from Thomas Heyricke, who lived in Leicester, to his brother William Heyricke (c.1562–1653) London goldsmith which writes of William's sample book noting, '*I will send your sampell booke nex time that my cosen lanford comes vp It ware done a great whyle agoe*'. See also, GE Aylmer, 'Herrick, Sir William (bap.1562, d.1653)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 1 Jan 2013, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13076>>.

45 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 399, 399v. The full text of the warrant is: '*Mrs Mowntygewe I pray you deliver to this berrer whitle my L man so moch ^fringe^ lace and buttons as will serve for a grogram cote for my L and vij dosen of lace for a jerkin of shamoyes for my L and so moch lace as will serve for a cloke for Andrew the Duche page and buttons for the same clooke and this shalbe your warrant in this behalf. This fare ye well wryten the xvijth of December 1566 yor lovinge frend Antho forster*'. The verso of the warrant is inscribed '*Rxd mr foster warrant ffor whittell ye taylor ye 18/of december/1566f*'.

46 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 332.



fact that Whittell carried the warrant himself to Mountague's workshop demonstrates the importance of the task, a task that took him out of his busy studio. This again highlights the crucial part personal communication between the artificers within the network had in ensuring the necessary outcome for Leicester's wardrobe. Furthermore it establishes the tailor, as we have seen for the hosier, as the bearer of the warrant from the household to the artificer supplying the goods. These warrants, then, are valuable tools in demonstrating certain aspects of how the wardrobe network functioned. They also highlight the importance of personal communication in concert with written communication as necessary in the supply chain. The warrants also served as material evidence for the products supplied.

Leicester's use of warrants within his wardrobe supply network clearly mirrored that of the Great Wardrobe. How far this practice was utilised by his contemporaries is difficult to establish largely due to the lack of evidence. The majority of warrants that remain in archive collections originated from the Royal Household. Reference to materials that may have been used for the production of wardrobe warrants can be found in Sir Henry Sidney's papers.<sup>47</sup> However there is no specific mention of the writing of warrants.<sup>48</sup> The one reference to a warrant written by Sidney is for the payment of debts incurred by Lady Mary Sidney his wife.<sup>49</sup> Leicester also used warrants for payment of debts as demonstrated by a warrant amongst Leicester's papers that directs Richard Pecoock to pay John Anthonio for pearl lace to the value of £24.<sup>50</sup> The extant warrant in the Sidney papers would suggest he used a warrant system as one of the tools in the financial management of his household. It is clear that a paper-based ordering system for the wardrobe must have been in use by Leicester's contemporaries however the exact nature of that system has yet to be established. Kate Mertes refers briefly to the use of warrants in the noble household as supporting documentation used in the auditing of household accounts.<sup>51</sup> Indeed that was how the warrants that relate to Leicester's wardrobe have survived.<sup>52</sup> Yet without further evidence for his contemporaries' use of warrants in their wardrobe management no firm conclusions can be drawn. The warrants that survive for Leicester's wardrobe are unique.

Warrants were used by the auditors and examiners of Leicester's accounts to establish

---

47 HMC, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley*, p. 259.

48 Ibid. The entry reads 'Necessaries for the wardrobe – making of writings, parchment, paper, brokage on loans, (£14), total, £22.9s.5d'.

49 Ibid., p. 264.

50 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 300, dated 29 and 30 December 1565 and written at Durham House by Anthony Forster.

51 Mertes, *The English Noble Household*, p.78.

52 Adams, 'The Papers of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester III', p. 13. Adams suggests the warrants relate to a volume of household accounts now lost.

the accuracy of the bill before payment would be actioned.<sup>53</sup> While the surviving warrants for Leicester's wardrobe do not record any prices for the items supplied, and sometimes, as in the example above, supply limited quantity information, they were a vital part of the paper trail that was required when a bill was submitted for payment. Each of the suppliers were required to submit their warrants with their bills when seeking payment in order for their bill to be examined. This is explicitly mentioned in a note at the beginning of William Chelsham's bill which states: '*mr chelsham let all the warrantes you have be brought with you*'.<sup>54</sup> The inclusion in the bill of any product outside the normal materials supplied was queried.<sup>55</sup>

Receipts were issued assiduously on any goods delivered to an artificer by another supplier. For example Peter Richardson, goldsmith, delivered embroidery materials to David Smith, embroiderer. Richardson described the delivery in his bill, and received a receipt for the goods from Smith which was submitted with Richardson's bill to Leicester for payment. Richardson sets out the situation clearly;

*I firste delivered unto davyd Smythe one of the Quenes ma[jes]ties embrotherers  
iii spangette of fyne sylver and gilte to be by hym employed of  
and upon my Lordes affairs that is to saie for the garnishing  
of the cootes of his footmen iiijc oz di at viijs.viijd. the ounce xxxs.iiijd.  
Item more delyvered to hym in white spangles of sylver for the said  
Cootes xoz di at vjs.viijd. the oz ijli.xs. as more playnely maye  
appere by a bille of his hande for the receipte of the same beringe  
date the xxiiijth daie of August in Ano 1559 and in the firste yere of  
the reigne of our souraigne Lady quene Elizabeth SUM  
vli.iiijd.<sup>56</sup>*

Smith's receipt confirms delivery of the embroidery materials and what the materials were to be employed upon;

*This byll mayde the xxiiij daye of auguste in anno 1559  
and in the fyrste yer of our sofrren Lady Quen Elysebeth  
witnesseth that i daued smyth ymbrotherer have reseued  
of peter Rykard gouldsmyth for the yues of my Lorde  
Robarte dudley mayster of the quenes hors that*

53 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. The majority of the bills exhibit evidence of having been audited or examined by a combination of the following members of Leicester's household – John Dudley, William Kynyett, Richard Horden, Thomas Blount, William Glasier, George Christmas, John Yerwerth, Anthony Forster. Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 13, names William Kynyat as Leicester's auditor of the 1558–9 and 1559–61 household accounts.

54 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 158, for the examination of the bill. The warrant was evidence that Leicester had ordered the product and therefore it could be allowed in the accounts.

55 Ibid., ff. 44v, 45. Whittell's bill charged for 4 white Spanish skins, a marginal note in the auditor's hand queries if the skins appear in the accompt of Cooke or Best. Whittell also charged for silk and lace outside that which he normally supplied, a marginal note in the auditor's hand indicated the entries were to be double checked against Mrs Mountague's book (bill).

56 Ibid., f. 12v. This was the first of three consecutive year entries for embroidery materials supplied by Richardson to Smith for use in embellishing Leicester's footmen's coats.

*is to saye for the garneshing of the cootes for his fottemen in spangelles of fyne sellver and gyltt thre ounces demo mor reseued for the sayde cootes in whit spangelles of siluer tenn ounces deme I witnes wher of her unto the sayde Daved Smyth have put to my hand the daye and yer aboue sayde byme Davyd Smyth.<sup>57</sup>*

Whittell too used the receipt system, acknowledging receipt of fabrics delivered by Pecock in a bill that lists a variety of fabrics and the purpose to which they were to be put.<sup>58</sup> A further example is found on yet another of Pecock's bills; both Whittell and Buckwith sign the base of the page to acknowledge that they did indeed receive the fabrics listed.<sup>59</sup> Keeping track of the various component parts that might be used in the production of Leicester's wardrobe was clearly essential to the smooth running of the network and the accounting process. This is also demonstrated in the suppliers' bills, a number of which record who within the household received the final product.<sup>60</sup> It is clear that, in order to receive payment for the goods and services provided, a supplier was required to have all their paperwork in order before submitting it for examination by members of Leicester's household. Being able to prove that one had provided a product to the examiner's satisfaction was the difference between receiving payment or not.

Very few of the documents exhibit Leicester's participation in the auditing process at the level of the warrants or bills. Adams points out that Leicester took an active part in the administration of his accounts.<sup>61</sup> However only one bill is signed by Leicester as part of the examination process.<sup>62</sup> The bill is dated to the early years of the reign and may indicate that Leicester became too busy with his commitments at court to

---

57 Ibid., f. 14.

58 Ibid., ff. 262–262v. Below the list of the fabric supplied the document is inscribed '*All thes parcells wrytten and aboue ar confessed by Whyttell to be receuyd of Mr Pecok to my lordes use the xxiiij of November 1566*'.

59 Ibid., f. 268. The bill records deliveries of fabrics to Whittell and Buckwith from 12 April until 27 April 1567. The bill also records the types of fabrics, what they were to be used for, and the cost of the fabric.

60 For example see: Ibid., f. 169, the bill of Roland Frees, shoemaker, which exhibits a marginal note recording the shoes listed were delivered for Leicester's use and received by John Empson and George Giles, both members of Leicester's household. Ibid., f. 171, is a bill for footwear (unnamed) that records for the shoes listed that '*thes parsells receuyd for my L[ords] use by John Emson & George Giles*'. Ibid., f. 176, is Richard Hanforde's bill that records goods delivered to Richard Ellis, John Yerworth, John Dudley and Anthony Forster. Ibid., f. 196v., is the penultimate page of Richard Hinton's bill that is inscribed at the base '*thes parselles reacyyd for my L[ords] use by John Emson / George Giles*'. Ibid., f. 198–199, records deliveries of goldsmith wares produced by John Lonyson to Leicester and members of his household, John Empson, George Giles and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton. Ibid., f. 232, is the final page of Anthony Pagan's bill that records the receipt of goods by Anthony Forster.

61 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 14.

62 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 28. Leicester signed Wilkinson's bill along with two financial officers, John Dudley and William Kynyett.

comb through all the documentation regarding his expenditure on his wardrobe, choosing to delegate the financial management to specialists and concerning himself with the audited accounts. This does not mean that Leicester was disengaged from the procurement process for his wardrobe, but perhaps less able to manage the bulk of the paperwork generated.

The two extant documents relating to Katherine Cowdry (later Storer) demonstrate the examination process of each supplier's account submitted to the household and the reliance Leicester placed on the credit of his suppliers. The first is a bond for payment for goods supplied before 13 July 1561 and reads;

*Katheryne Cowthrye     Upon thaccompt & rekening of Mrs Cowdry wyddo &  
silkwomen of her  
demande of her billes shewyd and  
examened before us the xiiijth of  
July anno 1562 [sic] / et regine Elyzabeth  
Ter[c]io before John Duddley and others  
yt apearyth that the lord Robert  
dudely was Indetted unto Katheryne  
Cowdry in the somme of lxjli.xs. And  
so ys there appare no distcharge  
of the same ^of may of the^ then the sayd L[ord]  
Robert is Indeptyd unto the sayd  
Katheryne Cowdry in the sayd some  
of  
Exd.per.nos [signed]     John Duddley  
   William Glaser  
   William kynyett  
   John Yerworthe.<sup>63</sup>                             lxjli.xs.*

Cowdry/Storer had clearly been able to furnish all the obligatory paperwork to prove that she had indeed been requested to make the necessary products through the warrant system, and that the goods had been delivered.<sup>64</sup> This was particularly important when the main recipient of the products – Leicester – had delegated financial management to members of his household.

The second document is Cowdry/Storer's bill which includes a statement of the debt Leicester had incurred in the above bill and two further deliveries of goods, along with payments she had received from members of the household. This bill would have been submitted with the document transcribed above as proof of the debt owed by Leicester. The bill is worth transcribing in full to demonstrate the long drawn-out payment process that the supplier encountered.

*Mres Storer Shepster  
The bill^ of reconyng^ of Mrs Cowdrye als Storer for  
stufte deliverd to the Erle of leicester*

63 Ibid., f. 168. The bill that this document refers to is not among the Dudley Papers.

64 No warrants are known to exist for Katherine Cowdry/Storer.

*As hat fold 1562 annio quarto Elizabeth*  
*Regine viz.*  
*Remaynyng upon adibentor dewe to her bering*  
*Date the xiiijth daie of Julie 1561 Anno tericio* lxjli.xs  
*Eliz Regne as appereth by the same synd by John duddeley*

*More delivered to the said erle in hatfeld*  
*aboue said by the said John Duddely apaire*  
*of slevis and partlett fare wrought with*  
*Ragged staves and edges with purle with goldsmyth* xxxli.  
*work*

*More delivered to the said erle which Edward*  
*duddley brought his L[ord] two shirts with*  
*purld kuffes being of the same facyon the*  
*Erle of Warwik then had shirtes made*  
*And delivered the same tyme of anno*  
*Quarto aforesaid* iiijli.  
Sm *iiij<sup>xx</sup>xvli.xs.*

*Receyved by the said John Duddley at sundry*  
*tymes as apperith by acuyrrance delivered* lxxli.  
*So remaining due of this bill* xxvli.xs.  
*Whiche said some of twentie fyve poundes tene shillinges*  
*remayneth due to the same mrs storer by the right honoable*  
*therle of liecester for almaner of reconynge ^ dette^ and other demandes*  
*ffrom the begynnyng of the world till this xxvijth of februarie*  
*Anno Octavo Elizabeth Regine*  
*by me [signed] Catarin Storar Exd.per.nos [signed] Tho Blowntt*  
*Willism Gllaser*  
*John Duddley*  
*William Kynyett.<sup>65</sup>*

Cowdry/Storer's bill demonstrates that Leicester, although paying off a portion of the bill, remained in debt to her from before 13 July 1561 and beyond the last date of the examination on 26 February 1565(6). The payments recorded in the above bill would have been entered into the now lost household accounts. How these were entered was open to the interpretation of the account keeper. There appear to have been two types of entry, particularly in the first two surviving household accounts. The entry may have been included as a list which occurred in the case of payments to Mr Cowltrye shepster;

Paid unto Mr Cowltrye shepster the xxiiijth daie of December anno secundo  
 dominae Reginae xxli., the xth daye of January xlii., the [blank] day of  
 Aprell [xli. deleted], the xxixth daye of June followinge lxli., the [blank] of  
 September xli. and the ixth of December xxli. Cxlii. [x deleted].<sup>66</sup>

The payments might otherwise appear as separate entries as in the payment made to 'Mrs Coudry, Item peid unto Mrs Coudry for mony dewe unto her upon your

65 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 166.

66 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 119.

lordship's bill vjli xs'.<sup>67</sup> Whichever way they were recorded in the household accounts these payments marked the end of the procurement process with the payment of the supplier – although as Cowdry/Storer's bill demonstrates a debt might not be completely paid for some time. The fact that these accounting documents have survived demonstrates their importance to the household's financial management system. They also highlight that all those involved in Leicester's wardrobe network were required to keep, and understood the necessity of, records to verify payments if they were to be contested in the future.

The household accounts also offer glimpses of the procurement and production process apart from the payment for materials and finished garments seen in the bills and warrants. The entries in the accounts that record reward payments made by Leicester to servants in an artificer's shop demonstrate Leicester was physically present in the shop either for a fitting or to peruse merchandise.<sup>68</sup> These visits facilitated communication and the efficient running of the wardrobe network. As we have seen in the previous chapter the household accounts also demonstrate Leicester's shopping for items that were bought ready-to-wear.<sup>69</sup> Payments for transportation recorded in the household accounts demonstrate that artificers were being brought to Leicester presumably for discussion of products or to mend damaged goods.<sup>70</sup> These records tie Leicester into the shopping process and illustrate the continual flow of participants in the wardrobe network through each other's community. Whether these visits to shops continued, or diminished in number as Leicester's time was taken up by court activities can not be substantiated without further evidence.

Leicester's surviving fabric disbursement book reinforces the use of methodical record-keeping within the household. It acts as an inventory of fabrics delivered to artificers, having been created by Nightingale.<sup>71</sup> It is clearly drawn from the bills of the merchants supplying the fabric and therefore occurred after submission of the merchant's bills and the supporting documentation.<sup>72</sup> The records display the names of those to whom the fabric was delivered, the date of fabric delivery, fabric type with cost per yard or ell, the garment or product for which it was to be used, for whom the

---

67 Ibid., p. 53.

68 Ibid., pp. 45, 48.

69 Leicester appears to have purchased ready-made goods from various shops including the Holbornes' shop for stockings and gloves and the shop of Best the haberdasher for gloves. See Ibid., pp. 138, 139, 142, 146, 147.

70 Ibid., pp. 45, 159, 171.

71 Ibid., p. 481. Adams identifies Nightingale as probably Richard Nightingale an officer in Leicester's wardrobe at Leicester House. Although Nightingale identifies himself at the beginning of LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, f. 1, water damage obscures his full name.

72 Ibid., f. 1–4. Marginal notes identify Ambrose Smith as the fabric merchant.

final product was made, and the total cost of the fabric.<sup>73</sup> Such a document could have been used to check against artificers' bills and inventories of Leicester's wardrobe and household stuff. It also hints at other processes that have occurred in the production of the final products in particular decorative finishes applied to fabrics and the altering of a garment. The document also clearly identifies clothing liveries and textiles for members of Leicester's household, offering the opportunity to consult one document in order to examine the history of an object, be it dress or a household textile, instead of having to sift through bills and warrants. For example the diversity of the products itemised can be found in the following entries:

*dd to maynarde the 30th of auguste j ell of yello taffetye sarsnet to make cāneons for ij pere of hose for the ij huntsmen before writton ix.*<sup>74</sup>

*dd to John Tomlinson the same day ij elles of crimson taffetye sarsenet & a haulf at xs. thell to line the toppe of a canepe of carnation clothe of golde for my L[ord] xxvs.*<sup>75</sup>

*dd to mr whittell the xijth of october xiiij yerds of blacke Jeyne damaske at xiiijs the yerd to make a nyght gowne for my L[ord] ixli.ijs.*<sup>76</sup>

*dd to browne the shewmaker the 12th of desember 1571 half a yerde of white velvet to make shewes for my Lorde xs.*<sup>77</sup>

*dd to my L[ord's] boyer the same tyme iij nayles of crimson velvet to make handelles for my L[ord's] bowes iiijs.*<sup>78</sup>

While not strictly part of the procurement process the fabric disbursement book was a key tool in the wardrobe for identifying what had been made for Leicester and his household, by whom it was constructed, and when. To a lesser extent it offers information on cost, however it is purely the cost of the fabric identified not the whole product for which the artificer's bills were required to supply information on these additional costs. No book that records the complete cost of a garment is known to exist for Leicester, or indeed any of his contemporaries. There is no evidence that Leicester examined this document. However that fact that it survives amongst the Dudley papers indicates it was valued as a record of the transactions that occurred.

Not all materials for Leicester's wardrobe were procured in the manner described above. Numerous goods were sourced from overseas. In particular the outer fabrics Leicester

73 Entries for the first year of this document has been tabulated and included in Appendix 5.6.

74 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, f. 6. The two huntsmen had jerkins and doublets made for them by William Whittell earlier in the document.

75 Ibid., f. 6v. John Thomlinson, upholster, received livery in 1567–8. See Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 429, and a bill of Thomlinson's which survives in LHA, Dudley Papers, Box V, f. 242. He supplied all manner of household textiles specialising in silk based products, for example coverlets, bed hangings, curtains, cushions, chair coverings.

76 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, f. 7v.

77 Ibid., f. 9.

78 Ibid., f. 23. Leicester's bowyer is not identified. Fabric was delivered to him on 5 March 1572(3).

chose for his wardrobe were sourced by merchants primarily from the market centres in Europe where fabrics from across the continent converged, or directly from the source country, via the sea (see Appendix 4.1).<sup>79</sup> This document demonstrates that high quality silk fabrics were imported from France, Italy and Spain by sea directly or via key European markets. As we have seen in Chapter Three Richard Pecoock supplied silks to Leicester but did not import these silks. Merchants such as John Isham imported fabrics and sold to retailers including Pecoock.<sup>80</sup> This would suggest that the fabrics available for Leicester's wardrobe in London were dictated by their availability at the overseas markets, what the merchant chose to purchase, along with the resources and good credit of the merchant conducting the trade. This points to Leicester not being able to react so rapidly to European fashion changes, as is reflected in his wardrobe, although this may also have been a personal preference. As we have seen in Chapter Two Leicester dressed in a fashionable, but conservative manner. However this did not mean he necessarily settled for only the fabrics available to him in England.

In centres where silk weaving took place there was more opportunity to deal directly with the fabric producer and therefore influence the fabric choices available. This is seen in a surviving garment, a cloak, that had belonged to Don Garcia de' Medici.<sup>81</sup> The silk damask from which the cloak was constructed features the Medici emblem that points to a direct commission of a Florentine weaver.<sup>82</sup> Indeed Roberta Landini posits that both Cosimo and his wife Eleonora were important patrons of weaving within Florence.<sup>83</sup> Further to this Eleonora employed two weavers within her household.<sup>84</sup> There is currently little evidence to suggest that Leicester commissioned the weaving of fabric for dress, however he did commission the weaving of tapestry

---

79 TNA, SP 12/35, ff. 81–84v.

80 See Ramsay, *John Isham Mercer*, pp. 21, 46, 52, 111, 116, 163, for Pecoock's entries in Isham's accounts.

81 RO Landini, *Moda a Firenze 1540–1580 Cosimo I de' Medici's Style*, Mauro Pagliai Editore, Firenze, 2011, pp. 126–129. Don Garcia de' Medici (1547–1562) was the seventh child of Cosimo de' Medici Grand Duke of Florence from 1537–1574 and his wife Eleonora di Toledo.

82 *Ibid.*, pp. 193–199. Landini lists silk merchants who supplied the Medici, a list that includes weavers. RO Landini and B Niccoli, *Moda a Firenze 1540–1580 Lo stile di Eleonora di Toledo e la sua influenza*, Pagliai Polistampa, Firenze, 2005, p. 189, identifies the damask as including the Medici ring emblem, and that it was woven in Florence.

83 *Ibid.*, pp. 183–195.

84 See *Ibid.*, p. 186 for information on Eleonora's weavers.



and napery.<sup>85</sup> Tantalisingly Leicester's accounts name two London-based silk weavers – James Mondaye and Gwyllam Tyan.<sup>86</sup> Leicester purchased goods from both men in 1560, which included white silk for a pair of hose.<sup>87</sup> However it is not clear whether Mondaye wove the silk in England for Leicester, or had it imported. Unfortunately without further evidence for this fabric being woven in England, or it being a product that Mondaye relayed from abroad, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions on Leicester's patronage of weavers for his wardrobe.

It is clear that Leicester, and a number of his fellow courtiers, were not entirely happy with the material they could obtain from London-based fabric suppliers. It is notable that Leicester is found in London Port books importing fabric himself.<sup>88</sup> This appears to have been a widespread practice within the court. During 1565 the earl of Arundel, duchess of Suffolk, Lady Throckmorton, the earl of Pembroke, and the earl

---

85 See Goldring, 'The Earl of Leicester's Inventory', particularly p. 41, 58, for an image of one of the tapestries that still survives bearing Leicester's arms, and description of a long table cloth of fine damask 'with sundry scutcheons of your Lordship's armes on it'. Two towels and eight napkins similarly woven made up the set. The Victoria & Albert Museum has one of Leicester's commissioned tapestries in its collection, accession number T.320-1977, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O78831/arms-of-the-earl-of-tapestry-unknown/>>. The Burrell Collection, Glasgow, holds two smaller tapestries also commissioned by Leicester exhibiting his arms, accession number 47.2, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://collections.glasgowmuseums.com/starobject.html?oid=40941>>. There is some debate regarding the weaving of these tapestries. Having previously been described as produced by the Sheldon workshop (an English based weaving studio) there is suggestion by both the Victoria and Albert Museum and The Burrell Collection that they may be of European origin. The napery too was probably woven in the Low Countries.

86 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 124, 148. Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part I*, pp. 185, 314, lists James Munday as living in the parish of 'St Katheryns Colmans' in 1549 and in 'St Leonardes' Parish, 'Aldrichgate Ward' in 1564. *Ibid.*, *Part I*, pp. 313, 326, 432, 438, listed Gwyllam Tyan/Tyon, denizen as living in 'St Leonardes' Parish, 'Aldrichgate Ward', in 1564, 1567, 1571. He is also recorded as having been in England for twenty eight years in 1571 which places his immigration around 1543. Tyan is also found in *Ibid.*, *Part II*, pp. 185, 229, 477, in the same ward for the years 1576, 1582 and 1595 when he is described as a 'poore old man'. See also *Ibid.*, *Part III*, p. 437, where Tyan, still in the same ward, is described as a silkweaver, Dutchman and denizen, attending the English church.

87 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 124, 148. The first entries for Tyan and Monday, both described as silk weavers, are slightly ambiguous as they describe payment for money due, and money due for work. As their profession is listed it is assumed the payments were for silk weaving carried out for Leicester. The entry (p. 148) reads 'Item geavin in earnest to Mondaye for silke for a paier of whight hose for your lordship xs.'

88 TNA, E 190/3/2, unfoliated. In May Leicester imported goods on the Owl of Haarlem, mastered by John Emyson, which included 6 holland sheets; In June Leicester imported goods on the Lavynder of Milton mastered by John Wynlye out of Antwerp, which included 1 piece of velvet.

of Huntington all imported various materials including fabrics.<sup>89</sup> While all must have used agents abroad to gather the materials for their purposes Leicester in particular used his family, political connections and merchants to source fabrics through associates abroad. However he was still at the mercy of what was available to those persons and could only describe his requirements in general terms. This is seen in Leicester's letter to William Davison, the Queen's envoy to the Low Countries in 1579.<sup>90</sup>

Davison's role in the Low Countries was a political one and his correspondence chiefly

---

89 Ibid., unfoliated. In May 1565 the earl of Arundel imported goods on the Jonas of Flushing, mastered by Jacob Stoffell, products included a chest containing a piece of satin, 2 remnants of velvet, 11 pair of silk hose, 9 pieces of holland (linen), 6 pieces diaper damask work for board clothes, 12 dozen damask napkins, 8 curryers, 2 fine jerkin of leather embroidered, 4 Spanish skins, 1 cupboard cloth of fine white silk. Also in May the duchess of Suffolk imported goods on the Sampson of Bruges, mastered by Jacob Albright, products included 38 yards of damask table cloth, 3 pieces of damask towelling, 2 pieces of diaper table cloth, 3 pieces of diaper towelling. In June the earl of Pembroke imported goods on the Greyhound of Lee mastered by William Moett and the Mary Grace of Lee mastered by Rychard Morcok both out of Antwerp, products included, 1 piece of black velvet, 2 pieces black satin, 1 piece of black damask, 1 piece further piece of velvet, 1 piece of yellow velvet, 1 piece of green velvet, 1 piece of fine holland cloth, 4 pieces of black velvet, 1 piece of white velvet, 1 piece of blue velvet, 1 piece of crimson velvet. Also in June Lady Throckmorton imported goods on the Greyhound and the Mary Grace (see above for masters), products included 1 piece of black satin measuring 30 yards, 1 piece of black velvet measuring 20 yards. Also in June the duchess of Suffolk imported goods on the Greyhound including 12 pieces of holland, 1 piece of diaper table cloth, 5 pieces of diaper towelling, 1 piece of holland, 2 pieces grosgrain chamlet, 12 yards black damask, 3 yards velvet. In August the earl of Huntington imported goods on the Mary Thomas of Lee mastered by Robert Dewebb out of Antwerp, including 38 pieces of holland.

90 Davison was sent to the Low Countries on 3 August 1577, see, AJ Butler (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 12: 1577–78, 1901*, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=73282&strquery=davison>>. See also, S Adams, 'Davison, William (d.1608)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 4 Jan 2013 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7306>>. William Davison's wife, Catherine Spelman, was the granddaughter of Jane Dudley's first cousin (i.e. Jane Dudley, duchess of Northumberland, Leicester's mother). See TNA, SP 15/26, f. 23. The letter reads as follows; '*Cosen Davison. Touching the sylkes where of I wrote unto you, I very earnestly pray you in my wise to take vp and stave for me of crimosen and blacke vellets ^and sattens^ and of suche other coloured sylkes and vellets as I wrote to you for to the value of three or fowre thousand crownes. Also yf there be any good clothe of tissue, or of goulde or suche other pretye stuffe to stave for me, lyke wise thereof to the velue of three or fowre thousand crownes Also yf there be any good clothe of tissue or of goulde or suche other pretye stuffe to stave for me lyke wise therof to the value of three or fowre hundred pwndes. And asure yo[u]rselfe what soever the charge shalbe you shall be no ley leaser by it thoughe I choulde not go throughe w[i]th the bargain, But I mynde certainly to go throughe w[i]th it And will take ordre for payment as sone as I shall heare from you what you have stayed and what the prices are w[hi]ch in any wise I pray you lett me knowe as sone as may be And so w[i]th my very hartye comendacons fare ye well ffrom the Court the xxvth of Aprill 1579 Your lovyng cosin R Leycester*

*I pray you further make stay of so much stuff as I have wrytten for and the money shalbe sent you when Imedyaty upyn y[ou]r answer that you have made bargyn for me. Lett it be of the best sort of euery kinde I haue wrytten for I meane according to ye pryce as ye best ye secound & third sort to be worth the vallew and to bargin accordingly & I wyll send one over uppon your answer to take order for payment. RL'*

reflects this.<sup>91</sup> However it is clear he was also open to performing other tasks when required. Leicester's letter clearly gave Davison the authority to purchase goods in place of a warrant. It also demonstrates Leicester was still interested in fine silk fabrics, so much so that he was seeking to source them from overseas. This letter also underlines the different relationship Leicester had with Davison when compared to his wardrobe suppliers previously discussed. Claire Walsh has termed this mode of purchasing goods as 'proxy shopping'.<sup>92</sup> While this phrase appears to suit Leicester's use of Davison in this particular instance it oversimplifies what was a rather more complicated relationship between the two men. Although there was a familial connection, Davison was primarily responsible to the Queen and her Privy Councillors in his role as an envoy. As a Privy Councillor Leicester was able to correspond readily with Davison. Separating Davison's obligation to carry out the requested tasks for Leicester as his relation or as a Privy Councillor may perhaps be determined by the end use of the goods requested.

Leicester's request for Davison to seek out velvets and satins of crimson and black, and also look out for cloth of gold and tissue took advantage of Davison's location in Antwerp.<sup>93</sup> Antwerp had been the leading market of northwest Europe during the first half of the sixteenth century and had developed a permanent market.<sup>94</sup> Although still a market city when Davison was appointed, Antwerp was in decline having lost many of its foreign merchants, who were replaced by local merchants.<sup>95</sup> Davison's ability to complete the shopping task for Leicester would have been limited to what was available and what he thought would satisfy Leicester. It is clear that Leicester considered that the quantity of money involved in the transaction would cause Davison some concern and required firm assurance of payment. This highlights the importance of good credit

---

91 A number of Davison's letter during this period survive, see Butler, *Elizabeth, Volume 12*. See also AJ Butler (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 13: 1578–79*, 1903, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=821>>. The correspondence is primarily information on the political situation in the Low Countries. See Adams, 'Davison', *ODNB*, for a summary of the surviving Davison papers. Adams reflects that there are a lack of personal papers amongst those that survive.

92 Walsh, 'The Social Relations of Shopping', p. 338. Walsh defines proxy shopping as 'shopping carried out for someone by family, friends or socially significant contacts'.

93 Adams, 'Davison', *ODNB*. Davison was sent to the Netherlands as a resident agent in August 1577 and stayed until May 1579.

94 O Gelderblom, 'The Organization of Long-Distance Trade in England and the Dutch Republic, 1550–1650', in O Gelderblom (ed.), *The Political Economy of the Dutch Republic*, Ashgate, Farnham, 2009, pp. 223–254, p. 226. See also GD Ramsay, 'The Undoing of the Italian Mercantile Colony in Sixteenth Century London', in NB Harte and KG Ponting (eds), *Textile History and Economic History Essays in Honour of Miss Julia de Lacy Mann*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1973, pp. 22–49, p. 24; and O Gelderblom, *The Decline of Fairs and Merchant Guilds in the Low Countries, 1250–1650*, 2005, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://www.lowcountries.nl/workingpapers.php>>.

95 G Unwin, 'The Merchant Adventurers' Company in the Reign of Elizabeth', *The Economic History Review*, vol.1, no.1, 1927, pp. 35–64, particularly p. 61 where Unwin discusses the departure of the Merchant Adventurers from Antwerp in 1564. See also Gelderblom, 'The Organization of Long-Distance Trade', p. 227.

in making these long distance transactions. Considering the length of time Leicester took to pay some of his bills in the 1560's this may have been a very legitimate concern for Davison. Indeed Davison would have been dealing directly with the merchants selling the cloth and therefore responsible in the first instance for payment. There is no further information on whether Davison was successful in purchasing fabrics for Leicester although he had previously written to Leicester communicating prices for silk, which indicates the exchanging of letters regarding silks had been ongoing for at least two months.<sup>96</sup> This highlights one of the pitfalls of proxy shopping, it could take some time to complete the purchase, if it was indeed completed. There is no information either on the final use for these particular materials. They may have been destined for dress, furnishings or use in the Royal Stables.<sup>97</sup>

Fabrics were not the only products that Davison was asked to provide information on for possible purchase. Davison informed Leicester on the cost of armour and was able to compare prices between English manufacture and that which was available to him in the Low Countries.<sup>98</sup> Leicester's use of Davison to explore availability of products was grounded in both a personal connection and a governmental relationship. The personal connection was vital in the procurement of products for Leicester's wardrobe, not just in the relationship with Davison. The governmental relationship put Davison in the role of a servant to Leicester as one of the Privy Council. Where Davison was requested to ascertain prices and availability of armour, probably for the potential equipping of English soldiers in support of the Prince of Orange, his position is more closely aligned to his role as a government official.<sup>99</sup> However the final end use for the fabrics discussed in the letters is less apparent. This hinders the ability to establish the balance of the relationship between the two men in this instance.

Leicester was not alone in using those posted abroad, or mercantile contacts, to source goods, and indeed master craftsmen from abroad. In 1561 William Cecil, was recorded as corresponding with Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, ambassador to France, requesting a goldsmith be sent from France to satisfy the Queen and her ladies' desire

---

96 BL, Cotton Galba C/VI, f. 310X, Davison to Leicester 26 March 1579. The letter refers to prices for silks having been sent in a previous letter. TNA, SP 15/26, f. 23, Leicester to Davison 25 April 1579, see transcription above. The letters regarding silks were sent to Davison in Antwerp where he was based when he replied.

97 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box II/6 is an undated warrant that enabled Lord Robert Dudley, Master of the Horse to '*furnish the royal stable*', with an allowance of £400 per year.

98 TNA, SP 83/5, unfoliated, dated 18 January 1577(8) Davison to Leicester, including a short note on the cost of pieces of armour '*as Collonell Morgan dothe make offer to provide within this lowe Counties in thre weekes space*'. Davison also suggests that ordinary corselets are more reasonably priced in England.

99 Adams, 'Davison', *ODNB*.

for jewellery.<sup>100</sup> The widespread use of government officials posted overseas in the procurement of items of dress by those at court, particularly the Privy Council deserves further exploration, but will not be attempted here as it falls outside the scope of this dissertation.

Leicester made use of his position at court to cultivate his association with leading figures in the merchant world. He also used his relationships with foreign merchants to procure items of dress, or materials for dress, for himself, and the Queen, overseas. This gave him access to some of Europe's leading craftspeople and most luxuriant textile materials. It was clearly a situation which was beneficial to all parties. This can be seen in surviving evidence for both Benedict Spinola and Tommaso Baroncelli.<sup>101</sup> Ramsey suggests that Spinola put 'his widespread international contacts and other resources at the disposal of his high-placed friends and customers at court'.<sup>102</sup> While it is possible that Leicester's relationship with Baroncelli developed through his association with Spinola, it appears more likely to have been through the Queen's groom of the privy chamber Giovanni Baptista Castiglioni.<sup>103</sup> However the Spinolas were certainly involved in cultivating the relationship between Baroncelli and Leicester.<sup>104</sup> Leicester's use of Spinola and Baroncelli for procuring objects for his wardrobe deserves further analysis.

Benedict Spinola was purchasing fabrics for Leicester in overseas markets, some of

---

100 J Arnold, 'Sweet England's Jewels', in *Princely Magnificence Court Jewels of the Renaissance, 1500–1630*, Debrett's Peerage Limited, London, 1980, pp. 31–40, p. 40. See a transcript of the letter Arnold quotes in P Yorke (ed), *Miscellaneous State Papers From 1501 to 1726*, Vol. I, London, 1778, pp. 170–172, Sir William Cecil, to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, May 1561, particularly p. 172. See also Archer, 'Conspicuous Consumption', p. 48. Archer quotes Arnold incorrectly transposing 'himself' for 'herself', which changes the interpretation of the statement. The original letter does not appear to be amongst the State Papers housed at the National Archives, the 1778 publication locating it within the papers of Philip Yorke, the second earl of Hardwicke.

101 For Spinola see Bennell, 'Spinola' *ODNB*. For Baroncelli see, The Medici Archive Project, 'Baroncelli, Tommaso di Bartolomeo', *The Medici Archive Project*, online accessed 30 September 2012 <<http://bia.medici.org/DocSources/Home.do>>.

102 Ramsay, 'The Undoing of the Italian Mercantile Colony', p. 42.

103 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 196, 207, 223, 226, 252, are the references to Castiglioni, or 'Mr Bapteste' in Leicester's accounts. His son, Sir Francis Castilion, served in Leicester's household. HMC, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts*, p. 50, Baroncelli's letter of 21 February 1565 discusses Leicester's request mediated through Castiglioni to find an armourer. Francis Bartie may also have been involved in the Baroncelli/Leicester relationship. Baroncelli was one of the business partners with Bartie in an attempt to set up salt production in England, see E Hughes, 'The English Monopoly of Salt in the Years 1563–71', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 40, no.159, 1925, pp. 334–350, particularly pp. 337–338 and also HMC, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts*, p. 50.

104 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 149, is the reference to a cup and cover commissioned and purchased by the Spinolas and given as a gift on Leicester's behalf to Baroncelli on the christening of Baroncelli's daughter Elizabeth, to whom Leicester was godfather.

which were used to construct elements of dress.<sup>105</sup> He was also sourcing garments from overseas markets.<sup>106</sup> Spinola's brother Pasquale, who was based in Antwerp, was mentioned in Spinola's extant bill sourcing goods for Leicester.<sup>107</sup> Pasquale himself was also in contact with Leicester.<sup>108</sup> Oscar Gelderblom reflects on the steps necessary for a merchant to conduct trade successfully in the Low Countries in his examination of the career of Hans Thijs.<sup>109</sup> Gelderblom highlights the necessities for a prosperous business practise as a merchant. These were a combination of personal relationships, good quality merchandise, the ability to negotiate a good price with suppliers and ensure delivery of the goods along with efficiency in selling goods and the financial resources to maintain business.<sup>110</sup> A similar thread can be seen in the evidence for the Spinola model as the company of brothers sought to procure stuff for Leicester's wardrobe and the wider court.<sup>111</sup> Benedict, the face of the business in London, successfully maintained a personal relationship with Leicester. Even Spinola's bill conveyed the message that he was giving Leicester the best deal on his goods with entries such as

*dd wyttell The xxvth of maye xvj yardes iij qtrs of duble veluit blakel playne on thone side & unshorne on the other at xxxiiij. ye yarde / thoughe it cost me more xxviiijli. ixs. vjd.*<sup>112</sup>

The quality of the merchandise the Spinolas supplied, certainly as it is described in the bill, was high, and Leicester appears to have been happy with the products, continuing their trading relationship over an extended period.<sup>113</sup> Pasquale procured the goods by

---

105 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f.80. William Whittell charged 8s. for the making of a doublet using white taffeta striped with gold '*that you had of Mr Speneyley*'. Ibid., f.146–150, is Spinola's bill which lists an array of goods Spinola sourced overseas including materials for Leicester's wardrobe.

106 Ibid., f.148v. Two shirts decorated with white work embroidery were delivered on 27 October 1564; they had been bought in Flanders for Leicester.

107 Ibid., ff.146–150. While Pasquale is the only brother mentioned in Benedict's bill his brothers Francisco and Giacomo were also based in Antwerp. See Bennell, 'Spinola', *ODNB*.

108 HMC, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts*, p. 47. Pasquale Spinola to the earl of Leicester, 22 January 1564(5).

109 Gelderblom, 'The Governance of Early Modern Trade', particularly p. 610.

110 Ibid.

111 Benedict Spinola supplied goods and financial services to leading figures at court including the Queen and Sir Henry Sidney.

112 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 149.

113 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 41, 53, 161. Spinola was recorded in Leicester's accounts from the beginning of the reign and clearly continued their relationship into the 1570's, most likely until Spinola's death in 1580.

negotiating with craftspeople in Antwerp who produced the articles.<sup>114</sup> These goods were shipped by Pasquale and delivered to Leicester by Benedict.<sup>115</sup> Finally the Spinolas had the financial resources to ensure their business was successful.<sup>116</sup> The Spinolas collaborated in the procurement of goods to ensure their client's needs were met. This also included sourcing products from Italy.<sup>117</sup> They had access to craftspeople and materials in Antwerp at a time when the English merchants were no longer in residence. Leicester's wardrobe network was therefore expanded beyond the shores of England into areas where his personal contacts could source the necessary products, a process Leicester was clearly engaged in.

The Florentine merchant Tommaso Baroncelli, based in Antwerp in the 1560s, was also used by Leicester to source goods.<sup>118</sup> Baroncelli's ability to fulfil the criteria Gelderblom outlined for a successful merchant is more difficult to determine due to a lack of evidence.<sup>119</sup> There is a partial survival of correspondence between Leicester and Baroncelli for a short period in early 1565 which provides glimpses of the procurement process used.<sup>120</sup> No bills are known to have survived. While the underlying theme of the correspondence is limited to the procurement of armour, an armourer, horses and embroidered bodices for the Queen, the personal relationship is evident in the references to Leicester being godfather to Baroncelli's child. When this relationship

---

114 HMC, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts*, p. 47, Pasquale Spinola to the earl of Leicester, 22 January 1564(5). Pasquale writes of the christening gift for Baroncelli's child that he was not able to have a silver bowl and ewer made immediately, however a silver-gilt cup could be produced in three days which he would then deliver. See also, LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 147v. Pasquale had a pair of fine sheets made for Leicester embroidered with white work for which Leicester was charged '£19.2s.8d.' He also purchased for Leicester a green velvet bed and bedstead with counterpoint and an embroidered green velvet table carpet for which Leicester was charged '£263.12s.8d.' He also purchased four chairs covered with green velvet and five cushions embroidered with gold for which Leicester was charged '£39.2s.10d.' These goods were most likely made to Leicester's specification. They could be the green velvet bed and bedstead, table carpet and chairs mentioned in the c.1578 inventory at Kenilworth Castle, see, Goldring, 'The Earl of Leicester's Inventory', p. 42.

115 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 147v. Benedict charged '*for the freight & charges of the same bedd & other stufe rexd out of flanders iijli.xvjs.*' This was the cost for shipping of the bed, bedstead, bedding, chairs and cushions noted above in footnote number 114.

116 Bennell, 'Spinola', *ODNB*. Bennell records that Spinola's state and business interests were such that he was owed £27,879.9s.8d on 24 June 1574.

117 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 148v. Although not for Leicester's wardrobe the ten cases of Normandy glass bought in Rome establishes the Spinolas' ability to access the markets in Rome.

118 Baroncelli returned to Florence in 1565 to be appointed maggiordomo (butler/steward) to Cosimo I de' Medici, see, The Medici Archive Project, 'Baroncelli, Tommaso'.

119 Gelderblom, 'The Governance of Early Modern Trade', particularly p. 610.

120 TNA, SP 70/76, f. 77, Baroncelli to Leicester 29 January 1565; TNA, SP 70/77, f.70, Baroncelli to Leicester 25 March 1565; TNA, SP 70/77, f. 73, Baroncelli to Leicester 26 March 1565; HMC, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts*, p. 44, Baroncelli to Leicester 3 January 1565; *Ibid.*, p. 46, Leicester to Baroncelli 16 January 1565; *Ibid.*, pp. 50–51, Baroncelli to Leicester 21 February 1565.

was established is not known. The act of accepting the position of godparent to a child infers that the relationship is one of more than casual acquaintance. Indeed it would suggest a longer standing and closer relationship than extant correspondence allows. Unfortunately the evidence that might support further conclusions on their relationship have not yet been discovered. It is clear however that Baroncelli was able to combine the resources of his powerful merchant family in Florence with important Flanders merchant connections, through his wife's family, to tap into a wide network of master craftsmen and suppliers.<sup>121</sup>

The extant letters highlight the importance of patterns in the procurement process in order to determine the most suitable designs for both armour and clothing. Indeed it was from the pattern supplied to Leicester for the Queen's bodices that further direction was made on styling. This is seen in Leicester's letter to Baroncelli on 16 January 1565, which notes that:

The patterns of bodices which you have sent me for the Queen are beautiful, but not what she wants, having several of that make. She wants the kind used in Spain and Italy, worked with gold and silver.<sup>122</sup>

The pitfalls of long distance procurement can be clearly seen in Leicester's letter. Patterns take some time to produce. They have to be conveyed by the merchant's courier across the sea, the efficiency of which might be weather dependant. Any alterations would have to be communicated back by letter before the process could be repeated until the final design was established. This was a much more protracted process than relying on locally available artificers. However it did ultimately provide a product different to that which was available in an English-based network and was evidently worth the wait.

While the quality of the merchandise appears to be high, Baroncelli's ability to negotiate a good price with suppliers is difficult to establish without further evidence such as a bill. He does however, as Spinola had done, advise that he would give a good deal on products as seen in his suggestion that if he were able to supply gunpowder to the Queen it would be at 'no profit to myself.'<sup>123</sup> His letters demonstrate that he was concerned to assure Leicester that the acquisition of the goods he was sourcing for him was in hand by keeping him up to date with progress of production or inspections

---

121 Baroncelli married Chiara Gualterotti the daughter of Giovan Battista Gualterotti and Contessa di Vanich who was a member of an important merchant family of Ghent, see The Medici Archive Project, 'Baroncelli, Tommaso'.

122 HMC, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts*, p. 46.

123 *Ibid.*, p. 51.



of the product.<sup>124</sup> That objects were delivered is evidenced by the gift and patterns Baroncelli sent via Leicester to the Queen.<sup>125</sup> While there is no information on the financial transactions that occurred in Baroncelli's business it is clear he was able to call on resources of his wider mercantile family if required. In these long-distance negotiations for products the ability to communicate well, and frequently were clearly necessary to ensure a successful business. This is particularly the case for Baroncelli who, unlike the Spinolas, did not have such a high profile for his business in London. It also reiterates the importance of the use of letters in the procurement process as we have seen with the Davison letter above. These letters also firmly tie Leicester into the negotiations.

Baroncelli and Spinola were able to source a wide variety of goods for Leicester, including items for his wider wardrobe.<sup>126</sup> Neither specialised in a particular product for Leicester as other suppliers to his wardrobe did. Their skills lay in being able to secure suitable products at an acceptable price and deliver them to Leicester. What these two merchants also had in common was that they also offered the services of master craftspeople, based overseas, or indeed convinced them to travel to England to attend on Leicester. These included a tailor and an armourer.<sup>127</sup> While the outcome for both of the master craftsmen sent to Leicester is not known, the fact that he was seeking foreign masters to contribute to his wardrobe adds weight to the argument that his network had a high proportion of stranger artificers by choice. Leicester was seeking the difference that a foreign craftsperson might offer.

## Conclusion

Leicester was central to the management of his wardrobe network. Following Leicester's instructions members of his household facilitated negotiations and ensured

---

124 Ibid., p. 44. In his letter of 3 January 1565 Baroncelli informed Leicester that the mares that were to be sent had been held up by the weather, the arquebus was to be finished in four days, he will inform Leicester when the painter from Florence has begun his journey, requests Leicester to send a pattern for armour and enquires if the sample of gunpowder he sent was tested by Warwick. Ibid., p. 50, in his letter of 21 February 1565 Baroncelli describes his inspection of a horse Leicester has expressed an interest in purchasing and confirms that once he has received the horses from the Prince of Orange and her Highness he will send them together as soon as possible, once the ice has cleared.

125 Ibid., p. 46, for the bodice patterns. See TNA, SP 70/76, f. 77, for the book.

126 Ibid. Baroncelli enquired of the patterns for armour if they were for Leicester or the Queen. There is no suggestion that the Queen had any of her own personal armour, however Leicester had a number of suits of armour and therefore this armour was most likely for him.

127 TNA, SP 70/77, ff. 70, 73. Baroncelli names the Florentine armourer and engraver Heliseo (or Eliseo) Libertes he is sending to Leicester with two suits of armour of his own making, along with armour for a horse and drawings. A Florentine painter was also reported to be leaving Florence imminently to carry out some painting for Leicester, see, HMC, *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts*, p. 44. LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 148v., is Spinola's entry on his bill for the charges incurred by Pole the Flemish tailor sent to Leicester in England.

all the paperwork was in order so that the elements of dress came together seamlessly. They also kept track of the pieces within the wardrobe, with Leicester's oversight. While his hand is not detectable in the writing of warrants it is clear that Leicester remained engaged with his wardrobe network and continued to personally source additional materials through overseas merchants and agents.

Through the re-examination here of the questions that formed the framework for this chapter one can better reflect upon the implications of the findings. The questions will be considered in turn and are restated here. To what extent did Leicester manage his wardrobe network? What were the dynamics of the supply relationship between the suppliers themselves and with Leicester? To what extent was Leicester's wardrobe procurement process demonstrated in that of his contemporaries?

When pondering the extent to which Leicester managed his wardrobe network the written documentation provides clues to his involvement. Most importantly clear communication was the underlying factor evident in the sourcing of goods for Leicester's wardrobe. That communication took a number of forms. The most significant form were the face-to-face conversations, the ephemeral nature of which has left little evidence. However, as we have seen, the fact that these conversations took place is demonstrated in the surviving accounting documentation that relates to Leicester's wardrobe. The ability of the wardrobe network to function successfully relied on all parties communicating effectively, not simply with Leicester, but between each other across the network.

The documents generated in the production and procurement of Leicester's wardrobe highlight the assiduous use of paper records within the network and the household. The use of warrants, receipts and bills each demonstrate an aspect of the procurement and production of Leicester's wardrobe. The flexibility of warrants that were sanctioned following the delivery of the goods demonstrates trust between the supplier and Leicester. Warrants written to order goods exhibited the whispers of the background conversation between Leicester and his artificers enabling the request for the necessary quantities of materials. The survival of original warrants for a personal wardrobe appears to be unique for a figure outside the monarchy. Indeed those that exist for the monarchy are largely copies and do not demonstrate to the same extent how these documents actually functioned. Leicester's wardrobe warrants then contribute to the understanding of the procurement process for this period in a manner that has not been identified previously.

Designs were communicated through samples and patterns which were used widely within Leicester's wardrobe network. Indeed patterns were particularly necessary when long distance shopping was being conducted. To achieve success through correspondence shopping, letters that conveyed as much information as possible were

essential, particularly on the part of the merchant endeavouring to satisfy his client's needs. Samples too were used to communicate information on products available to Leicester and the artificers within the network. Although little evidence survives for the use of samples the fact that specific fabrics types, with clear identification of colour, were ordered in a warrant demonstrates that these were in use. As has been demonstrated the artificer also had a clear understanding of the products available to him, particularly in the case of the tailor and hosier, for use on garments for Leicester and his household.

Receipts issued between artificers as a product moved through the network highlight their interaction and the demands placed on a supplier to demonstrate product delivery. The culmination of these demands occurred with the examination of the paperwork in Leicester's household when a supplier's bill was scrutinised for payment. The bills themselves recorded not only products supplied but included information on payments received and who within the household took delivery of the product. The supplier provided as much information as possible to ensure his or her bill satisfied the examiners ensuring a partial or full payment on a bill. These payments are what were recorded in the household accounts. The inclusion in the accounts might be a simple entry of a name and a figure which hides the procurement process evidenced by the documents that resulted in that entry. Supplementary documents such as the fabric disbursement book were used to identify wardrobe products that had been produced for Leicester and his household. It was a document clearly for use within the household. Of particular interest to the compiler of the book was the cost and quantity of fabric delivered. Here again the survival of Leicester's papers is invaluable for shedding new light on the process for the production of a nobleman's wardrobe.

The ability to communicate face to face was without doubt preferable to shopping by correspondence. However the ability to tap into a wider network of resources was clearly utilised by Leicester and the wider court. It has been possible to explore further Leicester's use of letters in the procurement process, particularly in search of overseas products. Through these letters Leicester demonstrated his desire for products that were not available to him in England. They also show that Leicester had access to some of the leading craftspeople and merchants in Europe and endeavoured to utilise them. That he developed strong relationships with the Italian merchants he dealt with is clear. As Antwerp featured so significantly in each of the letters discussed it is not surprising that Leicester leaned towards Dutch styling for his wardrobe. Letters replaced warrants in the procurement process when dealing with overseas correspondents. Although the supply process was much protracted, the effort involved in sourcing goods from overseas was clearly acceptable if the end product suited Leicester's needs.

When considering the dynamics of the supply relationship between the suppliers themselves and with Leicester a number of limitations became apparent. Much of the

true nature of the relationships between Leicester and his suppliers would be found in their everyday exchanges that occurred when discussing products. Unfortunately this evidence is without material form and therefore any assessment of it can only be speculative. However it is clear that the successful functioning of the network relied on each member understanding their role, ensuring it was executed to the best of their ability before it was passed to the next in the chain. Surviving receipts reflect a brisk business-like manner between the members which ensured each party played their part in the accountability for a product. Relationships could sometimes be less formal though, and developed into relationships of trust, such as are seen in Mountague's warrants.

While it is possible that Leicester's contemporaries followed a similar method of procurement for their wardrobes there is scant evidence for the practice, apart from the Great Wardrobe. While parallels can be drawn with the functioning of Leicester's wardrobe and that of the Great Wardrobe, particularly the use of warrants, no such parallels can yet be demonstrated for his contemporaries.

The surviving documents that demonstrate the procurement process for Leicester's wardrobe also provide unparalleled information on the contents of a courtier's wardrobe. Through satisfying the requirements of the household examiners the bills and warrants offer information on the products available to Leicester through his wardrobe network. They also demonstrate the skill and resourcefulness of the master craftspeople who supplied Leicester. The following two chapters focus on the production and business practise of two of Leicester's master craftspeople who were represented by bills and warrants in Leicester's papers. These two suppliers become exemplars of two distinct types of supplier: the first is an English citizen of London, while the second is an immigrant. Each was a master craftsman who strove to satisfy Leicester's wardrobe demands.



## Chapter Five: William Whittell, Merchant Taylor, in focus

### Introduction

As we have seen in the previous chapter Leicester's wardrobe was created by a wide network of merchants and artificers, and Leicester himself was at the heart of the process. Undoubtedly the crucial element of these networks were the individuals. They were the network. The glue that held them together was satisfying the needs of their client and his household. Yet suppliers themselves lived within their own networks, professional and social. Any study of Leicester's wardrobe networks would not be complete without an examination of the individuals involved in the network. However there must be some constraints placed upon this examination, as with possible subjects in excess of 57 individuals, any in depth analysis is precluded for this dissertation. Some suppliers have already received attention from other scholars. High profile figures such as Sir Thomas Gresham have been the subject of several biographies.<sup>1</sup> Anne Sutton includes a short biography of William Byrde in her examination of the Mercers' Company, although she does not reflect on his role as a mercer to Leicester's wardrobe.<sup>2</sup> Other figures have received attention for their connection to the Great Wardrobe such as David Smith, with little reference to their wider client base, including Leicester.<sup>3</sup> While there are prominent figures within the list of suppliers who deserve further analysis there is not the space here to carry out such an examination.<sup>4</sup> What is evident is that there is little consistency in the amount of information available for any of the suppliers in Leicester's supply network. The bulk of information demonstrating their dealings with Leicester pertains to the first decade of Elizabeth's reign. This includes entries of their names in household accounts, for a

---

1 Sir Thomas Gresham (c.1518-1579) supplied Leicester with gold canvas in Chancy's 1558-9 account; Adams, *Household Accounts*, p.65. See in particular, I Blanchard, 'Gresham, Sir Thomas (c.1518-1579)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 2 March 2012, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11505>>. JW Burgon, *The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Gresham Compiled Chiefly from his Correspondence Preserved in Her Majesty's State-Paper Office, 2 Volumes*, Robert Jennings, London, 1839.

2 Sutton, *Mercery*, pp. 526-527. William Byrde, Mercer supplied Leicester with fine linen cloth in Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 118, 134. Byrde also loaned Leicester money, including a sum of £1,630 by June 1561, see, *Ibid.*, p. 113.

3 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 99, 106, 141, 145, 149, 150, 179, 187, 189-192, 194. David Smith was a member of the Great Wardrobe from Elizabeth's accession until his death in 1587. Those suppliers that have entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* online include David Smith, see, Archer, 'Smith', *ODNB*. For Benidict Spinola see Bennell, 'Spinola', *ODNB*. For Thomas Aldersey see, RCD Baldwin, 'Aldersey, Thomas (1521/2–1598)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 21 September 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/73473>>. For Sir Thomas Gresham see, Blanchard, 'Gresham' *ODNB*

4 William Chelsham (Mercer), William Denham (Goldsmith), William Holbourne (Haberdasher), Robert Brandon (Goldsmith), Adam Bland (Skinner), Alice Mountague (Silkwoman) are just a selection of those prominent figures who require further examination.

few the survival of bills, and for a smaller number, warrants.<sup>5</sup> I am therefore choosing to focus on a very limited number of Leicester's suppliers.

The selection of figures I explore in this chapter, and the next, is governed in part by the information available for their life and work and their relationship to Leicester. I am also interested in the opportunity they provide to explore different aspects of sixteenth-century English society. Although each of the suppliers had an important part to play in dressing Leicester none had such a pivotal role as William Whittell, Merchant Taylor, closely followed by Maynard Buckwith, hosier. Both men were central to the network. Each crafted fabrics and materials into outer garments which are seen represented in portraits of Leicester from the 1560's and early 1570's. While it could be argued that the garments would not be constructed without the fabrics supplied by a number of different people, this only serves to emphasise the importance of all those in the network. It was, however, ultimately Whittell and Buckwith who ensured that Leicester was dressed in the necessary fashion. They also had intimate access to Leicester through personal fittings, a luxury not shared to the same extent by any of the other suppliers.

The focus of this chapter will be William Whittell. It will examine his circumstances, his background, and his business practise. It will place him within his community and the City of London, and will examine the impact of his relationship with Leicester on his life, and vice versa. The questions that have been formulated to further this enquiry are: What was Whittell's background? How did he come to supply Leicester? What was Whittell's position in his local community? How did he conduct his business? What was the impact of his relationship with Leicester? Ultimately Whittell will be defined by the evidence available and the occupation that he practised, this is summarised in Appendix 5.1.

### **William Whittell (active 1554-1599)**

William Whittell, citizen and Merchant Taylor, was a conduit for many of the elements of dress that entered Leicester's wardrobe. He was Leicester's main tailor from the period covered by the first household account until at least the mid 1570s. As a prominent member of the Merchant Taylors' Company of London there is evidence of his involvement with the Company in its court minutes. Surviving bills and warrants give an indication of the types of garments he, and his workforce, were constructing for Leicester and his only other confirmed client, the Queen. They also demonstrate his supply of certain materials beyond those delivered by the fabric supplier for the construction of garments. Leicester's household accounts hint at Whittell's workforce

---

5 Adams, *Household Accounts*. The bills and warrants are found in LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. XII, is the wardrobe disbursement book identifying garments and accessories made by artificers and fabric suppliers.

and trading practises, while the wardrobe disbursement book indicates the flow of work through Whittell's workshop for Leicester. Lay subsidy assessments and parish records locate him in his community while the Merchant Taylors' Company records help narrow that location within a street. The Merchant Taylors' Company records also show Whittell as a leading member of the Company who perpetuated the trade by regularly engaging apprentices, and continuing to inspire a high level of confidence within the Master and Wardens of the Company into the 1590's.

### **Whittell's Background**

William Whittell's origins are somewhat obscure. Adams has suggested 'He may be the William Widnell, merchant taylor, listed by Foster (p.167) as a common councillor [in] 1574-8'.<sup>6</sup> This is where the vagaries of sixteenth-century spelling and script cause confusion. Both Whittell and Widnell, along with a William Wheatley, were members of the Merchant Taylors' Company at the same time.<sup>7</sup> Both Whittell and Widnell engaged in the service of the Company, Widnell reaching the position of Master of the Company in 1586, while Whittell was elected to serve as a warden on numerous occasions.<sup>8</sup> Their names regularly appeared in the Court Minutes throughout their membership, though not often on the same page. However they were both elected to livery on the same day along with sixteen other freemen.<sup>9</sup> In addition the Apprentice Bindings show that Whittell was based in *Powles Churchyarde* while Widnell was in *Basing Lane*.<sup>10</sup> Foster mentions both men. Whittell is included in Foster's list of common councilmen who were 'probably on the Common Council'.<sup>11</sup> Foster lists Widnell among a list of the leading councilmen, giving his dates for service as 1574–8.<sup>12</sup> Widnell does not appear to be a supplier to Leicester's wardrobe and his client base is unknown.

---

6 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 42, n.22. See also F Foster, *The Politics of Stability, A Portrait of the Rulers in Elizabethan London*, Royal Historical Society, London, p. 167.

7 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, ff. 674, 683. William Wheatley is mentioned here because his name is spelt several different ways within the records when his apprentices were presented to the Company which initially caused some confusion when attributing apprentices to masters. Wheatley's (or Whetle) apprentices were Henry Almer and Charles Bradshawe (f. 674), Richard Clewe and Rauf Whithed (f. 683).

8 C Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St John the Baptist London with Notes on the Lives of Some of its Eminent Members, Part II - The Lives*, Harrison and Sons, London, 1888, pp. 342–343. See also Appendix 5.10 for a summary of offices achieved by both men.

9 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 443. Both were elected to the livery or 'taken into the clothinge of this Mystery' on 13 March 1569(70). The others elected to the livery on the same day are listed in Appendix 5.10 which will be discussed later in the chapter.

10 GL, MTC, MS 34038/1, ff. 149, 162v. Whittell was located at St Paul's Churchyard, and Widnell in Basing Lane.

11 Foster, *The Politics of Stability*, p. 172. Foster does not give any dates for Whittell's membership of the Common Council or his specific source for Whittell's membership.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 167.



Whittell obtained freedom of the City and membership of the Merchant Taylors' Company by redemption in 1554.<sup>13</sup> Others who obtained freedom in this way did not necessarily practise as tailors. Davies and Saunders state that 'freedom of a company meant freedom of the City and the right to trade in any commodity or to follow any craft for which one had the skill'.<sup>14</sup> Many traded in fabric, and the wealthiest members of the company were ultimately not practitioners.<sup>15</sup> For example Richard Paramore and Francis Pope were both members of the Merchant Taylors' Company and are found in Leicester's accounts supplying fabric.<sup>16</sup> Both were assessed in Lay Subsidy Assessments as being worth £50 or more.<sup>17</sup> This places them within the top 15% of the assessed wealth holders in the City.<sup>18</sup> While Paramore and Pope may have trained as tailors they appear to be no longer practitioners by the time they were entered in Leicester's household accounts, or at least not crafting goods for him.<sup>19</sup> It would appear however that Whittell was a practising tailor at least until 1583.<sup>20</sup>

Interestingly Davies and Saunders suggest that the candidate applying for admission to the Merchant Taylors' Company by redemption required a recommendation by either a senior member, a City official or other notable person.<sup>21</sup> This information

---

13 GL, MTC, MS 34048/4, f. 281. Redemption was the payment of a fee to the Company to become a member. Whittell paid 20s. See also GL, MTC, MS 34035/1 and MS 34037/4 which records that Whittell was made free of the Company on 30 April 1554. The latter is a document compiled at the end of the 1920's while the former was compiled circa 1614 from sources no longer extant.

14 Davies and Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Taylors'*, p. 129. See also Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, pp. 29, 186.

15 N Sleigh-Johnson, 'The Merchant Taylors' Company of London under Elizabeth I: Tailors' Guild or Company of Merchants?', *Costume*, no.41, 2007, pp. 45 – 52, particularly p. 48 for a discussion of the number of practising tailors within the Company.

16 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 426 – 428, is Richard Paramore's circa 1567–8 bill for fabric supplied towards livery. *Ibid.*, p. 420, is part of a circa 1559 livery list in which Francis Pope delivered 87¾ yards of cloth for the hose.

17 LMA, CLC/281/MS02859, f. 24v., shows Frances Pope in St Mary Abchurch Parish assessed for £150 in June 1559. By 1572 Pope was assessed at a value of £50, see, LMA, CLC/281/MS02942, f. 22v. *Ibid.*, f. 5, shows Richard Paramore in St Augustines Parish in the 1572 assessment at a value of £50. A further assessment carried out in 1577 shows Paramore in St Martens at Ludgate, assessed at a value of £100, see, TNA, E 179/145/252, f. 81.

18 Lang, *Two Tudor Subsidy Assessment Rolls*, p.lxx, Table IB. This percentage is calculated from Table IB of those assessed above £50 in the 1582 assessment rolls. Not all people were assessed, some were exempt, while others were omitted through administrative error, see *Ibid.*, for a discussion of these factors, particularly p. xvi.

19 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 114. Richard Paramore may not have trained as a tailor as he gained his membership of the Company by redemption on 12 May 1564. See GL, MTC, MS 34035/1, unfoliated, in alphabetical order by surname within which names are arranged by date of freedom. Francis Pope served an apprenticeship with master tailor Hobthorne, a member of the Company, and was made free on 28 January 1540(41).

20 TNA, LC 5/35, f. 343. This is the last year that Whittell was recorded supplying tailored garments: See also Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 180.

21 Davies and Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Taylors'*, p. 129.

would have been recorded in the Court Minutes of the Company. Unfortunately the minutes for the period Whittell bought his membership are missing and the Wardens' Accounts only record the fee paid. Who recommended Whittell for membership of the Company is a question that will remain unanswered.

Where Whittell trained as a tailor is also not known. It is tempting to link the William Whyttyll made free of the city of Norwich during 1535/6 to the Whittell who bought his membership of the Merchant Taylors' Company and freedom of the City of London in 1554. The possible link to Norfolk is interesting considering Leicester's association with the area. Northumberland was said to have been establishing a Norfolk power base for Leicester after his marriage to Amy Robsart.<sup>22</sup> Although Leicester is not thought to have spent much time in the area there is no reason to believe he did not make contacts with business people as part of a larger plan to become more established in the district, and in his role as a Member of Parliament. Indeed Sir John Robsart as an important landholder would have long-standing relationships with business people and artisans of the area. Frustratingly the survival of records that might support these associations is poor. Very little material relating to Sir John Robsart is known to exist, and there is scant information on Leicester's activity in Norfolk. Some evidence can be found in the Calendar of Patent Rolls for Edward VI. These suggest Leicester had some involvement with the community in Norwich. In 1551 he sat with other knights and justices in hearing the case of Henry Marsham of Norfolk who was imprisoned in Norwich Castle for mortally wounding John Drye and subsequent flight.<sup>23</sup> Leicester was also amongst the special commissioners named to make searchers of parishes in Norfolk for un-inventoried goods.<sup>24</sup> He was also granted the offices jointly with Sir John Robsart in December 1550 for the Steward of the Lordship, Constable of the Castle, and Master of the Hunt or Deer or Ranger of the Chace of Rising, Norfolk.<sup>25</sup> What is more, other members of Leicester's later household had links with Norfolk.<sup>26</sup> However these people were not artificers.

If Leicester had been familiar with Whittell's work why would a Norfolk tailor come to London to service a client who in April 1554 was in the Tower and condemned? Whittell may well have been in London, or its precincts, prior to Leicester's arrest in

---

22 See Loades, 'Northumberland' and Adams, 'Dudley, Robert', *ODNB*. LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. III, f. 22, is the transcription of the 24 May 1550 covenant by John Dudley, earl of Warwick to settle lands in Norfolk upon his son Robert upon his marriage to Amy Robsart (the original is LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box II, f. 1).

23 *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI Vol. IV*, p.286.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 395. The other commissioners were The earl of Sussex, Sir William Fermour, Sir John Robsart, Sir Christopher Heydon, Osborne Mounford, Robert Barney, John Calybolte.

25 *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward VI Vol. III: 1549-1551*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1925, p. 402.

26 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 65, n. 97. The household servants with links to Norfolk included Richard Ellis, William Huggins and John Marbury.

1553. There is evidence for a William Whittell living in Westminster in the 1550's. Numerous Whittell children were baptised, and buried, at St Margaret's Church Westminster. The earliest entry is the burial of an Alys Whyttell on 13 January 1548.<sup>27</sup> Intriguingly there is evidence that Leicester engaged at least one artificer as part of his household.<sup>28</sup> Whittell too, may have been connected in some capacity with Leicester's household, or one of the Dudley family, and based in Westminster.<sup>29</sup> How widespread the practice of retaining a tailor within the household in mid sixteenth-century court circles has yet to be established.<sup>30</sup> However a tailor was listed among the members of the household of Sir William Cecil (later Lord Burghley) from at least 1554.<sup>31</sup> In addition the earl of Pembroke's servant is recorded in Leicester's household accounts in 1558-9 as making a canvas doublet for him.<sup>32</sup> This entry may well indicate that a tailor was a member of Pembroke's household at the time.<sup>33</sup> Ultimately this may point to a practice more widely spread among the members of the court, echoing the use of craftsmen in the monarch's household, however further research is needed in this area.<sup>34</sup>

---

27 Burke, *Memorials of St Margaret's Church*, p. 386.

28 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V. f. 152-157. Maynard Buckwith hosier's bill charges for board and wages on numerous occasions as other household servants did in 'The Book of My Lords Servants Wages and Boord Wages, 1559-1561', in Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 399-418.

29 Following Leicester's appointment as Keeper of Somerset Place on 27 December 1552 he and his wife lived there for the rest of King Edward's reign (until 6 July 1553), see, Adams, Dudley, Robert, *ODNB*. The necessity to establish his own household would have accompanied this appointment. Numerous members of the household of Leicester's brother, and Northumberland's heir, John Dudley, earl of Warwick are referred to in his wardrobe inventory that is found in: Bod., Add. C 94, though there are no clues to the size of his household nor indication of the household including artificers.

30 Sleight-Johnson touches on the topic of tailors employed as domestic servants in large households from the point of view of the Merchant Taylors' Company and their regulation of apprenticeship. He does not explore the extent to which this occurred in the mid-sixteenth century with respect of the nobility. See, Sleight-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London 1580-1645*, particularly p. 365. See also N Sleight-Johnson, 'Aspects of the tailoring trade in the city of London in the late sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries', *Costume*, no. 37, 2003, pp. 24-32.

31 BL, Lansdowne Papers, MS 118, ff. 36-46v. is a fragment of Cecil's household servants list with wages and livery. In the list of wages to his household Cecil in 1555 included the tailor Jherome, along with the butler Cokkes, the cook James, the horsekeeper Peter, and gardener Herford. Each was paid 7s. although the period this payment covers is not specified. Ibid., f. 42v. recorded payment of wages to Jherome at mid-summer 1554 of 10s. and Michaelmas 1554 of 10s./5s. The account later indicates these were quarterly wages payments. Jherome continued to appear in the list of household servants receiving wages and livery through to 1557 when the account ends.

32 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 88.

33 Pembroke also engaged a hosier within his household named Deathike, see, Ibid., p. 129.

34 No tailors are mentioned as household servants in GR Batho (ed.), *The Household Papers of Henry Percy Ninth Earl of Northumberland*, Camden Third Series, Vol. XCIII, Royal Historical Society, London, 1962. Nor do such individuals appear in FG Emmison, *Tudor Secretary Sir William Petre at Court and Home*, Longmans, London, 1961.

Information on the members of Leicester's household before his imprisonment is slim. Adams suggests a connection to Northumberland's household and affinity for a number of figures who were associated with Leicester after 1553.<sup>35</sup> However none of these people were at the level of the artificer, for Adams chose to focus on those who engaged in politics rather than craftspeople.<sup>36</sup> Mertes argues that service in a noble household showed a continuity of servants from father to son for both the master and servant.<sup>37</sup> The extent to which Northumberland's, or indeed the earl of Warwick's, lower level household servants became part of Leicester's household following his release from the Tower is uncertain, particularly as there is no complete list of any of their households.<sup>38</sup> Loades assumes that the 1553 Royal commissioners' list of Northumberland's household servants is complete.<sup>39</sup> However this assumption is called into question when considering Northumberland's wardrobe of the robes officers. None are identified in the list, although there are three identified for the duchess's robes.<sup>40</sup> A list of apparel compiled by John Empson identifies garments that the duke took to the Tower, left at Durham House and took with him to Cambridge before his arraignment.<sup>41</sup> Empson was clearly a member of Northumberland's household, most likely in charge of his robes, and his list demonstrates an intimate knowledge of the recorded apparel, yet there is no mention of him in the commissioner's list. Interestingly he appears in Leicester's household accounts as a servant in 1559 and was still receiving livery in 1568.<sup>42</sup> In addition Domingo the footman appears in both the

---

35 TNA, LR 2/118, f. 35–39, is a list of Northumberland's household servants, compiled by the crown's commissioners following Northumberland's execution in 1553. Loades prints excerpts of this list in D Loades, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland 1504-1553*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996, pp. 305–307. Loades omits the names of the lesser servants such as the grooms of the duke's chamber (John Cockes, Thomas Lovell, John Goldsmith, John Barbour), the armourer (Adrian Pecocke), the grooms of the stable (Thomas White, John Frenchman, Richard Southworth, John Brown, Evan up Thomas, Patrick Hamlyn, Robert Rochester, William Luffe, The furrier, Laurence Peuerton, Manno Denys, Thomas Bayleye), the saddler (Thomas Holwaie), the gardeners (Clement Kinge, George Lee), and the laundresses (Nurce Stacie, Joice Pretie, Jane Cole, Elizabeth).

36 Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, particularly pp. 151–153.

37 K Mertes, *The English Noble Household*, pp. 64–67.

38 TNA, LR 2/118, f. 100. The Queen's warrant to dismiss all remaining members of Northumberland's household at 'Syon' was dated 26 August 1553 and instructs the commissioners to '*calte the servantes bifoor you discharging them quyety to repair home to thir frendes, or otherwise to provide for themselves as they can by way of service*'.

39 Loades, *Northumberland*, p. 274.

40 TNA, LR 2/118, f. 36. The officers of the wardrobe of the duchess' robes were Christopher Donne, Edward Manyster and Henrie of the wardrobe.

41 *Ibid.*, ff. 118–118v.

42 Adams, *Household Accounts*, particularly pp. 403, 420, 421, 427.

commissioner's list of Northumberland's household and in Leicester's household.<sup>43</sup> This demonstrates a link between Northumberland's and Leicester's household servants for those below the rank of gentleman. However a dearth of information that might link Whittell to any of the Dudley households before 1553 has made drawing any solid conclusions on his relationship to the Dudleys before he became a member of the Merchant Taylors' Company of London presently impossible.

It is clear that the enticements of London were great for a successful tailor such as Whittell. The lure of the City brought a wealth of talent into its environs, and the opportunity to create a wider client base, particularly if an influential client could make introductions to further potential influential clients.<sup>44</sup> Indeed Selwood suggests that it was the influx of English migrants that sustained London's population growth, supplemented by alien immigration, against a background of high mortality within the City.<sup>45</sup> While a great number of these migrants were young people seeking apprenticeships, skilled craftspeople also relocated to the City. Whittell was clearly a master of his craft by the time he was made a member of the Merchant Taylors' Company of London. How a new migrant to the City with no earlier familiarity might come to the attention of the nobility as a potential supplier is uncertain. It may have been as simple as an encounter in the artificer's shop. Leicester's accounts demonstrate he did visit artificers' and suppliers' shops in the City during the early part of Elizabeth's reign.<sup>46</sup> However it is Wylkinson's bill that provides the earliest evidence of Whittell carrying out work for Leicester.<sup>47</sup> Wylkinson delivers thirty four and an eighth ounces of small silver lace '*bushellworke*' and fifteen and a half ounces of silver twist to Whittell on 18 November 1558 at a total cost of £18.16s.4d.<sup>48</sup> This would suggest that Whittell was working for Leicester by the end of Queen Mary's reign. The quantity and cost of materials delivered to him imply that Leicester trusted him with such materials to create the necessary garments, indicating a long-standing relationship. This would tie

---

43 TNA, LR 2/118, f. 36, lists the footmen: James footeman, Thomas hunte, Richard Mathew, Domingo the More; LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 66v., is Whittell's bill for making a doublet each for Domingo and Cragge the footmen; *Ibid.*, f. 116v., is William Tempest's bill for making livery hose for Domyngo and Cragge the footmen.

44 Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, p. 84.

45 J Selwood, *Diversity and Difference in Early Modern London*, Ashgate, Farnham, 2010, p. 23. See also Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, pp. 76–86.

46 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 46, 135, 138, 139, 142, 146. Leicester purchased silk hose at Mr Holborn's shop on numerous occasions. He visited a shop in Abchurch Lane and bought a pair of black stocks, and he visited Whittell's shop.

47 LHA, Dudley Papers, Box V, ff. 27–28v. The payment of the bill is found in Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 122.

48 LHA, Dudley Papers, Box V, ff. 27–28v. Wylkinson delivered to Whittell 34 $\frac{1}{8}$  ounces of small silver lace of '*bushellworke*' at a cost of £13.13s., along with 15 $\frac{1}{2}$  ounces of silver twist at a cost of £5.3s.4d. Numerous other deliveries to Whittell were itemised. Goods were also delivered to Mr Cewer the saddler, and David Smith embroiderer. Whittell was the only tailor receiving materials from Wylkinson.

in with Whittell having a connection with Westminster in the early 1550's, particularly if he was working for people on the peripheries of the court. Yet without further evidence, both Whittell's training as a tailor and how his relationship with Leicester began remains speculative.

Whittell's activities between his acquisition of freedom of the City and Company and his first appearance in Leicester's extant records are unknown. However there are some conclusions that can be drawn from the evidence. Leicester visited Whittell in his shop in 1558/9, before the coronation, which points to Whittell sometime in the intervening period establishing a base to work from, a shop and a home.<sup>49</sup> It is clear this base was in the City as the accounts record ferry charges to and from the City for Whittell, or his servants, to visit Leicester.<sup>50</sup> He had clearly engaged a number of servants, some of whom were probably journeymen tailors.<sup>51</sup> He was also engaging apprentices during this period although evidence for their enrollment with the Company has been lost. The first of Whittell's apprentices to finish his training and be made free of the Company (for whom data exists) was John Wormygam who was presented on 1 July 1566.<sup>52</sup>

Whittell's shop and home were within the parish of St Gregory by St Paul where, in

---

49 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 46.

50 Ibid., pp. 42, 52, 61, 72, 159. The first entry for Whittell in Leicester's household accounts records Leicester's servant Aglionby being sent to bring Whittell to Leicester, the purpose of the consultation is not specified.

51 A journeyman who worked for a wage had completed his apprenticeship and was free of the Company but had not yet established his own business. See, Davies and Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Tailors*, p. 38. See also Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 159. Jennings, William Whittell's servant who was recorded travelling by ferry to take measurements for Leicester's clothing was most likely a journeyman tailor. Jennings was probably William Jennings whose sons John and Gabriel were made free of the Company by patrimony in 1577 and 1584 respectively. There is no evidence to indicate when William Jennings was made free of the Company. See GL, MTC, MS 34037/2, unfoliated, arranged in alphabetical order by surname.

52 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 234. An apprenticeship may have lasted seven and a half years, and perhaps longer, which would place Wormygam in Whittell's household and workshop from at least the end of 1558. See, P Wallis, 'Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England', *Journal of Economic History*, 68, 2008, pp. 832–861, p. 834. Wallis discusses the Statute of Artificers (1562) which set out the basic terms of service for an apprentice; householders over 24 years could take on apprentices, the term of service was at least seven years.

1561, Whittell's daughter Johane was baptised.<sup>53</sup> Whittell was clearly married by this time. Indeed the family were still located in the same parish when Whittell's wife Johane was buried at St Gregory by St Paul twenty eight years later.<sup>54</sup> Whether Whittell remained in the same property on St Paul's Churchyard throughout this period is not known (see Appendix 5.2, Detail A).<sup>55</sup> He certainly stayed in the same parish until his wife's death. His name appears in the 1576 subsidy roll as living in 'Castlebaynard Warde, St Gregoryes Parische' with an assessment of £25 in land.<sup>56</sup> Of the eighty four names recorded in the subsidy roll for St Gregory's parish sixty nine were assessed.<sup>57</sup> The remainder, strangers, were not wealthy enough to be assessed and paid a poll tax.<sup>58</sup> Whittell's assessment places him in the top 20% of those whose values were recorded. However the exact nature of the calculation that resulted in the £25 valuation is not known.<sup>59</sup> By the 1582 subsidy assessment Whittell, again in St Gregory's parish, was assessed to a value of £50 paying 50s. (£2.10s.) to the collector.<sup>60</sup> The doubling of Whittell's assessed value may reflect his increasing successful business practise, which undergoes further examination below.

The subsidy roll documents are most useful as an indication of a selection of Whittell's neighbours and his community. Adam Bland, skinner, was also listed as a member of St Gregory's parish in both the 1576 and 1582 assessments, while further

---

53 LMA, St Gregory by St Paul composite register, 1559-1627, P69/GRE/A/001/MS10231, ff. 2v., 5, 7, 9v. Johan was baptised on 1 May 1561. Whittell's other children christened at St Gregory by St Paul were William baptised 4 April 1563, Robert baptised on 12 November 1564 (it appears that there was a transcription error in the compiling of the register as Robert's father is named as Richard Whittell, a Richard was baptised immediately below this entry. Robert is confirmed as William Whittell's son by later evidence) and Mary baptised on 24 May 1567. Ibid., ff. 79, 82, two Whittell women were married at the same church, Margery on 25 November 1582 and Elizabeth on 9 February 1589/90. These two women may also have been Whittell's daughters however they were not christened in the Parish church and there is no further evidence for them.

54 Ibid., f. 147v. Johane Whittell was buried on 2 July 1589. See also W Thornbury, *Old and New London: Volume 1*, Cassell & Company, London, 1878, pp. 262–274. St Gregory by St Paul's was located within Paul's Churchyard, against the wall of St Paul's Cathedral on the South side to the west end of the wall.

55 From whom Whittell rented or purchased the property has not been established. He was not recorded as renting property from the Merchant Taylors' Company until the 1590's. He was also not recorded as renting property from the Drapers' Company, the Mercers' Company, or the Leathersellers' Company.

56 TNA, E 179/145/252, f. 93. As yet it has not been possible to establish if the land Whittell was assessed as owning was the property he was living and working in, and where exactly it was located within the churchyard.

57 Of the eighty four people recorded 21.4% were classed as strangers.

58 Only three of the strangers were assessed, while the remainder each paid 4d. poll tax.

59 Lang, *Two Tudor Subsidy Assessment Rolls*, p. xvi. In 1576 Whittell was supplying the Queen and may have been granted exemptions for certain aspects of his assets; Lang discusses the sums these figures represent.

60 Ibid., p. 184.

evidence shows he was living in Paul's Churchyard.<sup>61</sup> Bland supplied Leicester, the Queen, and Sir Henry Sidney with furs and fur products.<sup>62</sup> Arthur Medlicote also appeared in both assessments and the Merchant Taylors' records show he too lived in Paul's Churchyard.<sup>63</sup> Bland and his family were also found in the parish registers for St Gregory by St Paul's while Medlicote was not.<sup>64</sup> Any further evidence of the relationship between Whittell, Bland and other tailors living in Paul's Churchyard has not yet been discovered.<sup>65</sup> Unpicking the dynamics of the relationship between Whittell and Bland who were supplying Leicester concurrently, and for the period when they were both supplying the Queen at the end of the 1570's, requires further evidence than that which is presently available.

The 1571 search of strangers in London, Southwark and the Liberties provides information for two of Whittell's workforce.<sup>66</sup> 'Garret Sawse', born in 'Gilderland' and 'Robert Fan Elbur' born in 'Flaunders' were recorded as servants to Whittell in St Gregory's Parish.<sup>67</sup> Neither is recorded in the 1576 Subsidy assessment for St Gregory's Parish.<sup>68</sup> Whittell's engaging of foreign, non-denizen labour is of interest. The employing of strangers in one's workforce went against the general tenor of the

---

61 TNA, E 179/145/252, f. 93; Lang, *Two Tudor Subsidy Assessment Rolls*, p. 184; and Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 126, 336–337, particularly p. 336 that records Bland living in Paul's Churchyard.

62 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 247–249, is Bland's bill for 1565–1566. See also Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 126, 336–337; Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 53, 58, 59, 106, 107, 167, 171, 173, 177, 192–194, for Bland's role as the Queen's skinner. CKS, Sidney Papers, U1475 A4/1, f. 6v., is the record, created by William Blounte, of a payment made on Bland's bill in September 1568. Ibid., U1475 A5/4 is Bland's bill of 1570(1)–1572. GL, SC, Freedom Records, MS 30719/1, f. 78. Adam Bland was made free of the Skinners Company on 1 February 1550(1) having served an apprenticeship with Richard Bewe.

63 GL, MTC, MS 34038/1, f. 101. Arthure Medlicote was recorded in Paul's Churchyard in 1587. Lang, *Two Tudor Subsidy Assessment Rolls* p. 184, shows that the 1582 assessment valued Medlicote at £15, paying 15s. See also GL, MTC, MS 34038/1, f. 116 which identifies two further tailors recorded as living in Paul's Churchyard in 1588, Humphrey Hockshawe and John Sleepe. Other Merchant Taylors in the same parish included Richard Dysney and Robert Pavy.

64 LMA, P69/GRE/A/001/MS10231, ff. 1v., 2v., 4v., 8v., 9v., 11, 12v., 14v., 21. Elizabeth was baptised 12 May 1560, Frances was baptised 16 July 1561, Richard was baptised 24 January 1562(3), William was baptised 5 April 1566, Gregory was baptised 22 April 1567, Jasper was baptised 28 October 1568, Mary was baptised 22 January 1569(70), John was baptised 28 September 1572. Bland's granddaughter Margaret Bury was also baptised in the parish 24 January 1581(2).

65 No last will and testament has yet been discovered for Whittell or Bland which might provide further clues to their relationship.

66 Kirk & Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 88.

67 Ibid., 'Gilderland' and 'Flaunders' were both areas in the Low Countries. Garret Sawse had been in England for a year and a half and Robert Fan Elbur had been in England for two years when the survey was conducted in November 1571. Both were recorded as immigrating to England 'for religion' and attending the Dutch church, neither was a denizen.

68 Ibid., p. 180. Garret Saweye was located living in St Annes in the Black Friars and was assessed at vli. paying xs. tax.



London Livery Companies during the sixteenth century.<sup>69</sup> It also appears at odds with his position in the Merchant Taylors' Company where members who employed foreign workers were imprisoned.<sup>70</sup> It may have been Leicester's influence that resulted in Whittell employing strangers. Leicester wore garments modelled on Dutch fashion, made by Whittell and those in his workshop.<sup>71</sup> Leicester also appears to have been actively seeking a Dutch tailor.<sup>72</sup> Retaining Dutch servants may have been a strategy Whittell used to ensure he was able to supply the latest Dutch fashions to Leicester. In addition Leicester's patronage of religious refugees may have had some influence on Whittell.<sup>73</sup> There is no mention in the Merchant Taylors' Court Minutes of any special dispensation for Whittell employing foreigners, or any disciplinary action. Indeed his rise within the Company continued through the 1570s and 1580s. The fact that he engaged strangers within his workforce may also point to his sympathy for their cause and an affinity to the new religion as each was a religious refugee.

69 GC, Court Minutes Book K Part I, ff. 262, 273, 275. The Goldsmiths' Company required any foreigners working for any of their members to have letters testimonial as to their good character and origin - or the member in question was fined and the stranger ordered to leave the country. Other Livery companies had their own regulations regarding foreign labour, see Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, pp. 54–57, 104–105; Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, pp. 118–119; and Archer, *Pursuit of Stability*, pp. 131–140.

70 By 1571 Whittell had been elected into the livery of the Company. See GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 236. At the meeting on 23 July 1565 the Master and Wardens recorded that '*where as ceten housholders of the handicraft of this mistere to the nombre of lxxx persons or there aboute have exhibited a supplicacion, to this house desiringe therby, that suche order maye be taken as no forrens maye be hereafter sett a worke by eny freman of this mistere, for that there is suche nombre of the seide forrens workinge within the saide citie, that poore men housholders beinge fre by reason thereof cas gett no worke And so therby a greate nombre of them are already vndone & more a greater number hereafter very likelt to be vndone (yf spedy reformacion the sorv be not had & provided, wherfor they the saide mr Wardens & assistentes have agreed & decreed & by these pivtes do decree that the forsaid me & wardens nowe beinge & there successour Mr & wardens for the tyme beinge for the better reformacion of the peringsfs shall asmoche as in them do lye putt the ordenince of this mistere in execution against all suche of this mystere as shall at any tume hereafter sett any forren a worke contrary to their othes & ordenince of this mystere*'. See *Ibid.*, f. 243, 391, September 1565 Robert Pavy, Robert Hartforde, Richard Dyseney, Arthur Gardenor, John Mattyson and Roger Boland were sent to prison by the Company for employing foreigners. On 23 April 1569 John Crane was committed to prison for employing a foreigner. See also, CM Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St John the Baptist, London with Notes of the Lives of Some of its Eminent Members (in Two Parts) Part I. – The History*, London, Harrison and Sons, St Martins Lane, 1888, pp. 41, 50. Clode records the oath made by freemen when they joined the Company which included the term 'to conceal no foreign craftsman, but to warn the Chamberlain of such and to take only workmen who have duly served the Company as apprentices'. In addition the Master of the Company took an oath 'to punish those of the mysterie keeping foreigners'.

71 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 73v., 76v., itemises Dutch style garments - a Dutch cloak and a Dutch gown that Whittell constructed for Leicester.

72 *Ibid.*, f.148v., is Benedict Spinola's bill itemising a charge paid '*vnto Pole the fflemishe taylor for his chargis comyng out of fflaunders hither to serue your honour/& parte of his charges while he taryed heare xiiijli.xvjs.iiijd*'.

73 JH Hessels (ed.), *Epistvlae et Tractatus, Volume 3, Part I*, Cambridge, 1897, p. 827, is Joannes Bernardus letter (circa 1586) to the ministers and elders of the Dutch Church London outlining Leicester's patronage of his studies at the University of Oxford.

The area around and within St Paul's Cathedral was a meeting place for all walks of life. It is where preachers gave sermons at St Paul's Cross and the fashionable paraded along Paul's walk.<sup>74</sup> Indeed Kirby in his examination of the influence of Paul's Cross highlights the importance of the location as the "public pulpit" of the entire realm' where 'large crowds, sometimes numbering in thousands, gathered to listen to the weekly two-hour sermons'.<sup>75</sup> Peter Blayney's examination of bookshop locations in Paul's Cross Churchyard highlights the concentration of bookshops in the area, thus building a picture of a vibrant location.<sup>76</sup> Blayney's map also provides a clear perspective of the parish in which Whittell lived and the proximity of Paul's Cross to Paul's Churchyard (see Appendix 5.3). The precinct was undoubtedly a dynamic place for a home and workshop/shop to be situated. Quantifying the impact of this location on Whittell's work practise is difficult. The best evidence for those visiting Whittell's workshop is found in Leicester's accounts. These identify people who were probably visiting for the necessary fittings of garments, delivering goods and paying Leicester's bills. They range from Leicester's footmen, pages, musicians and huntsmen to gentlemen of the household and members of the nobility.<sup>77</sup> Suppliers of silk fabrics to Leicester such as Richard Pecock, leather seller, Ambrose Smith and William Chelsham, mercers, delivered fabrics to Whittell through the 1560's and early 1570's.<sup>78</sup> Meanwhile goldsmiths, such as William Denham and silkwoman Alice Mountague

---

74 W Sparrow Simpson, *Chapters in the History of Old St Pauls*, London, 1881, p. 235; Hentschell, 'Treasonous Textiles'; WJT Kirby, 'The Public Sermon: Paul's Cross and the culture of persuasion in England, 1534-1570', *Renaissance and Reformation*, vol.31, no.1, 2008, pp. 3-29.

75 Kirby, 'The Public Sermon', p. 6.

76 PWM Blayney, *The Bookshops in Paul's Cross Churchyard*, Occasional Papers of the Bibliographical Society No. 5, London, 1990, p. 2a.

77 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 44-85. Whittell's bill names members of Leicester's household that he was dressing in addition to Leicester including; Mr Knolls, Mr Cary, Mr Derynge, George Gyles, John Empson, William Cussett, Mr Senatin, Mr Cardye, Mr Heyes, Cragge, George Jeyettes, Domyngo, Mr Kyllegrau, the boy that went to Scotland, Aime the boy, Thomas Clynton, young Killegraves, Levenecke, Mr Bird's two sons, Sir George Haward, along with the earl of Pembroke for whom Whittell made several garments that Leicester was billed for. See also LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. XII. The wardrobe disbursement book names further household members and associated people dressed by Whittell including; Thomas Cooper, Richard Pepper, John Conawaye, Rychard Cook, Robert Hill, Robert Knowles, Mr Trystrame George, the two huntsmen, John Killingray, little Richard, Richard Nightingale, Henry Sapforde, John Butler, William Spenser, Anthony Dockerye, Rychard Griffin, Kelle, Richard Clarke, Lord Sheffield, Dennis Bewcham, and My lords players. See also LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 262, the receipt for fabric delivered by Richard Pecock to Whittell from 1 August to 24 November 1566. This names 'Mr Sedne', possibly Leicester's nephew Philip Sidney (1554-1586).

78 Ibid., ff. 158-165, 201-205, 262. LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. XII, identifies Ambrose Smith as delivering fabric to Whittell, see Appendix 5.6.

were both delivering supplies to Whittell.<sup>79</sup> Other suppliers used Whittell's continual contact with Leicester to have their goods delivered.<sup>80</sup> This suggests not only that Leicester's other suppliers were visiting Whittell's shop to consign their goods to his care, but also that he was acknowledged as a pivotal member of the supply network. Merchants and financiers such as Benedict Spinola were paying Leicester's artificer bills in the 1560s which points to, at the least, an acquaintance. Spinola is recorded as having paid Whittell £7.14s.6d on 10 June 1564 to cover the construction cost of livery for nine of Leicester's footmen.<sup>81</sup> It is unclear whether Spinola visited Whittell in his shop to pay this bill or if Whittell visited Spinola's property in Fenchurch Street to receive the payment.<sup>82</sup> Living and working in Paul's Churchyard would have exposed Whittell and those in his workshop to a wide cross section of London's citizenry. This was underlined by those that visited his workshop as a direct result of Whittell being Leicester's tailor.

Whittell's workshop was also a centre for learning as he engaged a steady stream of apprentices to his tailoring practise. These young men may have been living with Whittell through, or for part of, the period of apprenticeship.<sup>83</sup> The standard indenture would have tied the apprentice to Whittell for a number of years and he was expected to house, feed, clothe and instruct the young men. Although none of Whittell's apprentices' indentures are known to survive there is evidence for the origins of one of his apprentices, William Griffeth of Reading. The entry in the Merchant Taylors' Company apprenticeship bindings records the length of time the apprentice was expected to serve the apprenticeship, and his origins, along with his father's name

---

79 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 92–95 is William Denham's bill which includes deliveries to Whittell of hooks and eyes, rose buttons in silver, and gold buttons for a cloak. Ibid., ff. 304, 307, 309, 316, 326, 327, 368, 369, 370, 383, 399, 405, 415, 416, 430, 435, 439, 441, 443, are warrants for Alice Mountague to deliver materials to Whittell.

80 Ibid, ff. 17–22v., is the haberdasher John Gye's bill. Folio 19 records his use of Whittell's man to deliver a velvet cap to Leicester, who was on progress at Hemingham, on 15 August 1562.

81 Ibid., f. 147.

82 GL, MTC, MS 34048/4, f. 294. Benedict Spinola rented a property from the Merchant Taylor's Company from at least 1554 until his death in 1580. See also, GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, ff. 711, 722, which shows that in 1574 Spinola presented a suit to extend his lease on the Fenchurch Street property by forty years on top of the fourteen years remaining of his current lease. The agreement finalised by the Company extending of his lease for fifty four years on the condition he spent £500 on building and repairs to the property.

83 C Minns and P Wallis, 'Rules and Reality: quantifying the practice of apprenticeship in early modern England', *The Economic History Review*, 2011, pp. 1–24. Minns and Wallis have shown that apprentices did not tend to spend the full length of their indenture period with their master, see particularly pp. 8–11. See also, P Wallis, C Webb and C Minns, 'Leaving home and entering service: the age of apprenticeship in early modern London', *Continuity and Change*, vol. 25, no.3, 2010, pp. 377–404. Wallis, Webb and Minns show that the mean age at which an apprentice was bound to a master, at the end of the sixteenth century, was 17.98 years, see particularly pp. 385–390.

and occupation.<sup>84</sup> While this information is valuable to demonstrate that Whittell's apprentices were drawn from a national pool of young men, any kinship or business relationship which may have underpinned the engagement of an apprentice can not be explored further without information on the origins of each of his apprentices. The record of any premium the apprentice's families or sponsors paid to Whittell to take on their son is also lacking in the evidence.<sup>85</sup> The list of apprentices whose names are recorded in surviving Merchant Taylors' Company archives are those he presented at the beginning and/or end of their apprenticeship (see Appendix 5.4). Table Two shows that 81.25% of the recorded apprentices Whittell engaged were made free of the Company. This figure is close to twice the percentage (41%) achieving freedom found by Wallis across fifteen guilds in London for the 1490–1599 period.<sup>86</sup> Such a high rate of completion would suggest that Whittell fulfilled his obligations as a master, largely creating an environment where both parties remained committed to their indenture. Certain other enticements may have influenced the apprentices' situation, such as the frequent rewards they received from Leicester.<sup>87</sup>

It has not been possible to identify what became of the three apprentices that did not finish their training or to establish why they did not complete their apprenticeship.<sup>88</sup> For those whose presentment and freedom were recorded in the records of the Merchant Taylors' Company the period of apprenticeship ranged from eight years to one year ten months. There is no further explanation given in any of the Company documents for the shortness of Roger Hillier's apprenticeship at less than two years. It is possible that he may have had been presented to the Company after already completing some time in Whittell's workshop, or he may have been transferred from

---

84 GL, MTC, MS 34038/1, f. 149, records William Griffeth's binding as an apprentice to Whittell on 9 November 1585 for a period of eight years. Griffeth was the son of John Griffith, Innholder, of Reading in Berkshire.

85 A premium and/or bond was negotiated between the two parties at the beginning of the indenture. The premium was a fee paid to the master to take on the apprentice while the bond ensured the apprentice's good behaviour. For a discussion of premiums and bonds see, S Hovland, *Apprenticeship in Later Medieval London (c.1300-1530)*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of London, 2006, particularly pp. 78–81. See also, P Wallis, 'Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England', *The Journal of Economic History*, Volume 68, No.3, 2008, pp. 832–861, particularly pp. 835–836.

86 *Ibid.*, p. 839, for Table 1 showing the percentage of apprentices that became freemen.

87 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 46, 66, 150, 154, 159, record the numerous rewards given to Whittell's servants for example; 'reward to Whittell's servants vjs.viiijd.'; 'in reward to Whittell's men vs.'; 'reward to William Whittell's servants the xxvth daie of December xijs.viiijd.' and 'reward the first of January to William Whittell's servants xijs.viiijd.'; 'Whittell's servants in reward the last daie of Marche xijs.iiiijd.'; 'to Jennings William Whittles servant for his botehier and paynes cominge to Kewe iijs.iiiijd.'

88 Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, p. 313, suggests 10% of apprentices died during their apprenticeship. See also Wallis, 'Apprenticeship and Training', pp. 832–839. Wallis discusses the reasons for early departure.

another master.<sup>89</sup> The dates of each of the apprenticeships have been represented on a graph to demonstrate the numbers of apprentices within Whittell's workshop at specific periods (see Appendix 5.5). For example the period covered by the wardrobe disbursement book – 7 March 1571 to March 1574 – enables some conclusions to be drawn on who was most likely in the workshop and what work they were engaged in.<sup>90</sup> However as the commencement dates of five apprentices and the end dates for three are lacking these can only be tentative conclusions. In addition as apprentices may have stayed on as journeymen there is no certainty as to when the newly made freemen left Whittell's service. What is more there is no record of the journeymen Whittell employed at any one time. The two strangers, Sawse and Fan Elbur, identified by the 1571 return of aliens, and Jennings identified in Leicester's accounts, are the only journeymen that can be named, but the length of time they were working for Whittell is not known.

To further explore the numbers in the workshop and who was providing the labour a single year will be examined. The year from 7 March 1571 to 7 March 1572 provides a suitable example where garments can be identified with some certainty. From Appendix 5.5 it is possible to identify John Bridgeman in the seventh year of his apprenticeship, Thomas Lockett in the fifth year of his apprenticeship, and William Amptfield in the second year of his apprenticeship. Further possible apprentices in the workshop were Randall Eccles Jnr, enrolled in 1567, and Edward Branforde who was made free alongside Amptfield, though no data is available for his enrollment.<sup>91</sup> Added to the number of apprentices were the journeymen. The Statute of Artificers declared that there must be one journeyman for every third and subsequent apprentice, however the Merchant Taylors' Company lodged appeals against the act.<sup>92</sup> It is not known if aliens were counted as journeymen in this ruling, though it is unlikely. This would

---

89 There is no evidence in the Merchant Taylors' Company records for either of these circumstances. Whittell was not fined for late presentment of any of his apprentices and there are no records of any of his apprentices being set over to or from another master.

90 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU. Vol.XII, ff. 1–11v. This manuscript records deliveries by supplier(s) of fabrics to artificers, however it is evident that the document is not a complete record of all the fabrics delivered to each artificer. It is likely that the manuscript is largely the record of deliveries made by Ambrose Smith, mercer, who is named as the supplier on ff. 1–4. The manuscript, therefore, may not show all of the garments made by Whittell for Leicester and his household for which fabric was sourced from a different supplier.

91 The data available for these two apprentices is incomplete. Eccles were not made free of the Merchant Taylors' Company and it is not known when he left Whittell's workshop. No enrollment date is listed for Branforde.

92 Sleight-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London 1580–1645*, p. 359, discusses the impact of the Statute of Artificers on the tailors of the Merchant Taylors' Company. He also suggests that the majority of masters worked with a number of apprentices and possibly one journeyman. See also, GL, MTC, MS 34010, f. 43, which records the lobbying by the wardens substitute and members of the Company occupied in the '*handycrafte of Tayllorye*' that they might submit a bill to parliament in order to repeal of the act for '*kepinge of a Jorneyman for eny apprentices that they shuld kepe about the nombre of ij apprentices*'.

suggest that Whittell, if he abided by the statute, employed at least two journeyman, possibly three to deal with the number of apprentices in his studio during this year, alongside the two strangers. This suggests a total of approximately nine people, plus Whittell, in the workshop. How much hands-on work Whittell himself carried out is not known. Overseeing a workshop of at least nine (four to five apprentices, two journeymen and two strangers) would have been a time-consuming business, as would consulting with Leicester and his wardrobe staff on garments, and with suppliers on materials, along with any other clients Whittell may have had during the year.

In the twelve months from 7 March 1571 to 7 March 1572 a total of one hundred and six garments and two cloak bags were worked in Whittell's workshop for Leicester and his household (see Appendix 5.6). These garments were a mixture of new construction and translation or alterations. Apart from one waistcoat, all were outer garments.<sup>93</sup> It is possible to contrast this figure with Whittell's bill for one year from 8 March 1561 to 7 March 1562. He charged for the construction of one hundred and twenty eight garments and three cloak bags for Leicester and his household (see Appendix 5.7).<sup>94</sup> These too, were largely outer garments, apart from one waistcoat and a petticoat. This would suggest, due to the similarity in quantity of garments worked, that the number of people engaged within Whittell's workshop was largely equivalent for both years demonstrated by these records.

The allocation of tasks within the workshop are not known. It is most likely that there were different duties for apprentices at different stages of their apprenticeship, however some apprentices may have been better at certain aspects of the tailoring craft than others. We have already seen how Jennings was sent to measure Leicester for a garment, demonstrating he was a trusted member of the team.<sup>95</sup> It was essential that the measurements he took were correct as any inaccuracy would impact on the fit of a garment, and ultimately cost the tailor for alterations or replacement.<sup>96</sup> Cutting the fabric and pattern making were also specialised areas of the craft that only the more experienced tailor would be trusted with. The fabrics, particularly the outer fabrics, from which the garments were constructed were expensive and any mistakes could be

---

93 Outer garments included doublets, jerkins, cassocks, gowns, nightgowns, cloaks, coats, capes.

94 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 44–64.

95 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 159.

96 A Saunders, 'A Cloke not made so Orderly': the Sixteenth-Century Minutes of the Merchant Tailors' Company', *The Ricardian*, 13, 2003, pp. 415–419, particularly p. 416 where Saunders discusses the case of a tailor making a garment too small for his client. It cost him 40s. in compensation to the client for the cloth, however he was allowed to keep the garment to sell.

costly for the tailor.<sup>97</sup> There are no records that indicate Whittell was penalised for damaging the materials that were entrusted to his care. This would suggest that he kept a tight rein on the activities and the people in his workshop, ensuring the best quality work was produced.

We have an indication of who was working in Whittell's workshop for a reasonable amount of the time that he was known to be active (see Appendix 5.5). To make sense of the numbers of apprentices Whittell engaged it is necessary to provide some contemporary comparator.<sup>98</sup> The ability to identify practising tailors who were supplying the court and were active in the same period as Whittell is limited by the information available on individual business practise and the survival of records for apprenticeship.<sup>99</sup> Tailors to the Queen were considered as candidates to compare workshop size against, however each have their own limitations.<sup>100</sup> Information for the apprentices of Walter Fysh is incomplete.<sup>101</sup> The constraints on a study of William Jones is the difficulty presented by his name.<sup>102</sup> At least two, if not three or more, William Jones' were enrolling apprentices with the Company through the 1580's.<sup>103</sup>

Of the tailors making garments for Leicester's household only William Edney can be examined with any certainty as a supplier of garments to the wider court who was

---

97 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 44–85, 158–165. Sections of Whittell's bill, (ff. 44–85), can be correlated with the bill of William Chelsham, (ff. 158–165), to demonstrate the cost of the outer or show fabric of a garment. For example on 3 November 1562 Chelsham supplied 12 yards of black Jean damask fabric at 13s.4d. a yard, totalling £8.3s.4d. for the construction of a night gown, while on 15 November 1562 Whittell charged 20s. for making the night gown '*wyth weltes of satten whipped & laid wyth lace*' and for 3oz of sewing silk at a cost of 8s. for the construction and decoration of it.

98 The ideal contemporary comparator is a practising tailor active at the same time as Whittell, supplying a similar clientele.

99 See Sleigh-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London 1580-1645*, pp. 437, 369. Sleigh-Johnson has collated data on the apprentices of Arthur Medlicott, merchant taylor, from 1565 to 1604 which indicates the size of his workshop peaked at seven employees. Sleigh-Johnson suggests that Medlicot was 'almost certainly' a practising tailor. There is no indication of Medlicot's client base though he was a successful businessman leaving a considerable legacy, see, *Ibid.*, p. 279.

100 Whittell himself was a tailor to the Queen from 1575-1583 although he never received livery or was called the Queen's tailor. See, Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 180.

101 The missing Court Minutes of the Merchant Taylors' Company before 1562 and the Wardens Accounts 1557–1562 would supply more information for Walter Fysh's apprentices. Walter Fysh was appointed the Queen's tailor from her accession in 1558, but had been supplying her prior to 1558. He remained the Queen's tailor until he retired in 1582, he died in 1585, see Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 177–178.

102 *Ibid.*, p.180. William Jones was employed as the Queen's Tailor in 1582, replacing Walter Fysh. Jones retained the position throughout the remainder of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

103 GL, MTC, MS 34038/1, ff. 20v., 38v., 43v., 76, 166v., 116v., 117,134v. 179, 183. A William Jones was recorded in Love Lane in 1584; a William Jones was in White Chappell in 1584; a William Jones was in Chancery Lane 1585-1592; a William Jones was in Budge Row in 1588-1592; a William Jones was in Fleet Street in 1592.

active during the same period as Whittell.<sup>104</sup> However Edney's death in 1581 limits the comparison to a period of twenty five years.<sup>105</sup> Of the apprentices Edney engaged their completion rate within that period was 67.74% (see Appendix 5.8) compared to Whittell's 81.25%. In total Edney took on thirty five apprentices in the twenty five year period compared to Whittell's twelve for the same time. While there is no record of Whittell setting any of his apprentices over to a new master to complete their training Edney lost two in this way.<sup>106</sup> The setting over of Richard Warde, the latter apprentice set over to a new master, Thomas Norman, may have occurred due to an ailing Edney.<sup>107</sup> Certainly Edney was not present at the transferring of Warde, his last appearance at the court was on 10 June 1580.<sup>108</sup> His final apprentice to be made free of the Company, Thomas Conwaye, was done so by Edney's letter and the report of Isake Holwaye.<sup>109</sup>

The numbers of apprentices Edney engaged would suggest he had a busier workshop than Whittell. There is no evidence for Edney's journeymen, though with such a high number of apprentices it is most likely he employed waged labour. The parish records for St Thomas the Apostle show the burial of two of Edney's servants, who may have been journeymen.<sup>110</sup> It is possible that the Robert Loe, buried in 1579, was Edney's former apprentice Robert Lose whom he made free of the Company in 1575 after six years and seven months of apprenticeship. There is no evidence for any of Whittell's apprentices staying on as journeymen following their freedom. There is also no evidence for Edney employing any strangers in his workshop as Whittell did. Sleigh-Johnson has pointed out that Edney never reached the higher offices of the Company but suggests he was 'a major employer and one of the wealthiest freemen

---

104 GL, MTC, MS 34048/4, ff. 332v., 334, records Walter Fysh presenting William Edney as his apprentice and Edney becoming a freeman of the Company at the end of his apprenticeship; both occurred in the 1555-1556 period. LHA, Dudley Papers DU Vol.IV, ff. 3-4, 7, demonstrates that Edney was suppling Leicester's first wife, Amy, before her death in 1560. See also Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 122, 383-384. CKS, Sidney Papers, U1475, A5/4, f. 3, records that Edney was supplying the household of Sir Henry Sidney in 1565-1566.

105 LMA, St Thomas Apostle, Composite register: Baptisms, marriages, burials, P69/TMS1/A/001/MS09009, f.37. William Edney was buried on 16 November 1581.

106 An apprentice might be set over to a different master to complete his apprenticeship for a number of reasons, including death of the master, or mistreatment of the apprentice by the master.

107 GL, MTC, MS 34010/2, f. 109, records on Friday 17 June 1580 that '*William Edney by the relacion of Thomas Norman doth sett ouer Richard Warde vnto the saide Thomas Norman to serve owte with him the residewe of his yeres to come*'.

108 GL, MTC, MS 34010/2, f. 108v.

109 GL, MTC, MS 34010/2, f. 126.

110 JL Chester (ed.), *The Parish Registers of St. Thomas the Apostle, London Containing the Marriages, Baptisms, and Burials From 1558-1754*, London, 1881, pp. 91, 94. On 18 April 1573 'Gregory Martin, servant to Mr Edny' was buried, while on 6 May 1579 'Robert Loe, servant to Mr Ednye' was buried.



below the livery by the early 1570s'.<sup>111</sup> However the second point requires further exploration. The evidence Sleigh-Johnson cites for this evaluation is a record of the assessment of members of the Bachelors' Company of the Merchant Taylors to pay towards grain for the City.<sup>112</sup> Of the one hundred and fifty four members listed Edney is amongst seventy six that paid 20s., while eighteen others paid more – 30s. or 40s – and the remaining sixty members paid less. This places Edney squarely in the middle of those assessed by the Company at the time.<sup>113</sup> In addition Edney does not appear in the 1572 assessment of citizens of London.<sup>114</sup> However he does appear in the 1576 lay subsidy assessment in St. Thomas Apostle parish at a valuation of £50, paying 50s. (£2.10s.), a higher assessment than Whittell.<sup>115</sup> It is clear that Edney ran a busy workshop and the lay subsidy assessment would suggest it was a successful business. Whittell, on the other hand, may have chosen to take on limited clients within his business, focussing primarily on Leicester and his household.<sup>116</sup> Edney's engagement with the Company may have suffered from his dedication to his craft or perhaps he was simply left little time to engage further in the Company and City governance as Whittell did.<sup>117</sup> Indeed this may be an underlying factor in the number of apprentices Whittell engaged as he had other commitments to attend to as a liveryman of the Company and possibly within the City.

Any role Whittell had in the governance of the parish is obscured by the lack of records for St Gregory parish and Castle Baynard Ward for the period. Foster has suggested Whittell carried out additional service to the City by serving as a common councillor, an elected City office, however it has not yet been possible to substantiate this claim. Evidence for other common councillors, who were suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe, are found in vestry records of their parish. For example this is true of David Smith and John Parr, embroiderers, who, as common councillors, were recorded in the records of St Benet Paul's Wharf.<sup>118</sup> Without the vestry records for St Gregory's by St Paul's,

---

111 Sleigh-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London 1580-1645*, p. 369.

112 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, ff. 739–740. Sleigh-Johnson's reference cites the correct date of the entry (30 July 1574) but the wrong folio (f. 734).

113 William Edney's last will and testament, which would shed more light on his wealth, has not yet been located.

114 LMA, CLC/281/MS02942.

115 TNA, E 179/145/252, f. 8.

116 There is no evidence for Whittell supplying the wider court, as there is for Edney, apart from garments supplied through Leicester.

117 Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors*, p. 44. The higher positions, from Livery to Master within the Company demanded both time and money to dedicate to the various responsibilities.

118 LMA, P69/BEN3/B/001/MS00877/001, ff. 16–20. See LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 14–16, 98–100, for David Smith's bills. Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 199, 266, 329, records payments to John Parr for work carried out for Leicester in the 1580's.

or the Castle Baynard Ward records alternative sources must be consulted.<sup>119</sup> The most immediate of these are the archives of the Merchant Taylors' Company. These records reveal at least one aspect of Whittell's engagement in his local community and governance of the City through his various roles in the Merchant Taylors' Company. Through the following examination of the Company records the underlying consideration must be how Leicester's, and later the Queen's, patronage of Whittell affected his standing within the Company and community.

It was Whittell's election to the position of one of the four Warden Substitutes of the Bachelors' Company that signalled his rise in the Merchant Taylors' Company.<sup>120</sup> The Wardens Substitute, along with the 'Sixteen Men', were the governors of the lower body of the Company. Davies and Saunders describe the Wardens of the Bachelors' Company as often being 'employed to enforce ordinances and collect revenues'.<sup>121</sup> For carrying out the role, each of the Wardens Substitute was given an allowance of £3.6s.8d.<sup>122</sup> However it would appear that this allowance did not cover losses incurred through diminished time in one's own business, and the need to travel to carry out the tasks for the Company.<sup>123</sup> Very little information exists for the exact activities of the Wardens Substitute, or the Bachelors' Company as a whole.<sup>124</sup> The Court Minutes indicate that the Wardens Substitute and the Sixteen Men met at the Merchant Taylors'

---

119 Forster, *Politics of Stability*, p. 13. Forster surveyed the City administrative records for specified two year periods (1558-63, 1569-70, 1572-3, 1579-80, 1582-3, 1589-90, 1592-3, 1599-1600, and 1603). The periods he found Whittell's name in association with the Common Council were not specified. Therefore it will be necessary, in the future, to access these records to flesh out the full picture of Whittell's involvement in the governance of the City.

120 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 129. Whittell was elected as a Warden Substitute on 28 August 1564, in an election against Thomas Pope for the Watling Street Quarter, this post was for a year. The other Warden Substitutes elected at the same time were Otwell Semper for the Candlewick Street Quarter, Peter Lockey for the Fleet Street Quarter and Thomas Peyrson for the Tailors Hall Quarter. According to Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors*, pp. 66-68, the Warden Substitutes' role was to take charge of the Bachelors' Company, along with Sixteen Men of the Bachelors, directed by the Master and Wardens of the Merchant Taylors' Company. The Wardens Substitute also distributed the quarterly contribution of the Bachelors' Company members to the poor of the Company. They each had a designated section of the City to cover, see Davies and Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Taylors*, p. 173.

121 Ibid., p. 43.

122 Ibid., p. 131.

123 Ibid.

124 Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors*, p. 64. The records of the Bachelors' Company have been lost.

hall five times during the year, each day was a Tuesday.<sup>125</sup> The Minutes also show that an accounts book was kept which outlined all expenses and receipts for the year and was presented to the Master and Wardens in February 1566. These particular accounts caused some controversy over the cost of the Bachelors' dinner.<sup>126</sup> Whittell's service as a Warden Substitute no doubt brought him into greater contact with the tailor community in his designated area, the Watling Street Quarter, which included his home parish.<sup>127</sup> It also raised his profile within the Company, though the controversy surrounding the dinner expenses may have soured the view of some members. However in the long run it did not appear to hamper his rise within the Company hierarchy.

The impact of Leicester's patronage of Whittell in his rise in the Company is difficult to quantify. As we have seen above, it put Whittell in contact with some influential and successful business people through the supply network within the City of London. The Company Minutes remain largely quiet on any relationship that Leicester had with the

---

125 See GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 144, for a request to hold the quarter day on Tuesday 21 November 1564; Ibid., f. 163, for a request to hold the quarter day on Tuesday 23 January 1565; Ibid., f. 167, for a request to hold a quarter day on Tuesday 20 February 1565; Ibid., f. 187, for a request to hold the quarter day on Tuesday 5 June 1565; Ibid., f. 191A, for a request to hold a quarter day on Tuesday 31 July 1565. See also Sleigh-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London 1580-1645*, pp. 244, 260. Sleigh-Johnson suggests the Wardens Substitute was responsible for convening meetings when there was sufficient business to be considered. Sleigh-Johnson also suggests that every Merchant Taylor below the livery was expected to attend these meetings.

126 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 214, 218. The discrepancy between receipts and expenditure caused alarm in the upper part of the Company who noted; '*And so the paymentes exceedith the resceiptes vijli.iijs.vd. whereof there was lost by the dyner xlvijli.iiijs.ixd.*' This led to the imposition of limitations on future dinners held by the Bachelors' Company, '*whereas it hath apperyd vnto the foresaide Maister & wardens that the charge of the makinge aswell of the solempne eleccion dyner of the late Wardens Substitutes as of the two dyners made on the daye before & the daye next after the saide eleccion daye for the yere past did stande in charge more then was receyved at the saide solempne eleccion dyner the some of xlvijli.iiijs.ixd. As by the accomptes of the saide late Wardens Substitutes doth & maye appere. The whiche saide xlvijli.iiijs.ixd. was paide oute of the comen boxe of the saide Bachelors to the greate hinderance of the poore of the saide bachelors that mighte haue bene releuyd with it (if the same comen boxe had not bene so for charged). And it is very likely that the saide comen boxe shall hereafter growe to a greate deale of more charge then heretofore yf all the saide thre dyners hereafter shold contynewe as heretofore they have bene ffor remedy and reformacion whereof it is also agreed & decreed That the seide Wardens Substitutes that nowe be or hereafter shalbe Wardens Substitutes shall not at eny tyme hereafter make any dyner or refeccion within the comen hall of this Mystere nor in any other place at the comen charge of the comen boxe of the seide Bachelors the morrowe after the solempne chosinge & eleccion of the Wardens Substitutes that shalbe hereafter solemply & openly elected within the Comen hall of this mistere as heretofore hath bene vsid & accustomed Any acte ordennence decree or custome heretofore made to the contrary in anywise notwithstandinge*'.

127 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 433, lists the Parishes in the Watling Street Quarter, these were; '*St Gregorys*', '*Alhallows in Bredstreat*', '*Qwenetheth*', '*St John the Evangelist*', '*Pauls Wharfe*', '*St Andrew by the Wardrobe*', '*St Austians, Bowe Parish*', '*Aldermary Parish*', '*St Johns*', '*Trynitie Parish*' and '*St Thomas Apostles*'. This folio names sixty three Merchant Taylors in the Watling Street Quarter for the 12 December 1569 assessment by the Company for contributions to soldiers for the Queen's army to fight the rebels in the North.

Company, saving as a member of the Privy Council dealing with the Company. Only once was a letter from Leicester read to the Court and recorded in the minutes. The letter was in support of Henry Evans, a candidate for the post of the Company's clerk in 1571.<sup>128</sup> The recommendation, although considered, did not see Evans gaining the position. Perhaps this reflects a covert assertion of independence of the City Company to the power of the court. Certainly Whittell does not appear to have called on his relationship with Leicester to aid him in his dealings with the Merchant Taylors' Company. He did however use the name of the Queen when he was soliciting help from the Company in 1598.<sup>129</sup> There is no doubt that the connections he made while working for Leicester were influential in his career. The financial rewards too helped play their part in his ability to take on positions of responsibility within the Merchant Taylors' Company, which were expensive in both fees and time.

Spending time on the Company's business would have resulted in less time in the workshop.<sup>130</sup> For the year that Whittell held the office – August 1564 to August 1565 – his workshop was probably made up of three apprentices and at least one journeyman, with the addition of one new apprentice at the end of Whittell's term.<sup>131</sup> Therefore his staff had to be trusted to continue to produce high quality garments in his absence. Indeed there appears to be no change in the types of garments, or number produced, for Leicester and his household over the period.<sup>132</sup> Whittell's extant bills end in 1565.<sup>133</sup> The fact that he continued working for Leicester through 1566 and into 1567 is demonstrated by the extant warrants made out to Richard Peacock and Mrs Mountague.<sup>134</sup> The certainty that he was still Leicester's main tailor until at least the beginning of 1574 is confirmed by the fabric disbursement book.<sup>135</sup> This demonstrates no less than a sixteen year relationship between the two men. However Whittell does not appear in the later disbursement books. Indeed no tailor is named as making

---

128 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, ff. 535, 554, 555 A copy of Leicester's letter to the Company is recorded in the minutes. A copy of the earl of Sussex's letter supporting the same candidate is also recorded. Henry Evans was one of six candidates that were put forward for the position by various supporters. Only Evans and Nicholas ffuliambe reached the final interview stage. Nicholas ffuliambe was the successful candidate for the clerkship position.

129 GL, MTC, MS 34010/3, f. 368v.

130 The exact time spent on Company business is unknown. The Court minutes simply record requests by the Warden Substitutes to hold quarter day meetings.

131 See Appendices 5.4 and 5.5. The apprentices were John Wormygam, Thomas Wardley and Rycharde Robynson, along with John Bridgeman who was presented to the company on 20 July 1565 a month before Whittell ceased being a Warden Substitute.

132 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 73v–84v.

133 Ibid., f. 84v.

134 Ibid. For example ff. 359, 396, 437, 443 are warrants for delivery of materials to Whittell for numerous garments for Leicester.

135 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol. XII., f. 33v.

garments for Leicester.<sup>136</sup> A ‘Powher the taylor’ was given a cloak at Leicester’s funeral, but there is no further information on their relationship.<sup>137</sup> Determining exactly when Whittell ceased supplying Leicester and his household is a challenge.

Whittell was still supplying Leicester when he was taken into the Livery of the Merchant Taylors’ Company on 13 March 1570.<sup>138</sup> He had only appeared briefly in the Court Minutes in the intervening period following his election to Warden Substitute. In June 1569 he stood surety for Harry Good, who was granted a loan from the Company for £12.10s., part of a charitable device set up by Sir Thomas Rowe.<sup>139</sup> Two other men also stood surety for the loan, Robert Good, Haberdasher, and Rycharde Thompson, Pewterer.<sup>140</sup> These loans were to foster members of the Company who were poor householders and ‘*onely occupienge eyther shearinge with the brodesheare or els rowinge at the pearche*’ (i.e. clothworkers).<sup>141</sup> Robert Good and Rycharde Thompson were both members of the parish of St Gregory by St Paul, and appear in the 1576 lay subsidy assessment (see Appendix 5.9). This demonstrates the close ties that were developed within the Parish between Whittell, Thompson and Robert Good. It is possible that Harry Good was also a member of the parish, however as poor householder he does not appear in the subsidy assessment. If Harry Good was not a member of the parish it is possible Whittell encountered Good during his time as a Warden Substitute when he was dispensing charity.<sup>142</sup> Whittell’s second appearance in the Court minutes was his assessment for supplying money for the soldiers to fight

---

136 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 271, 288. ‘Poukes the taylor’ was recorded as making garments for Wat, Leicester’s boy in July 1585. Nicholas Harford, tailor, was sent to Leicester’s son Robert Dudley in August 1585. There is no record of his making garments and Harford was referred to as Robert Dudley’s man in three later entries, *Ibid.*, pp. 330, 340, 341.

137 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 457. Powher the taylor could be Robert Powler, made free of the Merchant Taylors’ Company on 20 June 1570, see GHL, MTC, MS 34035/1, unfoliated.

138 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 443. The entry in the minutes reads ‘*Item yt is lykewyse agreed and decreed by the mr wardens and assystemes afforenamed/ That this persons undernamed shalbe forthwith accepted reseived and taken into the clothinge of this Mystery viz./*’ The names are listed in Appendix 5.10.

139 *Ibid.*, f. 401. Sir Thomas Rowe was a Merchant Taylor and Lord Mayor of London in 1568. See, Sayle, *Lord Mayors’ Pageants*, particularly pp. 43–58 for a brief biography and transcripts of the record of the Lord Mayor’s Pageant held for Rowe’s mayoralty.

140 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 401. The loan was for two years and fell due in 1571.

141 *Ibid.*, f. 396.

142 *Ibid.*, f. 491. Harry Good is named as a member of the Company occupied in the ‘*Brodesheare*’ when his loan was passed on to another member following his death, which occurred prior to the quarter day meeting of 11th December 1570. No last will and testament has been located for Harry Good.

the rebels in the North.<sup>143</sup> Whittell was required to pay 10s.<sup>144</sup> This was not the first time Whittell had given money for soldiers. In August 1562 he is recorded as giving 2s. for the equipping of men to be set to Le Harve.<sup>145</sup> This particular collection took place in Westminster and adds weight to the earlier idea discussed regarding Whittell's early connections with court.

Whittell was accepted into the livery along with seventeen other men (see Appendix 5.10).<sup>146</sup> By 3 April the liverymen had paid their fees and taken their oaths.<sup>147</sup> The wearing of the Company's livery was an important aspect of maintaining the Company's presence in the City. Of those that were taken into the livery with Whittell 44% had served as Wardens Substitute. This compares favourably with the 30% Sleight-Johnson found for 1580-1645 who were former Wardens Substitute.<sup>148</sup> A fee of 20s. paid is recorded in the Master and Wardens' account book for each of the new liverymen.<sup>149</sup> Additional fees were paid to the Master for his own use 5s.4d., to the Clerk 6s.4d., to the Beadle 2s. Those who had not served as a Warden Substitute were required to pay a further 6s.8d. into the Company's common box.<sup>150</sup> Of those men who were elevated to the livery with Whittell, 50% went on to hold the office of Warden. Four of the men, or 22%, held the office of Warden twice, at a higher level the second time. Only three of their number, 16.66%, eventually achieved the highest accolade of Master. Whittell was the only person of the group who was a Warden twice but never the Master.

As a member of the livery Whittell was expected to attend a certain number of meetings and events where a defined Merchant Taylors' Company presence was required.<sup>151</sup> On Friday 6 September 1570 the whole of the livery were ordered to assemble at the Hall at 6am the following Monday to travel en masse to Shacklewell where the body of Sir Thomas Rowe lay and accompany it to the burial at Hackney

---

143 Ibid., f. 433.

144 Ibid., ff. 433–434. Those assessed in St Gregory Parish each paid 10s., they were named as John Punte, Rychard Williams, Richarde West, William Whittle, Thomas Watts, Robert Keley, Thomas Dale. The total raised from the Watling Street Quarter was £27.3s.4d.

145 TNA, SP 12/24, f.1, is the account of the collection made in the parish of St Margaret's for setting forth of twelve soldiers.

146 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 443.

147 Ibid., f. 447.

148 Sleight-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London 1580-1645*, p. 129.

149 GL, MTC, MS 34048/5, f. 8.

150 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 447.

151 This defined presence was created by the wearing of the Company's livery. At certain meetings a roll call was made of the livery; if a member was not in attendance his absence was noted and a fine imposed, for example see GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, ff. 475, 493, 509, 545. For the fine see Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors*, p. 193. Also see, Sleight-Johnson, *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London 1580-1645*, pp. 38, 260, for the references to fines levied for non-attendance at Quarter Day assemblies for non-liverymen.

Church.<sup>152</sup> On Friday 18 September 1573 Whittell and his fellow liveryman Thomas Peyrson were appointed as stewards for a dinner to be held at the Hall the following Thursday.<sup>153</sup> For this dinner they were given some funds to cover expenses.<sup>154</sup> During the week that the dinner was being organised Whittell, or those in his workshop, were also constructing garments for Leicester, including a 'wrought' velvet jerkin and a black satin doublet.<sup>155</sup> As a liveryman Whittell was also expected to contribute 33s.4d. (£1.13s.4d.) towards the Company's contribution to supply grain for the City that same week.<sup>156</sup> This represents a considerable sum when in July 1561 Whittell had charged Leicester 8s. for making a black satin doublet and in April 1562 10s. for making a jerkin.<sup>157</sup>

Squaring the income against the expenditure when one was reliant on a craft in which time was such a crucial factor must have been a challenge as the Company demanded more time, and money. Added to this were the other expenses involved in running a household, which included educating his children. Both Whittell's sons, William and Robert, attended school. His son William was enrolled at the Merchant Taylors' School in St Lawrence Pountney on 19 October 1571.<sup>158</sup> Phillippe Gunter, skinner and supplier to Leicester's wardrobe, also had his son Thomas accepted into the school on the same day. The school was limited to two hundred and fifty pupils. One hundred were taught for free, fifty scholars paid 2s.2d. a quarter, and one hundred paid 5s. the quarter.<sup>159</sup> Both young scholars were admitted as among the one hundred that were to pay 5s. a quarter for their education.<sup>160</sup> This was at the top end of the fees paid, clearly indicating Whittell had been assessed on his income and it was demonstrated he had the ability to pay the high fee. This was also the fee that Walter Fyshe, the Queen's tailor, was paying for his son Walter to be educated at the school.<sup>161</sup> Whittell's second surviving son, Robert, was given a place at the school on 6 March 1574(5) also at a cost

---

152 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 469.

153 *Ibid.*, f. 671.

154 *Ibid.* The sum of £5.6s. was given to Peyrson for the dinner. It is not known if this was expected to cover the full cost of the dinner or the number who were expected to attend.

155 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, f. 28v.

156 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 672.

157 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 50, 65.

158 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 547. See also LMA, P69/GRE/A/001MS10231, f. 5. William was baptised on 4 April 1563 at St Gregory by St Paul's, making him 8 years 6 months of age when he joined the school.

159 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 639, shows the admission of Christopher Cambell's son Christopher as one of the 50 scholars paying 2s.2d. the quarter, when the next vacancy arises. *Ibid.*, f. 87, shows John Harrys' son Alexander admission as one of the 100 poor scholars that were taught for free.

160 *Ibid.*, MS 34010/1, f. 547.

161 *Ibid.*, f. 647.

of 5s. the quarter.<sup>162</sup> Three days later Thomas Edney, the son of William Edney, was admitted into the school for the same fee.<sup>163</sup> Both William Whittell junior and Robert were recorded as having attended Cambridge University, each achieving a Master of Arts Degree.<sup>164</sup> There is no evidence for the education of Whittell's daughters.<sup>165</sup>

Whittell's work for Leicester had clearly been noticed by the Queen for in 1575 he became a tailor to the Queen.<sup>166</sup> It is possible that his skill as a doublet maker and the Queen's appreciation of his abilities and fashioning culminated in the doublet featuring as a fashion garment for women at court. Indeed Whittell made twenty eight new doublets for the Queen in his first year as a supplier. It is also highly likely that the ornate doublet that Leicester gave the Queen in January 1575 was made by Whittell and secured him the position of a tailor to the Queen.<sup>167</sup> Elizabeth Goldring suggests this doublet is depicted in a portrait of the Queen c.1575 (see Appendix 5.11).<sup>168</sup> Janet Arnold has also discussed the same portrait and concludes that the garment depicted appears to be following men's fashion and it 'seem[s] likely that this is a doublet'.<sup>169</sup> It is clear that Whittell concentrated on making the upper body garments he was a specialist in; doublets, sleeves, and close fitting bodies (bodice). He made new cloaks, jerkins, jackets, waistcoats, nightgowns but only a small number of gowns. The large quantity of garments he translated reflect the use of high quality materials and their re-use by the Queen.<sup>170</sup> The materials for many of the garments Whittell made and altered were housed in the Great Wardrobe (see Appendix 5.2, Detail D). It is not known whether Whittell travelled to the Great Wardrobe to carry out the work, or if the work was done in his own workshop. Whittell was still engaging apprentices through the period he was working on garments for the Queen (see Appendices 5.4 and 5.5). They too would

---

162 GL, MTC, MS 34010/2, f. 7. Scholars were expected to be at school from 7am until 11am then 1pm to 5pm each school day, and attend prayers before and after school. See also GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 636, for other school requirements.

163 GL, MTC, MS 34010/2, f. 7.

164 J Venn and JA Venn (eds), *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees: a Catalogue of those who have been Matriculated or been admitted to any Degree in the University of Cambridge from 1544 to 1659*, University Press, Cambridge, 1913, pp. 725, 726. William Whittell was a pensioner and fellow of Trinity College, matriculating at Easter term 1578. He was awarded a Bachelor of Arts in 1581–2 and a Master of Arts in 1585. Robert Whittell was also a pensioner and fellow of Kings College, matriculating at Michaelmas term 1582. He was awarded a Bachelor of Arts in 1586–7 and a Master of Arts in 1590.

165 LMA, P69/GRE/A/001/MS10231, ff. 2v., 9v. Whittell's daughters were Johane, baptised 1 May 1561, and Mary, baptised 24 May 1567.

166 TNA, LC 5/35, f.18, is the first evidence for Whittell as a supplier to the Queen. See also Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 180.

167 Goldring, 'Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I', p. 658 gives the description of the doublet Leicester gave the Queen, transcribed from BL, Harley, MS 4698, f. 9.

168 Goldring, 'Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I', p. 658.

169 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 19.

170 See *Ibid.*, pp. 1–2 for a discussion on the alteration of the Queen's garments.



be engaged upon the work that Whittell was carrying out for the Queen.

The sums Whittell charged for making garments for the Queen do not appear much greater than those he was charging Leicester fourteen years earlier. The perfumed doublet laid with gold Venice lace and green silk, lined with taffeta sarcenet, that he made for the Queen in 1575 attracted a charge of 35s. (£1.15s.) for his workmanship.<sup>171</sup> This can be compared with a yellow satin doublet stitched all over that he constructed for Leicester in 1561 at a charge of 25s. (£1.5s.) for the workmanship.<sup>172</sup> There were other benefits that working for the Queen offered. On 26 October 1576 Whittell was rewarded 'for his service' with a lease for twenty one years.<sup>173</sup> The property, the rectory of Edwardston in the county of Suffolk, was to be Whittell's from the expiration of the current lessees' patent, for a rent of £20 a year and the right of the Queen's steward to be entertained and hold courts in the property. The property was held until 1583 by Sir Francis Jobson. This reward in fact may have been at Leicester's instigation. Sir Francis Jobson and Leicester were related through Jobson's marriage to Northumberland's half sister.<sup>174</sup> Indeed Adams asserts that Leicester 'obtained episcopal leases for Jobson'.<sup>175</sup> The rectory that Whittell was awarded had been part of the Colne Priory before the reformation. Furthermore, to receive such a reward for service for just one year appears extremely generous. It is more likely to have been an expression of Leicester's appreciation of Whittell's service. This theory is supported by the fact that Whittell did not receive any further grants from the Queen, until he approached her for help in 1598.<sup>176</sup>

Whittell continued supplying the Queen until 1583.<sup>177</sup> Evidence hints at a wider client base in the later part of 1583, with the survival of documents demonstrating he was supplying fabric to the Archbishop of Canterbury at this period.<sup>178</sup> Unfortunately there is no evidence for any other clients Whittell may have had. He may have still been supplying Leicester or members of his household, or the wider court, but without further evidence of his clients after 1583 this area of his life can be explored very little. He did, however, engage four apprentices in the period 1584 to 1592 which would suggest he was still an active tailor (see Appendices 5.4 and 5.5). It is not known why

---

171 TNA, LC 9/67, f. 13. Whittell also supplied the '*bumbaste*' (padding) at a cost of 18d., the hooks and eyes 2s.6d.

172 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 51v.

173 *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Elizabeth I, Volume VII, 1575-1578*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1982, p. 85.

174 Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, p. 155.

175 *Ibid.*, p. 164.

176 See below for the circumstances and GL, MTC, MS 34010/3, f. 368v.

177 TNA, LC 5/35, f. 343, is the last entry for Whittell in the warrants.

178 Bod., MS Rawl. Letters 106, ff. 208, 209. There is no evidence Whittell was supplying tailoring services to the Archbishop.

he ceased working for the Queen. Arnold suggested that he left the Queen's service because he 'died, or perhaps did not get on well with William Jones, the Queen's new tailor'.<sup>179</sup> Whittell did not die until a number of years later; though the date is not certain it was clearly after 1598. The idea that he did not get on with William Jones is an interesting one. A conflicting relationship is not evident in the Merchant Taylors' Company Minutes. Indeed Whittell and Jones, along with James Farington, haberdasher, stood surety for John Hope for a loan from the Company for £25 in 1586.<sup>180</sup> If there was any animosity between the two men there is no evidence for it.

Whittell's continued service to the Company was recognised in 1584 when he was elected to court as a Warden on 14 July, giving his oath on 24 July.<sup>181</sup> Of the four Wardens elected that year Whittell was the third Warden and was delegated the task as Warden Renter for the West (see Appendix 5.12). This position required that he collect the rents for all of the properties held by the Company on the West part of the City and liberties. He was also to use the money collected to dispense charity from bequests such as that of Sir Thomas Rowe.<sup>182</sup> Additional Company expenses were paid for, such as equipment for the muster before the Queen, and materials for building the new Company Hall.<sup>183</sup> Whittell was liable to pay any rent he could not collect, for which he asked for recompense at the end of the account.<sup>184</sup> It is clear that this task had a significant impact on the remainder of Whittell's career. The Minutes reflect his growing interest in property development. In particular properties that he had encountered as a Warden Renter were of interest when their leases came up for renewal. He was to forward his petition (or suit) for at least three of the properties he dealt with.

As early as November 1585 Whittell was putting forward his suit to obtain a lease from the Company. Having served as a Warden for the Company he became one of the Assistants whose function was to aid and advise the current Master and Wardens on matters that arose within the Company.<sup>185</sup> This also resulted in the Company showing a level of benevolence towards Whittell. When the Wherrymen's Hall at Three Cranes Wharf came up for renewal, the Wherrymen's Company put their suit to the Merchant Taylors.<sup>186</sup> Whittell also endeavoured to obtain the same lease, offering to pay £90 for

---

179 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 180.

180 GL, MTC, MS 34010/3, f. 141v.

181 Ibid., f. 114, is the record of the election. GL, MTC, MS 34010/2, f. 166 is the record of the giving of his oath. Wardens were elected from liverymen. Four Wardens were elected each year, the 1st Warden was the highest ranked while the 4th Warden was the junior office holder.

182 GL, MTC, MS 34048/6, f. 287. Sir Thomas Rowe had bequeathed £40 to ten poor men.

183 Ibid., f. 290.

184 Ibid., f. 291.

185 GL, MTC, MS 34010/3, f. 130v. William Whittell was named as one of the Assistants on 27 September 1585.

186 Ibid., f. 131v. The Wherrymen's Company offered £50 for a 21 year lease.

the lease.<sup>187</sup> Whittell was clearly familiar with the property as it had been within the remit of the Renter Warden in the West (see Appendix 5.12).<sup>188</sup> The lease was made over to Whittell who was to pay £100 and receive an extension to the twenty one year term to thirty one years, paying £6 a year rent and all cost of repairs.<sup>189</sup> By 28 June the following year Whittell had surrendered his lease and the Wherrymen had secured the property.<sup>190</sup> Whittell's further suit for the lease for a property in Trinity Lane was unsuccessful.<sup>191</sup>

Prior to his second term as a Warden, Whittell was awarded an armorial grant. William Whittell of London received the grant in 1587 which may have been as much to do with his service to the Queen as to Leicester, or a personal desire for greater status.<sup>192</sup> By 1565 all applicants for armorial grants were examined by the Duke of Norfolk, Leicester or Burghley. Here his relationship with Leicester may have been crucial in assisting his grant. However Vaughan suggests that the great number of grants that were awarded between 1560 and 1589 resulted in the loss in value for such a grant.<sup>193</sup> Vaughan also posits that a grant may have been reasonably easily obtainable if one had enough money to purchase one.<sup>194</sup> Both of Whittell's sons used the family crest into the beginning of the seventeenth century.<sup>195</sup> The date of this grant ties in with Whittell's success in securing a lease with the Company.

---

187 Ibid., ff. 132v., 133. The Wherrymens' Company were asked if they would pay £100 for the lease, they replied that they would only pay 100 marks (£66.13s.4d).

188 GL, MTC, MS 34048/6, f. 282.

189 GL, MTC, MS 34010/3, f. 137c.

190 Ibid., ff. 141v., f. 142. This action appears to have been at the request of the Company.

191 Ibid., f.141v. The Company offered to approach Regnold Barker the grant holder of the lease to the house in Trinity Lane to investigate if he was going to take the lease up. If not Whittell was to have the lease. This appears to be an attempt to appease Whittell following his having to surrender the lease he held for the Wherrymens' Hall. The property in Trinity Lane was also in the Renter Warden for the West catalogue of properties.

192 BL, Stowe MS 670, f. 21. Whittell's arms are described as: Gules, a chevron ermine between three talbot's heads erased and for his crest on a wreath argent and gules, a hound's head couped or the ear and collar argent. See also, F Madden, B Bandinel, J G Nichols (eds), *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, Volume 7, London, John Bowyer Nichols and Son, 1841, p. 299.

193 J Vaughan, *Secretaries, Statesmen and Spies: The Clerks of the Tudor Privy Council, c.1540-1603*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of St Andrews, 2006, p. 130. Vaughan suggests over two thousand grants were made in the 1560-1589 period.

194 Ibid. The fees paid to obtain a grant varied according to the applicant's financial circumstances.

195 A Page, *Topographical and Genealogical History of the County of Suffolk*, Ipswich, 1847, pp. 19, 698. Robert Whittell 'second son of William Whettell, Gent., citizen and merchant taylor of London and younger brother of William Whettell, Esq.' with his wife Margaret owned Netherhall manor in Suffolk, he died in about 1607. William Whittell (the younger) was granted a manor in Ampton Suffolk in 13 James. He was High Sheriff for the county in 1622 and died in 1628; TNA, PROB 11/155/246, is William Whittell the younger's last will and testament proved 22 February 1629.

The ‘*old Hall at Dowgate*’ was proposed to be leased to Whittell on 9 May 1587, however a number of other people expressed an interest in the property which resulted in a delay of the grant.<sup>196</sup> Indeed the lease was not sealed until 8 March 1589.<sup>197</sup> It is not known when or if Whittell moved from his Paul’s Churchyard workshop. The property at Dowgate included a series of buildings that Whittell rented out, but none were identified as his home. In addition the main building was in extremely bad repair; part of his lease agreement was to repair and rebuild much of the property spending £400. The commitment to spend such a large sum on repairs to the old Hall was coupled with the added expense of being elected to the position of second Warden in July 1589.<sup>198</sup> Indeed the weight of the financial investment needed to complete the renovation of the property was too much for Whittell. After gaining a further loan of £300 for the repairs he finally gave up the property to the Company with the renovation unfinished.<sup>199</sup> He had spent £670 on the building.<sup>200</sup> This had left him ‘*destitute of a house and not in so good estate as he hathe bene*’ when he successfully sought a lease for a newly built property in Knightrider Street.<sup>201</sup> Some time before December 1596 Whittell conveyed the lease to Edward Humfrey for an unknown sum.<sup>202</sup> Pinning down Whittell’s location at this point is a challenge. He may have still been in London or have resorted to his property in Suffolk. However he did also sell on his lease for the Edwardston rectory. The exact date of the transaction has not yet been determined due to the poor preservation of the relevant document.<sup>203</sup>

---

196 GL, MTC, MS 34010/3, ff. 160v., 172v., 173,176v., 180v., 183v., 186, 186v., 190v., record the negotiations for the lease following the settling of the dispute over entitlement to the property.

197 Ibid., f. 190v. The lease was for seventy years at a rent of £8 for the first year and £20 a year for the remainder of the term.

198 Ibid., f. 197.

199 Ibid., f. 256v. This occurred on 17 December 1592.

200 Ibid., ff. 257v., 258. The minutes record what he had spent and the income he received from his tenants.

201 Ibid., ff. 272v., 276. The twenty one year lease cost him £60 and he was to pay £6 rent per annum. He subsequently extended the term of the lease to thirty years on 19 October 1594.

202 Ibid., f. 336. Edward Humfrey, Merchant Taylor, had conveyed the property to Richard Woofall who had surrendered the lease to the Company to receive the lease in his name: See LMA, P69/GRE/A/001/MS10231, f. 85v. Edward Humfrey was Whittell’s son-in-law, marrying Mary Whittell 7 September 1590: See TNA PROB 11/94/511 for Humfrey’s will, proved 13 December 1599. Humfrey was survived by Mary and their three children Edward, Elinor and Dorothie; see AA Locke, *The Hanbury Family, Volume 1*, London, Arthur L Humphreys, 1916, pp. 61–64, Mary then married (Sir) John Hanbury, they had two children Edward and Mary.

203 TNA, E 133/9/1446 is the Thomas Appleton v blank document outlining a dispute over tithes for the rectory at Edwardston that mentions the grant of the rectory of Edwardston to William Whittell by the Queen. The document is 43 Elizabeth (1600/1). It is not known when the rectory was sold by Whittell as the document is disfigured.

William Whittell's last appearance in the Company's Court minutes is in April 1598.<sup>204</sup> He was clearly an elderly man by this stage and his property investments had not proved as successful as he would have hoped,

*Att this courte the company having consideracon to the decayed estate of William Whittell a brother of this company and one that hath ben twice warden of the livery of this company and who hath privertely a suite vnto her Matie and wanteth money to goe forward with the same haue freely gyven vnto him towardes the supply of his want the some of fyve pownds to be paide by our Master and to be allowed him in his accompt.*<sup>205</sup>

Fortunately he was able to call on the Queen and the Company to aid him in what was probably his final property investment.<sup>206</sup> Positive verifiable evidence for Whittell disappears after this property transaction. He is not mentioned in his son-in-law Humfrey's will of 1599 whereas William junior and Robert each received a black cloak.<sup>207</sup> A William Whittell 'from Staffordshire' was buried on 14 February 1600 at All Hallows Lombard Street in London.<sup>208</sup> However Locke suggests William Whittell was associated with Bury when he recounts the marriage of Mary Whittell to John Hanbury.<sup>209</sup> This evidence suggests Whittell may have left London. The challenge of determining how soon a citizen and Merchant Taylor of London might shed those particular status markers to become associated with a different region is exacerbated by the lack of a last will and testament. Ultimately, for the purposes of this dissertation, Whittell spent his working career based in the City where he counted Leicester and the Queen among his clients, where he ended his days is currently unknown.

## Conclusion

In this chapter it has been possible to shed some light on Whittell's career and biography with specific reference to his presence in Leicester's wardrobe network. The questions posed at the beginning of the chapter have provided a framework to consider the evidence available and reflect upon the findings in order to draw a series of conclusions. Through the reexamining of the questions the conclusions can be better emphasised. The questions are listed here and reconsidered in turn below; What was Whittell's background? How did he come to supply Leicester? What was Whittell's position in his local community? How did he conduct his business? What was the

---

204 GL, MTC, MS 34010/3, f. 368v.

205 Ibid.

206 *Calendar of Patent Rolls 41 Elizabeth 1 (1598-1599) Part 1 (Calendar), Volume 328*, SR Neal & C Leighton (eds), The Lists and Records Society, London, 2009, p. 150. On 2 March 1599 lands and rents were alienated to William Whittell and Edmund Grene, to the use of Percival Harte, for £16.13s.4d by the Queen's patent.

207 TNA, PROB 11/94/511.

208 LMA, P69/ALH4/A/001/MS17613, f. 97v.

209 Locke, *The Hanbury Family*, pp. 62–63. William Whittell is referred to as from Bury, Suffolk when Mary's marriage to John Hanbury was discussed.

impact of his relationship with Leicester?

Whittell's background has been difficult to pin down. By purchasing his membership of the Merchant Taylors' Company in 1554 he not only joined a powerful network of business people, but he also enjoyed the privileges of the freedom of the City. In order to achieve both of these stations he had to have access to financial resources, and a recommendation from a notable person either within the Company, City or elsewhere. Presently there is no information available that sheds light on these aspects of his wider support network prior to his entry into the Company. Available evidence strongly suggests that Whittell practised the art of a tailor contrary to the majority of Merchant Taylors who gained membership of the Company by redemption. However it has not been possible to determine where Whittell trained as a tailor, though links to the William Whittell, tailor, of Norwich can not be discounted. The fact that Whittell's children established themselves in Suffolk may indicate an ancestral connection to the area, however more research is needed to explore the Suffolk connection. Establishing Whittell's background prior to his appearance in Leicester's household accounts has proved a challenge and at this stage is an unresolved question.

Equally vexing is the question of how Whittell became Leicester's tailor. Whittell may have been plying his trade within court circles in Westminster prior to 1554. Certainly Whittells were recorded in parish registers. Whittell may also have been in the household of a courtier, possibly even one of the Dudley family. However this line of enquiry is hampered by lack of evidence. The fact that members of the nobility did retain tailors in their household has been clearly established, but if Whittell held such a position is unclear. A further possibility is the recommendation of Whittell to Leicester by a trusted acquaintance or Leicester visiting Whittell's shop from which visit a relationship was established. Without doubt members of the nobility shared intelligence on craftspeople; this is seen when the earl of Pembroke used Whittell's services. Leicester also appeared, at least in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, to have spent time visiting shops in the City. However no clear picture has been drawn of exactly how Whittell came to supply Leicester, chiefly due to lack of hard evidence.

Establishing Whittell's position in his local community can only be based on the limited evidence available which only hints at his involvement with his immediate community. Much of the evidence is tied to his membership of the Merchant Taylors' Company which was itself a collection of people ostensibly forming a supportive community of business people. He also dispensed charity on behalf of the Company within this community. In addition Whittell supported those struggling financially through standing surety for Company loans. Further evidence is found in his business practise demonstrated by Leicester's surviving papers which place Whittell at the centre of a network of suppliers. What is missing is the evidence that demonstrates his involvement in parish affairs. This may be found in the fact that Whittell maintained

a shop within the parish for at least twenty years providing a stable business. This business brought into his local community his clients and suppliers who visited the shop along with his workforce which may, at times, have exceeded nine individuals. These people, including his apprentices, contributed to the success of Whittell's business and helped cement his position within his community. Whittell's role in the governance of the parish is yet to be firmly established.

Whittell's business practise and how he conducted his business can be seen reflected in Leicester's long-standing patronage of Whittell as a supplier of garments to the noble's wardrobe. Whittell was clearly a talented practising tailor who could meet the needs of clients at the centre of the early modern English court. The maintenance of such a position points to a person who was able to translate ideas into material form working with his client and other suppliers in the network to create a vision of Magnificence seen through Leicester's, and later the Queen's, dress. It also indicates Whittell was able to communicate effectively with Leicester and others in the supply network. Whittell's surviving bill provides the most immediate evidence for this communication. It appears Whittell was also flexible in his workshop practise, in particular that he was open to employing strangers, perhaps to accommodate Leicester's desire for the latest Low Country styling. In addition he was able to delegate tasks to those in his workshop. This is demonstrated clearly by the continued production of garments for Leicester while Whittell was undertaking additional Company business as a Warden Substitute. Company records also show that he was a successful master who was able to retain a large number of the apprentices he engaged. Indeed his ability to see such a high number of his charges through to freedom of the Company suggests that the apprentices were content with his management of their training. Ultimately he was central to a supply network that co-operated in the production of wardrobe items and was evidently able to run a successful business which provided a working environment that was conducive to the perpetuation of the craft.

The impact of his relationship with Leicester is demonstrated by a series of key circumstances: his successful business, his rise in the Company, and his patronage by the Queen. Leicester's patronage ultimately gave him the financial resources to succeed in business and to reach high office in the Company. However financial means was not the only requirement for success within the Company. Other financially successful Merchant Taylors did not achieve office at all. Leicester, or the Queen, do not appear to have actively influenced or assisted in Whittell's Company business, although his connections to both his clients would undoubtedly be common knowledge. Whittell must therefore have possessed both the financial means and the personal qualities that the Company looked for in its elite governing body. Leicester's patronage also gave him access to a wide range of business people across many specialities within the City and the Liberties. Furthermore Leicester's patronage exposed Whittell to many potential

clients, particularly when he was dressing members of Leicester's extended household. There is little doubt that if Whittell had not been Leicester's tailor he would have been unlikely to have worked for the Queen. Whittell's impact on Leicester can be seen in the upper body outer garments Leicester is depicted wearing in portraits prior to 1575. Whittell ensured Leicester's Magnificence was visible for all to see in the garments he produced for his client. Whittell may not have been so successful at the property investment he resorted to later in his career, but his mastery of his craft remains unquestionable.

An underlying theme of Whittell's business practise was that he was part of a network of suppliers whose goal was to dress Leicester in a suitable manner. While Whittell was a pivotal member of this network he did share this central position with one other figure. Maynard Buckwith, hosier, dealt with largely the same suppliers and dressed the same clients as part of his role as Leicester's hosier. What makes his career different from Whittell's is one crucial factor, he was an immigrant. The following chapter focuses on Buckwith's career in an effort to determine, in part, how his stranger status impacted on his life and his relationship with Leicester.





## **Chapter Six: Maynard Buckwith, hosier, and the hosier's role in supplying Leicester's wardrobe.**

As we have seen in the previous discussion of William Whittell, it is clear that Leicester's patronage, particularly long-term patronage, was advantageous to a person's career in the City. Yet Whittell's success was also aided by a series of key factors. Firstly he was English, secondly he was a citizen of London and thirdly he was a member of one of the City's leading Livery Companies. Maynard Buckwith was none of these things.<sup>1</sup> He was an immigrant, was not known to be a member of a Livery Company, and there is no evidence for him being made free of the City. These aspects raise interesting questions around Leicester's patronage of aliens, particularly the alien master craftsmen supplying his wardrobe. As has been demonstrated in Chapter Three Leicester chose to utilise the skill base of the alien community in London, and its environs, in his wardrobe network. Through the examination of Buckwith's life and career in this chapter the impact of Leicester's patronage on one of his alien suppliers can be explored. In addition while there are stark contrasts, there are also distinct parallels that can be drawn between the careers of both Buckwith and Whittell which will highlight the challenges faced by the alien artificer with a similar skill level, servicing the same client. It is also apparent that there are gaping holes in the evidence for the life of an alien artificer, although this is not necessarily due solely to ethnicity, but is influenced by wealth, community engagement and survival of evidence. A comparison with Whittell is only made possible through the interrogation of surviving bills for both men which demonstrate the specialist products each produced for Leicester's wardrobe. Visually the products the men supplied are represented in portraits of Leicester from 1560 to 1575. While supporting material in the form of Merchant Taylors' Company archives demonstrate a wider engagement with various communities for Whittell, no such information is known to survive for Buckwith.<sup>2</sup> What we do have are Buckwith's last will and testament, his denization records, and a deposition by his wife, each illuminating aspects of his career not entirely evident in Leicester's bills and accounts.

This chapter, then, becomes an exploration of the life and career of Buckwith through a discussion of the specialist craft attributed to him in Leicester's papers, his status as an alien, and the impact of Leicester's patronage on his occupation and way of life. In order to provide a framework through which to explore these aspects a series of research questions have been formulated. These are; What was the role of a hosier as represented in Leicester's accounts? How did Buckwith fit into this specialist field? How did Buckwith's career develop through Leicester's patronage? To what extent did Buckwith's alien status help or hinder him within his career and community? These

---

1 Maynard Buckwith is variously called Buckway /Buckwaye/Buckell/Bockwith/Bockway.

2 The evidence is summarised in Appendix 5.1.

questions differ from those used in the examination of Whittell's career in Chapter Five as Buckwith presents unique challenges in terms of readily accessible information for his activities outside Leicester's accounts. Therefore a broader approach, that considers hosiers more widely, has been adopted.

### **Hosiers as found in Leicester's accounts**

Buckwith is first encountered as 'Maynard your lordship's hossier' in Leicester's 1559–1561 household accounts.<sup>3</sup> The use of the designation 'your lordship's' hosier requires further examination, however it must be preceded by a defining of the term hosier as found in Leicester's accounts. The role of the hosier, a specialist garment-maker, is somewhat vague. Certainly in the first half of the sixteenth century the hosier was engaged in producing leg coverings and breeches. The term hosier when applied to Leicester's wardrobe identifies a master craftsman primarily constructing hose (breeches), not netherstocks (leg coverings). Leicester's leg coverings tended to be knitted hose or stocks and were supplied by a number of different suppliers including haberdashers, (see Appendices 2.16 and 2.17). The hosier to the queen, Henry Herne, constructed woven fabric leg coverings, called hose in the accounts, while the silkwoman and others supplied additional knitted hose.<sup>4</sup> Herne also supplied hose (breeches) for livery to the Queen's household.<sup>5</sup> Hayward suggests the hosier in the Tudor court was the result of specialisation within the tailors' profession.<sup>6</sup> Tailors were certainly able to turn their hand to the production of hose as William Jones, the Queen's tailor, demonstrated when he supplied cloth hose to the Queen's Wardrobe between 1592 and 1597.<sup>7</sup> Although these were leg coverings, not the breeches that Leicester's hosiers supplied, it highlights the crossover between the two allied crafts. This notion is supported by tailors being included in the 1562 proclamation against the production of outrageous hose (breeches).<sup>8</sup> A further surviving document confirms that tailors were producing hose and being bound by the proclamation. The 1562 recognisance signed by Thomas Dore, tailor of Shalfleet, and John Hacley, tailor of

---

3 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 129.

4 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, pp. 206–210. Henry Herne, hosier, is recorded as supplying the Queen's fabric hose from the beginning of her reign until 1592. Fabric hose continued to be supplied by William Jones, the Queen's tailor, from 1592–1597, followed by Robert Morland, hosier, from 1597. Alice and Roger Mountague supplied knitted hose as part of their wider supply relationship with the Great Wardrobe. Ralph Abnett, called a hosier by Arnold, but in fact a member of the Clothworkers' Company, supplied knitted silk hose from 1590–1597.

5 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 206.

6 Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, p. 319.

7 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 206.

8 Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, p. 189. This proclamation focuses on the amount and type of cloth included in a pair of hose/breeches.

Calbourne, binds them to abide by the proclamation.<sup>9</sup> While it is clear tailors shared the ability to construct hose none of Leicester's hosiers appear to have been members of the Merchant Tailors' Company, the company to which a hosier might logically belong.<sup>10</sup>

Fitch notes that hosiers were found as suppliers of leg-coverings as early as 1170.<sup>11</sup> The *Oxford English Dictionary* cites the date of 1440 for the occurrence of the word hosier.<sup>12</sup> It is clear that hosiers had been specialising in garments for the lower body for some time. From the analysis carried out by John Pound it would appear that hosiers, at least in Norwich, considered themselves to be a separate profession to tailors, calling themselves hosiers in their freedom admissions.<sup>13</sup> Hosiers were also evident as a separate trade in the 1525 London Amicable Grants lists scrutinised by John Oldland.<sup>14</sup> Oldland suggests that later London subsidy assessments 'do not include trade designations and the accuracy of the assessments may have declined'.<sup>15</sup> This precludes a comprehensive assessment of the numbers of hosiers active in London during the period that Leicester was being supplied with hose and breeches.

The figures exhibited by Pound and Oldland show that the number of craftspeople calling themselves hosiers were only a fraction of those referred to as tailors. In Norwich the freedom admissions for 1500-1603 show that twelve hosiers were admitted, compared to four hundred and fifty eight tailors for the same period.<sup>16</sup> Oldland's figures are based on wealth assessments for tax purposes and therefore do not show total numbers of practising artisans. However, here too, the hosiers were in short supply, only fourteen hosiers were worth more than £5, in comparison to the one hundred and sixty one tailors and forty one merchant taylor who were worth more than £5.<sup>17</sup> Hosiers as craftspeople in London were fewer in number and less wealthy than their tailor counterparts. Yet the regulation of London wages proclamation of

---

9 HRO, 44M69/G3/93. Jervoise Family of Herriard, Justices of the Peace. Recognisances to keep the terms of the proclamation concerning hose and cloth, 1562.

10 GL, MTC, MS 34038. Ralph Abnett, supplier of knitted hose to Queen Elizabeth from 1590-1597, was a member of the Clothworkers' Company of London.

11 M Fitch, *Notes on Trades and Occupations in Medieval London*. Unpublished manuscript housed at the library of the Institute of Historical Research, London, 2003, pp. 128-129.

12 *Oxford English Dictionary*, hosier, n. Second edition, 1989; online accessed 23 October 2011, <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/88717>>

13 JF Pound, 'The Social and Trade Structure of Norwich 1525-1575', *Past & Present*, no.34, 1966, pp. 49-69, see the following Tables: Trades of the Freemen of Norwich, pp. 65-66; Admissions to the Freedom in Norwich 1500-1603, pp. 67-69. The numbers of hosiers are only a fraction of the number of tailors in both tables.

14 Oldland, 'The Wealth of the Trades'.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 128.

16 Pound, 'The Social and Trade Structure', p. 69.

17 Oldland, 'The Wealth of the Trades', pp. 147-148.

1573 shows that the skilled journeymen tailor, hosier or ‘dyers being hosiers’ could expect to be paid an equivalent wage.<sup>18</sup> This same wage expectation was repeated again in 1576, however ‘drapers being hosiers’ replaced the ‘dyers being hosiers’, suggesting that drapers rather than dyers engaged in the craft of hose production.<sup>19</sup> Stella Kramer’s discussion of drapers, hosiers and tailors highlights the connection between the areas of specialism.<sup>20</sup> Indeed it again demonstrates the overlaps between hosiers and tailors, yet there was clearly a separation felt by hosiers, which led to the drapers and hosiers forming a Company in Chester much to the displeasure of the tailors.<sup>21</sup>

Two English artificers, Roger and William Tempest, referred to as hosiers in Leicester’s accounts, were members of the Drapers’ Company of London, each having served his apprenticeship to gain his freedom of the Company and City.<sup>22</sup> Neither of the Tempest brothers identified themselves as hosiers in their last will and testament; Roger supplied no Company affiliation in his brief declaration while William called himself a draper.<sup>23</sup> Neither was identified as a hosier in the surviving Drapers’ Company records. This perhaps partly illustrates why so few hosiers are visible in the records, their specialism is masked by omissions in data or hidden behind titles such as draper. The percentage of hosiers within the Drapers’ Company of London in the second half of the sixteenth century is unknown.<sup>24</sup> Arthur Johnson highlights the increasing diversity of trades practised by members of the London Drapers’ Company particularly through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>25</sup> Hosiers were identified in the Company as early as 1310.<sup>26</sup> Of particular note is the 1350 petition Johnson quotes that ‘the manner of Drapers is to purchase Cloth both at home and abroad, and to make liveries for great

---

18 Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, p. 372, where it is declared that ‘To the best and most skillful workmen, journeymen, or hired servants of any the companies hereunder named by the year [will be paid] with meat and drink, that is to say Tailors, hosiers £4. Dyers being hosiers, £4’.

19 Ibid., p. 401. The wage remains £4 a year with meat and drink.

20 S Kramer, ‘The Amalgamation of the English Mercantile Crafts, Part II’, *English Historical Review*, XXIII, 1908, pp. 236–251.

21 Ibid., p. 247. See also P Bolton, ‘The Chester Companies in the Seventeenth Century’, *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, vol.156, 2007, pp. 75–104.

22 Boyd, *Roll of the Drapers’ Company of London*, p. 180.

23 TNA, PROB 11/44/264, is the last will and testament of Roger Tempest, proved 5 July 1561; TNA, PROB 11/50/283, is the last will and testament of William Tempest, proved 8 October 1568.

24 AH Johnson, *The History of The Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London: preceded by an Introduction on London and her Gilds up to the close of the XVth Century*, Volumes I to V, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1914–1922, Vol. III, p. 93. Johnson lists the number of hosiers paying quarterage to the Company in 1624 as eighteen.

25 Johnson, *The History of The Worshipful Company of the Drapers*, Vol. I to V.

26 Johnson, *The History of The Worshipful Company of the Drapers*, Vol. I, p. 85. Johnson notes that between 1310 and 1346 four members of the Drapers’ Company were called hosiers.

lords and others of the Commons'.<sup>27</sup> This clearly demonstrates the well established practice of artificer members of the Company constructing garments. Hosiers within the Company were particularly linked to corsets and hose.<sup>28</sup> William Tempest's surviving bill demonstrates he was running a workshop where garments were produced exclusively for the lower body.<sup>29</sup> These garments were for the livery of members of Leicester's household, tying into the earlier petition declaring the production of livery as part of the drapers' craft. Tempest and his brother had learned their craft within the Company and each was perpetuating the trade through his own engagement of apprentices.<sup>30</sup> The existence of a strong link between hosiers and drapers is undeniable, however the parallels with the tailoring craft saw both specialisms share in the production of hose in the second half of the sixteenth century. The proportion of those master craftsmen who were able to specialise exclusively in the production of hose is a question that will remain unanswered. It does however paint a picture of a craft that was well established in the City of London, and its guild structure, which may have presented a challenge for a stranger hosier such as Maynard Buckwith to set up a business and attract patronage.

### **Alien Hosiers**

Determining the number of alien craftspeople practising the trade of a hosier also presents some difficulties. The returns of aliens are incomplete, exhibit inconsistent coverage of the City and the Liberties, and do not always record a person's occupation.<sup>31</sup> Buckwith appears in two returns of the alien population in 1568 and 1583, and one subsidy assessment in 1589.<sup>32</sup> The information supplied in the 1571 returns of aliens is reasonably comprehensive giving the name of the alien and their spouse, where they were born, their children's names, where they were born, often recording why they came to England, which church they attended, occupation and other occupants in the house.<sup>33</sup> However the area where Buckwith was recorded as living, the Liberty of the Duchy of Lancaster without Temple Bar, is not included in

---

27 Ibid., p. 122.

28 Johnson, *The History of The Worshipful Company of the Drapers*, Vol. II, p. 51.

29 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff.116–119, is Tempest's bill.

30 DC, WA 4 1547-1562, foliated within each account, bound as a group, '*The Acownt of henry lyege Rycharde Cooke John broke and ffranses basnam wardens in Ao Domin 1558 vntyll 1559*', f.2v. William Tempest presented two apprentices in 1558 Robarte Sandars and Thomas Rycharde; WA 4 1547-1562, foliated within each account bound as a group, '*The acownt of Wyllim Bery John Maynor Edwarde Hewy and Thomas Thomson Wardens*' 5 August 1559 to 6 August 1560, f.3. William Tempest presented Nycolas Ball his apprentice.

31 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens*. See also Scouloudi, *Returns of Strangers*.

32 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, pp. 375, 421, and *Part III*, p. 415.

33 Ibid., *Part I*, pp. 402–479, and *Part II*, pp. 1–154. The 1571 survey supplies the most information on the background of those included when compared to the other returns conducted through the 1560-1590 period.

either the May or November surveys of the alien population in the City and Liberties.<sup>34</sup> Why this area was not included in the returns is not clear; it may be that the relevant papers have simply been lost. This area was documented as containing 124 aliens in 1568.<sup>35</sup> For both of these periods in 1571 it can be firmly established that Buckwith was working for Leicester, no doubt in his workshop which was probably part of the house he dwelled in, located in St Mary le Strand parish, at the Savoy.<sup>36</sup> This ability to clearly identify one alien (Buckwith) omitted from the returns – and there were certainly others given that the entire Liberty of the Duchy of Lancaster was omitted – demonstrates the unreliable nature of the sources and calls into question any attempt to provide totals of alien hosiers working in and around London.<sup>37</sup> The figures themselves hint at the incomplete nature of the data; however, they are the only available documents that provide any indication of occupations for a range of aliens (see Appendix 6.1). While recognising the figures are flawed, some comparison of numbers of aliens identified as practising the trade of hosier over the sixteenth century with those calling themselves tailors is necessary. In the starkest contrast the 1593 survey shows one hosier compared to one hundred and eighteen tailors identified. At the other end of the spectrum the 1540/41 survey shows twice as many tailors as hosiers, although this figure is distorted by the small number identified.<sup>38</sup> This comparison suggests that amongst the alien community the specialist hosier was greatly outnumbered by those calling themselves tailors, mirroring the rate of hosiers evident amongst the English craftsmen.

It is perhaps the specialisation in a particular type of garment and reliance on generating an income based on craft skills alone that limited the hosiers' financial success. However, neither Buckwith nor William Tempest would have been considered poor if one was guided by their last will and testaments.<sup>39</sup> For these two artificers their ability to call Leicester one of their clients would have contributed to their success. Both men also supplied some of the materials required to produce their products, as

---

34 Ibid.

35 Ibid., *Part III*, p. 416.

36 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 3–3v., 7v.–8v. Fabric was delivered to Maynard Buckwith on 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 24 May and 4, 12, 13, 30 November in order to construct garments for Leicester and his household. In WCA, St Mary le Strand Parish Registers, Vol. 1, f. 211 Maynard Buckwith is called a householder from the Savoy in 1592.

37 Scouloudi, *Returns of Strangers*, see p. 129, Appendix IV in which Scouloudi lists as 56 the number of strangers inhabiting the area of the Duchy of Lancaster Without Temple Bar in the 1583 return of strangers.

38 The 1540/41 survey must be treated with caution as only three craftspeople practising the art of hose construction and tailoring were identified. Generally of those identified in the returns as hosiers or tailors 84–96% were tailors.

39 TNA, PROB 11/81/189, Maynard Bockwaye; and TNA, PROB 11/50/283, William Tempest. Buckwith left bequests of £83.10s and two leased properties, along with other goods and money. Tempest gave away at least £34 in legacies and had other goods enough to leave his wife and daughter-in-law.

Whittell had done, adding to the financial return of garment production. Indeed the materials supplied by the two hosiers were, not surprisingly, similar.<sup>40</sup> This enables the drawing of parallels between the draper/hosier Tempest and the alien hosier Buckwith. Of particular note is the fact that Buckwith's former wife, Mary, declared that Buckwith ran a linen draper's shop where he supplied the types of materials used in garment production to other artificers.<sup>41</sup> Further investigation is needed to determine if Tempest also maintained a shop. However given the fact that both men supplied similar products and possessed the craft skills to construct the garments, and both appear to have been financially successful there is a strong possibility Tempest too kept a shop which enabled the diversification of his income stream. Indeed both were likely to have capitalised on their situation in the network of artificers to the court. What is interesting to note in this discussion is that, through his shop, Buckwith was supplying materials to the earl of Oxford's tailor.<sup>42</sup> Indeed this individual, William Ruswell was in debt to Buckwith for £64 when Ruswell died.<sup>43</sup> Not only does this demonstrate the interconnected nature of the court supply network within allied crafts, it also illustrates the level of debt incurred by the suppliers who provided dress for the nobility and how this debt was transferred down the line of supply. There is no record of whether this debt was paid to Buckwith. Buckwith as an alien hosier was clearly able to combine the hosier's craft-based skills within a wider business practise outside the Livery Company system that supported men like Tempest.

Tailors often supplied hose as part of their business practise throughout the sixteenth century, particularly those craftsmen supplying the general population. There is, however, no evidence that Whittell constructed any hose for Leicester. Leicester was not alone amongst the nobility in employing a hosier and a tailor to produce the different elements of his wardrobe. The earl of Pembroke and Walter Devereux, later earl of Essex, also followed the same pattern.<sup>44</sup> Further work is needed to determine

---

40 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 116–119. William Tempest's bill records he supplied bumbast, silk, canvas, lace, linen, buckram, kersey as components for hose that he constructed. For materials Buckwith supplied see Appendix 6.2.

41 TNA, C 24/269, Part 1, No.68, available online at <<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ahnelson/RUSWEL/ruswel09.html>> accessed 23 April 2013 is the deposition of Mary Howson, former wife of Maynard Buckwaye, who states that her husband kept a linen draper's shop. The deposition was made in 1598.

42 AH Nelson, *Monstrous Adversary: The Life of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 2003. The case of Judith Ruswell versus the earl of Oxford is discussed on pp. 183–186; see also for mention of Buckwith (Buckwaye), and pp. 376–379 in general terms.

43 TNA, C 24/269, Part 1, No.68, deposition of Mary Howson. The date of Ruswell's death is not specified.

44 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 129, 136, 139. Dedick (or Dethick) the earl of Pembroke's hosier is mentioned in Leicester's household accounts. See also LHA, Devereux Papers, DE Vol.III, ff. 14–25. Essex's unnamed tailor did not supply him with any pairs of hose in his extant bill, suggesting a hosier was engaged to supply these pieces of clothing.



how widespread this practice was within court circles. It is clear from this brief discussion that hosiers considered their craft aligned to, but separate from, that of the tailor. For Roger and William Tempest their skills were founded in the drapers' tradition. The training behind the skill-set of alien hosiers is less evident, although they were similar to those required by a tailor. While hosiers practised in parallel to tailors they were clearly fewer in number throughout the sixteenth century. The hosier's craft, as the constructor of hose for men, seems to have been almost, but not entirely, subsumed by the tailor by the beginning of the seventeenth century. However the evidence demonstrates that Buckwith was a long-term supplier to Leicester of the garments associated with the hosier in the sixteenth century. His career was clearly defined by the products he supplied and appears to have shifted over time. It is the closeness of the trades of hosier and tailor that can be seen in the career of Buckwith himself.

### **Maynard Buckwith, hosier to Leicester**

Garments produced by Buckwith, and those in his employ, for Leicester and his household, were clearly constructed in close collaboration with Leicester's tailor Whittell. Fabric deliveries to Buckwith and Whittell show that they had material delivered to them separately and at the same time.<sup>45</sup> This demonstrates a convenience in record-keeping in the extant fabric disbursement book, and while it might suggest a closeness in proximity of workshops, it is a demonstration of the need for the two craftsmen to collaborate on suits of clothes for Leicester. Given that it was necessary for the hose and doublet, with which it was to be worn, to be fitted together it is distinctly possible that both Buckwith and Whittell spent some time in each other's workshops fitting garments to Leicester's body.<sup>46</sup> Both men were clearly mobile, collecting elements to construct Leicester's garments from various points in the City.<sup>47</sup> They also both travelled to fit Leicester at court.<sup>48</sup> While there is no evidence that they did these fittings at court together it is a logical conclusion. The close relationship between Leicester's hosier and tailor underlines the requirement for the supply and production network to collaborate harmoniously in order to achieve the prescribed end

---

45 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII. Fabric deliveries were made primarily to Whittell, tailor and Maynard (Buckwith) hosier, though other artificers also received fabric to produce elements of dress for Leicester and his household including; George Jerland, tailor, Ambrose Waller, tailor, Henry Cater, hosier, Mr Browne, shoemaker, Mr Browne, haberdasher, Mr Hemming, tailor, and Parre, embroiderer.

46 Leicester visited both Buckwith and Whittell in their workshops, see Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 46, 66, 154, 160.

47 For example LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 305, 329, 402, 407, 419 are warrants that demonstrate Buckwith collected materials from Alice Mountague silkwoman in order to incorporate them into hose for Leicester. Ibid., ff. 331, 343, 384, 389, 401, 413 demonstrated that Buckwith collected fabrics from Richard Pecoock for Leicester's hose. Whittell collected materials from the same two suppliers, see Ibid., ff. 405, 406, 410, 416, 441.

48 Ibid., ff. 53v., 63v., 152v., 155v; and Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 42.

result. Unfortunately the ability to demonstrate a close personal relationship between Buckwith and Whittell is hampered by lack of evidence. However it is clear that Whittell was happy to work with strangers, engaging at least two in his own practise.<sup>49</sup> This would suggest that, at least on a business level, the two men were able to work together harmoniously to ensure that the suits of clothes produced for Leicester formed a seamless ensemble.

Buckwith's trade is only recorded in two returns of aliens living in the Liberties; he is called a hosier in the 1568 return and a tailor in the 1583 return.<sup>50</sup> This reflects a broadening of Buckwith's production. Indeed he refers to himself as a tailor in his last will and testament.<sup>51</sup> In addition he is called a tailor when he is listed as an overseer, along with Peter Bunney, tailor, of the 1585 last will and testament of Oliver Hugins, hosier.<sup>52</sup> He is referred to as a hosier in Leicester's extant papers and in his bill dated 23 April 1565 to 15 February 1565(6) he refers to himself as a hosier.<sup>53</sup> The transition from hosier to tailor occurred sometime between his last recorded entry in Leicester's papers and the 1583 return of aliens. Buckwith clearly considered himself a hosier for the period in which there is evidence of Leicester's patronage. The correlation between products supplied and reference to Buckwith's trade deserves further analysis.

The earlier 1558–1559 household account identified three hosiers constructing hose for Leicester; the Spanish hosier, Hance the hosier, and Roger Tempest.<sup>54</sup> Tempest and Hance were both referred to as 'your lordship's hosier' in this early account.<sup>55</sup> While the term your lordship's hosier may indicate that the hosier was chiefly employed in the production of Leicester's hose, it may also suggest a link to Leicester's household. This is supported by evidence that demonstrates Buckwith and Hance were engaged,

---

49 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, p. 88.

50 Ibid., p. 375, and *Part III*, p. 415.

51 TNA, PROB 11/81/189.

52 TNA, PROB 11/68/521 is the last will and testament of Oliver Hugins, hosier, of St Martins-in-the-Field, Middlesex, dated 8 August 1585 and proved 11 September 1585. Hugins has not been definitively identified as a stranger in the published returns, but given he names two aliens as overseas of his will (Peter Bunney and Buckwith) it is likely he too was a stranger. His will suggests he had been resident in England for some time. He was married and had two daughters, leased a property in East Smithfield to Elizabeth and John Mathew, lived in a house in the parish of St Martins-in-the-Fields where he was a parishioner. See T Mason (ed.), *A Register of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials in the Parish of St Martin in the Fields In the County of Middlesex From 1550 to 1619*, The Harleian Society, London, 1898, p.130. Hugins was buried on 27 August 1585.

53 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 129, 140, 160; and LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 209–214.

54 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 56, 89, 90, 91, 106, 107. The Tempest in question was Roger Tempest, citizen and Draper of St Martin-within-Ludgate, London.

55 Ibid., pp. 106, 107. There is no further information on the identity of Hance the hosier.

at least for periods of time, within the household.<sup>56</sup> There is no such evidence for Roger Tempest, but this may simply be due to the uneven survival of the relevant documents.<sup>57</sup> What is also lacking is data on the hose Tempest constructed either for Leicester or his household which might support a conclusion. We do find, however, that ‘the Spanish hosier’, who may or may not have been the same artificer referred to in the accounts as the Spanish tailor, is recorded as constructing hose for Leicester yet is not called ‘your lordship’s’ hosier. This suggests that he may have been a casual supplier engaged when the workload on the regular suppliers was excessive. It would certainly fit with the surviving accounts, given the need to provide quantities of garments for Leicester and his household to wear in the early years of Elizabeth’s reign. From the available evidence it would appear that the term ‘your lordship’s’ hosier implies some exclusivity of supply to Leicester in particular, but may have included garments for his wider household. It is likely that the term did indeed demonstrate a connection to the household, however defining that connection, given the paucity of information, is a challenge. Buckwith was the only hosier in the 1559–1561 household account who was referred to as ‘your lordship’s’ hosier, and continuing references to him as such occur in surviving warrants.<sup>58</sup> However he was not the only artificer with the designation. It is a term that was applied to other members of the wardrobe supply network, including Whittell, whose home and business were well established outside Leicester’s household.

Anthony Forster’s warrants for Leicester’s wardrobe present a picture of a number of artificers who shared a close association with Leicester in the supply network. He names a variety of craftspeople as ‘my lordes’ when describing who was to receive the goods. In addition to Whittell, Buckwith shares this designation with More the embroiderer, John Tomlinson the upholster, and the unnamed painter.<sup>59</sup> Interestingly when the craftsperson supplying Leicester had an allegiance to a different client this was noted in the warrant. For example Thomas Cure is referred to as ‘the Queen’s

---

56 Both Maynard Buckwith and Hance charged Leicester for board and wages. LHA Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152–157 is Buckwith’s first bill charging for board and wages; Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 129 records payment for Hance’s board and wages.

57 No bill survives for Roger Tempest and there is no reference to such a charge for Tempest in the household accounts.

58 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 129, 130, 140, 160. The hosiers mentioned in the account are Hance, Deathike the earl of Pembroke’s hosier, Roger Tempest, Maynard (Buckwith), John Foxe, and Booreman. LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 305, 322, 329, 331, 336, 337, 345 (called ‘my lords man’), 348, 349, 350, 357, 384, 389, 390, 391, 394, 401, 402, 407, 408, 409, 413 & 414 (called ‘my lord’s man’), 419, 436, unfoliated dated 5 August 1566 Anthony Forster to Mrs Mountague.

59 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, Whittell ff. 307, 316, 318, 324, 327, 332, 334, 351, 355, 368, 369, 383, 399, 405 & 410 & 416 (called ‘my lord’s man’), 428, 430, 437, 439, 443, 444; More the embroiderer ff. 330, 333, 356, 358, 442; John Tomlinson the upholsterer ff. 328, 354; The painter, who is not given a name in the warrant, ff. 312.

saddler' even though he is supplying products to Leicester.<sup>60</sup> In addition this is also seen in Leicester's household accounts when referring to goods received from the earl of Pembroke's hosier.<sup>61</sup> This would suggest that Buckwith might appear in the accounts of other courtiers to whom Leicester gifted hose as 'the earl of Leicester's hosier', but no such accounts have yet come to light. While it is clear that Buckwith was one of a number of master craftsmen whose close association with Leicester was acknowledged through the use of the designation 'your lordship's' hosier, it is a title that brought some instant acknowledgement of his prestigious position as a supplier to one of the leading figures at court.

Adams refers to a warrant in which Buckwith is called 'my lord's man', and Buckwith's receipt of livery cloth, as evidence for suggesting he fell loosely into the classification of servant to Leicester.<sup>62</sup> As has been discussed in Chapter Five, information on those artificers included in Leicester's household is slim. While the bestowing of livery indicated that a close connection to Leicester existed, it is apparent livery was given to artificers who are likely to have had a wider client base than simply that of Leicester and his household. These included John Lonyson, goldsmith, whose shop was in Cheapside, Thomas Cook the perfumer of St Martins, and Diricke the jerkyntmaker.<sup>63</sup> While Buckwith was connected to the household in the early 1560's, once he had achieved denization he appears to have set up his own workshop and no longer charged board and wages for himself or wages for his workforce.<sup>64</sup> However he was given livery cloth after his denization indicating the strong connection to Leicester continued.

The impact of livery worn by the members of a household would have been greatest when seen en masse. The addition of an embroidered badge would have reinforced the perceived allegiance when apart from the household. Although Buckwith and the other artificers who received livery cloth were not named amongst those who received livery badges embroidered by More in 1567–8, they may have received badges created

---

60 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, f. 363. Thomas Cure (d. May 1588), TNA PROB 11/72/569, will proved 22 June 1588; See also Ian W Archer, 'Cure, Thomas (d. 1588)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 29 March 2013, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/93684>>.

61 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p.129.

62 Ibid., p.129. The warrant is found in LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.IV, f. 18 and reads as follows; 'Mr Pecok I pray you deliver to this bere Manard my L man an ell and a quarter of black bullony sarsenet to t cut the paynes of a hose aper and this shalbe your warrant for the same This fare ye well weyten the xiiijth of January 1566 youre verie frind Antho: forster'. See also Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 427, Adams suggests the livery cloth was delivered in 1567-8; A further partial list of members of Leicester's household, who were given winter livery cloth delivered to Whittell from 19 September to 26 October 1559, is found in Robert Gosling's bill, that is LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 1–2. Maynard Buckwith is not identified as a recipient of cloth in Gosling's bill.

63 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 426–428.

64 See Chapter Three for a discussion of Buckwith's connection to the household.

by David Smith.<sup>65</sup> Smith embroidered two hundred and twenty four badges with the white ragged staff in 1563, a further one hundred and fifty four in 1564, and sixty-nine in 1565.<sup>66</sup> The ability to visually demonstrate patronage, and the endorsement of one's skill, through the wearing of Leicester's livery would clearly have marked Buckwith as one of Leicester's men. This may have been advantageous for his business, and within his community, however as Leicester was also a polarising figure it may have carried with it some less favourable consequences, particularly by those who adhered to the old religion. Leicester's livery would also have identified Buckwith as an alien craftsman in a privileged position, perhaps antagonising native jealousy in a London uneasy with the idea of alien craftsmen taking work away from poor handy-craftsmen and journeymen.<sup>67</sup>

### **Maynard Buckwith, alien**

As yet no evidence has come to light that suggests Buckwith was the recipient of hostility from his fellow craftsmen or those native English within his local community. Indeed he may not have encountered any ill feeling at all, though without evidence either way no firm conclusions can be drawn. However he was constantly being reminded that he was identified as an alien through the repeated surveying of the stranger population in the Liberties by City and government appointed officials.<sup>68</sup> How he dealt with the wider issues of being foreign are unclear, but three key points become apparent through a survey of extant documentation. The most immediate evidence is that he was proactive in an attempt to gain more rights as an alien in England through his purchasing of a patent of denization in 1565.<sup>69</sup> Choosing to become a denizen may have made sense financially and may have been a step towards integrating more fully into the community. The patent awarded to Buckwith contains no special allowances and is recorded in a list of similar grantees.<sup>70</sup> The patent stipulates he was to pay customs as an alien and required special permission to live

---

65 Adams, *Household Accounts*, pp. 423–425.

66 LHA, Dudley Papers, Box V, ff. 99v–10, there is no list of the recipients of these badges.

67 There has been considerable discussion by scholars of the antagonism by the English population towards aliens, particularly artisans. Those of particular relevance to this discussion are: W Cunningham, *Alien Immigrants to England*, London, 1897, pp. 124–129; Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, pp. 104–105; Archer, *Pursuit of Stability*, particularly pp. 131–140; and Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, pp. 141–173.

68 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II*, pp. 375, 421; *Ibid.*, *Part III*, p. 415. Buckwith was identified in returns and subsidy assessments made in 1568, 1583 and 1589.

69 TNA, C 66/1016, membrane 14, Patent Rolls, part 8, 17 November 1564 – 16 November 1565. See also W Page (ed.), *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England, 1509–1603*, The Huguenot Society, Volume VIII, Lymington, 1893, p.25. And *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Prepared under the superintendence of the Deputy Keeper of the Records, Elizabeth I, Volume III, 1563–1566*, JH Collingridge & RB Wernham, (eds), London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1960, p. 297.

70 The names are listed in *Ibid.*, pp. 296–298.

in either Berwick or Portsmouth.<sup>71</sup> No evidence has yet come to light to suggest Buckwith was importing materials.<sup>72</sup> However the goods he was supplying as part of the process of manufacture of Leicester's hose were largely imported (see Appendix 6.2).<sup>73</sup> Leicester's patronage is not mentioned in the patent record although it is clear that Leicester's patronage of Buckwith would have contributed to the financial resources needed to purchase his denization, which in turn enabled him to establish a shop.<sup>74</sup> Further evidence for Buckwith's anglicisation may be found in both his extant bills. Each was recorded in English which points to fluency in the language. While these may have been written by one of Buckwith's employees this is unlikely given that they were written in the first person, charging for 'my bord wagys' in the first bill, while the second bill is signed by Buckwith in what appears to be the same hand as the bill.<sup>75</sup> The third factor is that Buckwith attended an English church, clearly engaging with members of the parish as discussed below. As we have seen in Chapter Three Leicester engaged alien artificers and utilised foreign merchants as part of his wardrobe supply network. This then would suggest that Buckwith's alien status presented no barrier to Leicester's patronage. Indeed it may have enhanced his appeal as he brought with him an innate European styling that Leicester clearly appreciated. While contributing to Buckwith's livelihood, the ultimate impact of Leicester's patronage is difficult to accurately measure, as are the ramifications of Buckwith's otherness as an alien on his situation within his community.

The parish records for St Mary le Strand, when read in conjunction with Buckwith's last will and testament, hint at his engagement with his local community. Buckwith names members of his parish in his will to oversee instructions to the executrix, his wife Mary.<sup>76</sup> Peter Bunnye tailor, John Reve, and Nicholas Eaton glover, are referred to as '*my good freindes*' in the document. Bunnye's name had earlier been associated with Buckwith in the will of Oliver Hugins, hosier.<sup>77</sup> Hugins appointed his '*well beloved freindes*' to oversee his will of 1585, confirming that Bunnye and Buckwith had a long-standing relationship. Indeed the baptismal records in the parish register show a further connection through the names chosen for the children of all three men named

---

71 Ibid., p. 297.

72 TNA, E 190/5/5, The Port of London, Imports by Aliens. Buckwith does not appear amongst the aliens importing goods in 1571.

73 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152–157, 209–214. Buckwith supplied dyed cotton fabric, dyed kersey, linen cloth, silk and other sewing thread, silk fabric, horse hair, bombaste, fustian, lace, buckram all imported, for instance see TNA, London Port Book, Inwards, E 190/3/2, unfoliated; 6 May 1565 Thomas Bressy imported linen cloth; 8 May 1565 Thomas Longston imported linen cloth; Frauncys Kyghtley imported dyed kersey; 10 May Wyllyam Holland imported buckram

74 TNA, C 24/269, Part 1, No.68, Mary Howson's deposition.

75 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 154v., 214.

76 TNA, PROB 11/81/189, will proved 26 February 1593.

77 TNA, PROB 11/68/521.

in Buckwith's will. It was surely no coincidence that Buckwith baptised one of his sons Peter and another John or that Eaton named one of his sons Maynard.<sup>78</sup> What is interesting to note is that the name Maynard occurred regularly in the parish records as a series of boys were baptised with the name.<sup>79</sup> This further suggests, perhaps, that Buckwith was a respected figure in his local community. The parish registers also reveal the high mortality rate of Buckwith's children. Of the thirteen children baptised between 1567 and 1579, two were still living when Buckwith wrote his will in 1589.<sup>80</sup> The impacts of these losses on the family or community are not recorded. Any additional community engagement that Buckwith undertook is lost due to the poor survival of records for the parish at this period. However it can be established that Buckwith remained in the same parish from at least 1567 until his death in 1593.<sup>81</sup>

There is also some difficulty in pinpointing the initial location and the size of Buckwith's workshop. It is certain that Buckwith had a workshop where he employed servants to assist in the production of hose.<sup>82</sup> Leicester was recorded as being in the workshops of Whittell and most likely that of Buckwith, although they also travelled to fit him at court.<sup>83</sup> The frequency of these fittings has been discussed in Chapter Three. Examining the numbers of servants and apprentices engaged in Buckwith's workshop demonstrates a clear difference and quality of information which might be available for an alien with no Company affiliation when compared to an Englishman who was free

---

78 WCA, St Mary le Strand Parish Registers, Vol. I, ff. 8v., 9, 10, 10v., 11, 12, 12v., 13, 13v., 15. Maynard and Mary Buckwith had thirteen children; John (baptised 16 November 1567), George (baptised 26 October 1570, buried 2 February 1571), George (baptised 3 July 1572, buried 20 September 1573), Abraham (baptised 10 June 1573), George (baptised 2 May 1574 buried, 29 May 1574), Isaack (buried 29 May 1574), Elizabeth (baptised 2 June 1575, buried 22 June 1575), Peter (baptised 1 July 1576, buried 5 December 1576), Anthony (baptised and buried 16 August 1577), Mary (buried 1 September 1577), Jasper (buried 9 September 1577), Godfrey (baptised 26 August 1579). See also *Ibid.*, f. 16v., Maynard Eaton, son of Nicholas Eaton was baptised on 2 September 1582.

79 *Ibid.*, ff. 16v., 18, 20v., 23, 26v. In addition to Maynard Eaton, son of Nicholas, further children in the parish named Maynard were: Maynard Tincome, son of Gilbert Tincome baptised 19 July 1584; Maynard Langton, son of Christopher Langton, baptised 1 September 1588; Maynard Smyth the son of John Smith baptised 18 October 1590; Maynard Wackefeild the son of William baptised 3 July 1592.

80 Abraham and Godfrey are the only children mentioned in Buckwith's will, TNA, PROB 11/81/189.

81 WCA, St Mary le Strand Parish Registers. Maynard Buckwith was married in the parish on 10 April 1567 and buried there 8 February 1592(3).

82 Adams, *Household Accounts*, p. 160. This is the record of Leicester paying a reward of 10s. to Buckwith's servants, probably when Leicester visited the workshop. LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152–155v., record that Leicester was charged wages for Buckwith's servants while the hose were being constructed.

83 Adams, *Household Account*, pp. 160: LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff.152–157. Buckwith charged for boat hire to and from court.

of the City and a member of a Livery Company.<sup>84</sup> The Merchant Taylors' Company records paint a picture of Whittell's career.<sup>85</sup> No such information survives for Buckwith. Whittell's workshop was recorded in the Company records as being in Paul's Churchyard. Buckwith's workshop, probably established post-denization, was likely to have been within the house he leased in the parish of St Mary Le Strand, attached to the Savoy.<sup>86</sup> The location is narrowed slightly by the 1599 depositions.<sup>87</sup> In Bennett Salter's deposition he stated that Buckwith dwelled on the Strand.<sup>88</sup> It is most probable the dwelling house was combined with the shop on the Strand within the parish boundary at the Savoy. Identifying the people Buckwith employed or apprentices he engaged also presents a challenge. By comparison information for those in Whittell's workshop provides some indication of the numbers working on garments for Leicester and his household within one workshop and can offer a loose model to explore the number of Buckwith's servants.

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Whittell engaged sixteen apprentices throughout his recorded career. It is uncertain whether Buckwith also engaged apprentices to his business practise or simply employed journeymen to assist in production. There is also no evidence for the nationality of Buckwith's employees. Archer states that denizens were 'limited as to the number of journeymen they could employ, and banned from employing stranger apprentices'.<sup>89</sup> Scouloudi puts the number of alien journeymen that a denizen could employ at a maximum of four.<sup>90</sup> However there is no evidence to demonstrate whether Buckwith engaged alien or English employees, or a combination of the two. There is evidence for two alien hosiers found in the returns of aliens. Nicholas Saige and Nychollas Kynge, denizen hosiers, were each recorded as keeping two alien men-servants.<sup>91</sup> The servants to these two men were listed in the same household as their master, there was no mention of English servants. Buckwith may also have kept his servants within his household

---

84 However not all the relevant records survive for the Merchant Taylors' Company for this period.

85 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1-3.

86 TNA PROB 11/81/189. There is no evidence to suggest that Buckwith leased more space than the two properties recorded in his will.

87 TNA, C 24/269, Part 1, No.68. The case was brought by Judith, the widow of William Ruswell, tailor against Edward de Vere, earl of Oxford. AH Nelson has transcribed a series of the documents available online accessed 23 April 2013 <<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ahnelson/RUSWEL/ruswel.html>> .

88 TNA, C 24/269, Part 1, No.68, online accessed 23 April 2013 <<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ahnelson/RUSWEL/ruswel02.html>> for Bennett Salter's deposition.

89 Archer, *Pursuit of Stability*, p. 134.

90 Scouloudi, *Returns of Strangers*, p. 5.

91 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part I*, p. 467, and *Part II*, p. 95 records that in 1571 Saige was keeping two alien servants and one man and a boy. *Ibid.*, *Part III*, p. 411 records that in 1568 Kynge had two alien men servants Richard Wright and William Galley.



although the returns of aliens do not reflect this. It is possible, however, that he initially may have used journeymen on a short-term basis, as hinted at in his first bill.<sup>92</sup> This is demonstrated when he charged £1.11s. for ‘*sarvants wagys whyle the hose ware making*’.<sup>93</sup> What this suggests is that quite a number of servants were working for Buckwith, engaged on specific projects for Leicester. This is particularly evident when considering the amount he charged Leicester for his own board and wages. At 8d. a day, Buckwith managed the production of hose for various periods of time. Yet the relationship between the figures charged by Buckwith and the actual number of days the servants were employed is unclear and varies throughout the bill.<sup>94</sup> What the first bill does demonstrate, though, is that Buckwith engaged servants in the production of Leicester’s hose.

Buckwith’s second bill contains no hints of payment to his servants.<sup>95</sup> This reflects the change in Buckwith’s status following his denization. Nevertheless he is likely to have still been employing servants to assist in the production of Leicester’s hose. In particular the number might be explored further when examining the year from March 1571 to March 1572, the period used to demonstrate the size of Whittell’s workshop in the previous chapter. Both Buckwith and Whittell were receiving deliveries of fabric in order to construct garments for Leicester and his household.<sup>96</sup> During this period one hundred and six garments and two cloak bags were worked on by the approximately nine individuals in Whittell’s workshop. The numbers of people working in Buckwith’s workshop may have been at an equivalent level when considering the number of garments made and altered in the corresponding twelve months. Eighty-two pairs of hose and canions passed through the workshop along

---

92 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152v.–155v.

93 Ibid., f. 152v. The figure is recorded as ‘xxxjs’.

94 For example see Ibid., f. 152v., 153, 154, 154v. The first figures appear to relate to a pair of leather hose with white lace made 24 August 1561, the servants wages were 28s. Buckwith’s boards and wages for nine days was 6s. The next wages figures appear to relate to a pair of black velvet hose with stitched lace made 21 September 1561, the servants wages were 31s. and Buckwith’s board and wages for nine days was 6s. The next wages figures appear to relate to a pair of leather hose with gold passement lace made 10 October 1561, servants wages were 16s., and Buckwith’s board and wages for seven days was 4s.8d. For the white velvet hose made 24 December 1561, and the leather hose embroidered, with gold lace, the servants wages were 31s. and Buckwith’s board and wages for five days was 3s.4d. For crimson hose with gold and silver lace made 4 January 1562, the servants wages were 48s. and Buckwith’s board and wages for seven days was 4s.8d. For black velvet hose made 9 March 1562, the servants wages were 35s. and Buckwith’s board and wages for seven days was 4s.8d. For the yellow velvet hose made 12 April 1562, the servants wages were 30s., there was no charge recorded for Buckwith’s board and wages. For the russet satin hose with round welts of velvet made 10 April 1562, servants wages were 32s., Buckwith’s board and wages for thirty six days was 24s. For the green leather hose made 7 June 1562, the servants wages were 36s. and Buckwith’s board and wages for ten days was 6s.8d.

95 Ibid., ff. 209–214.

96 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII, ff. 1–11v.

with eleven livery coats and four jerkins which were lined and faced, a total of ninety seven garments. Indeed the high turn over of garments in these workshops begins to paint a picture of thriving centres of garment production for the nobility. This can be further demonstrated through Mary's deposition which stated that Buckwith's neighbour Ruswell, tailor to the earl of Oxford, 'kept a dosen or 16 men at worke'.<sup>97</sup> Unfortunately she does not elaborate on the size of her own former husband's workshop in the deposition. Therefore the exact identity or number of people working for Buckwith remains unknown.

Buckwith's transition from a hosier in the 1568 survey of aliens to a tailor in the 1583 survey raises some interesting questions in relation to his trade and alien status. There is no doubt that Buckwith specialised in the products of a hosier in the items of dress he supplied to Leicester and his household. Buckwith's surviving bills record the production of forty nine pairs of hose, four pairs of slops, one pair of canions, and a pair of nether stockings, along with the necessary goods to complete the garments.<sup>98</sup> The fabric disbursement book demonstrates a slight broadening of the services and products supplied.<sup>99</sup> In this document Buckwith was recorded not only producing hose, breeches and slops for Leicester and his household, he was also lining and facing other garments for members of the household. This underscores the close working relationship between Whittell and Buckwith, Whittell having made the garment prior to it being lined by Buckwith. In addition, it highlights Buckwith's ability to produce a range of garments in-line with that of a tailor. This raises the question of his training prior to appearing in Leicester's accounts. Was he indeed a tailor who found employment specialising in hose for Leicester, or a hosier who found it necessary to diversify? What is clear from Leicester's patronage of Buckwith is that he had an affinity for fabric, an understanding of construction techniques, a design aesthetic, and an appreciation for the garments' ability to distinguish the wearer particularly at court – essential skills for a successful master craftsman supplying the nobility.

Luu in her discussion of trades practised by aliens suggests that for 'many, life in a new environment necessitated learning a new trade'.<sup>100</sup> Unfortunately no information has yet come to light that might clarify Buckwith's background prior to arriving in England. The ability to establish his training may be found in overseas archives, however this line of enquiry presents immediate challenges as Buckwith's origins are somewhat obscure. Buckwith was identified as being Dutch in the 1568 return of aliens, and was recorded as being born in 'Westphalie' in the 1583 return.<sup>101</sup> Scouloudi

---

97 TNA, C 24/269, Part 1, No. 68, deposition of Mary Howson.

98 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Box V, ff. 152–157, 209–214.

99 LHA, Dudley Papers, DU Vol.XII.

100 Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, pp. 13–14.

101 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part III*, p. 415, *Part II*, p. 375.

and Luu differ in their attributing of the location. In Scouloudi's transcription of the 1593 return of aliens Westphalia is referred to as 'in Flanders' or 'in Brabant' by the returning officers.<sup>102</sup> Luu places Westphalia in Germany.<sup>103</sup> Buckwith's denization record identifies his origins as from 'the dominion of the Emperor' which in 1553 when he emigrated to England encompassed both regions.<sup>104</sup> The early Dutch description may have been attributed to him by those officials carrying out the survey of aliens within the Liberties. Certainly the 1568 return shows only Dutch, French, Italians and Scots resident in the Liberty Buckwith resided within.<sup>105</sup> This may demonstrate the grouping together of the Dutch and German aliens within the broad umbrella of Dutch. However it may indicate that Buckwith was indeed from an area more closely associated with the Dutch. Unfortunately this does not narrow down Buckwith's origins, or identify where he may have learnt his trade.

There is no reference to Buckwith's connection to Leicester in any of the returns of aliens which suggests that he was considered a householder apart from Leicester at the times when he was recorded. A number of other strangers were associated with members of the nobility, and courtiers, in the returns where they were largely referred to as servants. This is seen in the cases of John Baker servant, and hosier, to Sir Christopher Hatton and Tiddy Domus, servant to the earl of Pembroke.<sup>106</sup> Curiously, too, Buckwith's wife does not appear in any of the returns of aliens. Their marriage, recorded in the parish records of St Mary le Strand, occurred on 10 April 1567.<sup>107</sup> This would indicate that Mary Buckwith (nee North) was possibly English. While an English spouse was often mentioned in the return of aliens this may not have been applied in every case, whereas an alien spouse appears to have been included in the records. What is more, none of Buckwith's children were recorded in the surveys where children of aliens were regularly recorded, however this may be chiefly explained by the dates of the returns in which Buckwith was identified, and the accuracy of the surveys. Certainly when the 1583 survey was taken Buckwith had two children living, Abraham and Godfrey, who are not listed in the return.<sup>108</sup> Further examination of the 1583 return shows that for the eleven areas identified as containing strangers only two areas do not include wives and children in the list, 'Turnemillstrete' and the 'Dutchie of Lancaster'.<sup>109</sup> It is unclear why wives and children had been excluded from the surveys

---

102 Scouloudi, *Returns of Strangers*, pp. 155, 159.

103 Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries*, p. 310.

104 Page, *Letters of Denization*, p.25. See also, *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, Collingridge and Wernham, p. 297 and TNA, C 66/1016 manuscript 14.

105 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part III* p. 416.

106 Ibid., *Part II*, p. 267 and p. 374.

107 WCA, St Mary le Strand Parish Registers, Vol. I, f. 6v.

108 Kirk and Kirk, *Returns of Aliens, Part II* p. 375.

109 Ibid., pp. 353–376, see particularly p. 369 for Turnemillstrete and pp. 374–376 for the Dutchie of Lancaster.

of these two areas. What is demonstrated, again, is the omission of data from these surveys. This in turn illustrates the value of wider supporting material to fill the gaps found in the returns of aliens.

Unlike Whittell's sons, there is no reference to any of Buckwith's children attending school or university. William and Robert Whittell had entered the Merchant Taylors' School at the ages of eight and ten years respectively.<sup>110</sup> There is no doubt their admission to the school was aided by Whittell's membership of the Company. Working outside the Livery Company system Buckwith clearly could not provide the same opportunity for his sons. Establishing their education then presents a challenge. It is most likely they undertook some early education, either within the household or the parish.<sup>111</sup> It might also be conjectured that when old enough they each undertook an apprenticeship, but there is no evidence to support this theory.<sup>112</sup> At the time of Buckwith's death Abraham was aged nineteen, while Godfrey was thirteen years old. Certainly Abraham had probably commenced an apprenticeship.<sup>113</sup> Unfortunately there is no mention in the Buckwith's will of his sons' occupations (see Appendix 6.3).<sup>114</sup> Buckwith did stipulate that both of his sons should not receive their financial legacy, forty pounds each, until they had reached their '*full age of three and twentie yeres*'.<sup>115</sup> This may suggest that Buckwith expected both his sons to have completed their apprenticeships by the age of twenty–three. However the lack of evidence prohibits the drawing of any firm conclusions on the education and training of Buckwith's children. Buckwith's ability to leave his sons each a financial legacy hints at his own success as a businessman, a success built on craft–based skills, shop keeping, and Leicester's patronage.

Buckwith's will also demonstrates that he too, as Whittell had done, leased property for his home and to rent to others. In 1589 when Buckwith composed his will he

---

110 GL, MTC, MS 34010/1, f. 547; GL, MTC, MS 34010/2, f. 7. William Whittell junior, and Robert, attended Cambridge University, see Chapter Five, nn.163.

111 JF Merritt, *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster: Abbey, Court and Community, 1525–1640*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2005, p. 318. Merritt posits there 'is every reason to think that Westminster shared the higher rate of literacy enjoyed by the capital and Middlesex generally' and that parishes were undertaking basic education of some local children.

112 Examination of extant wills at TNA in order to locate Buckwith's sons' wills revealed only two that may, or may not, relate to Abraham Buckwith. The first is the 1634 will of Abraham Bradwaie the elder, silkweaver of the parish of Newington in the county of Surrey (TNA, PROB 11/173/127, proved 30 January 1637). The second is the 1653 will of Abraham Backway of Kilkhampton in Cornwall (TNA, PROB 11/240/476). There is no such evidence that might relate to Godfrey Buckwith. However neither were mentioned in their mother's will of 1614, see TNA, PROB 11/124/334, which would suggest they had died prior to 1614.

113 Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds*, p. 295. Apprentices were typically in their late teens when they began their training.

114 TNA PROB 11/81/189.

115 Ibid.

had several years left on the lease for the house in which he lived and for the tenement occupied by Nicholas Eaton.<sup>116</sup> This suggests both properties were in the same parish as Eaton was a member of the St Mary le Strand community. Buckwith had already negotiated the reversions of the leases with Mr Coope for a further twenty one years which he left to Mary his wife and executrix.<sup>117</sup> On her death they were to pass to Abraham and Godfrey.<sup>118</sup> The fact that Buckwith was able to afford to purchase a lease for a property, or indeed two properties, demonstrates again that he was able to run a financially viable business. While it is unclear when, or if, he ceased supplying Leicester there is no doubt that Leicester's long-term patronage of Buckwith created the opportunity for Buckwith to achieve some degree of financial success. What is more it is likely, if each of the leases had been originally for a twenty-one year term, they were contracted while we have evidence for Leicester's patronage of Buckwith in the early 1570s.

Although Mary was the executrix of Buckwith's will, various conditions were placed upon her in order that his wishes were complied with. She was required to pay any residue of the money owing on the leases to Mr Coope. Mary was also obliged to enter into a bond to keep the leases intact if she was to remarry, confirming that Buckwith was endeavouring to provide for his sons future.<sup>119</sup> A further condition was that Mary enter into a bond with sureties to the overseers in order that she would execute all the instructions stipulated by Buckwith in the will.<sup>120</sup> She was left all of Buckwith's goods, chattels and the debts owed to him, along with the plate and ready money in order to defray funeral expenses, pay outstanding debts, recompense the overseers and provide the legacy for Abraham and Godfrey.<sup>121</sup> However if she did not enter the required bonds she would not receive anything. This clearly demonstrates that Buckwith's primary concern was his sons' future welfare. The two final legacies in Buckwith's will demonstrate his connection to his parish and his sympathy towards the Dutch Church,

---

116 Ibid.

117 No further evidence for the identity of Mr Coope has been found to date.

118 Ibid., Abraham was to receive the property where Buckwith lived while Godfrey was to receive the tenement.

119 Ibid., the bond would be between Mary and her new husband in the one part and Buckwith's overseers on the other, for the sum of two hundred and fifty pounds.

120 Ibid., this bond was for one hundred and sixty pounds.

121 Ibid., there is no indication of the types of goods or chattels, or the quantity of plate, or ready money, or how much Buckwith was owed by his debtors. However Mary's will TNA, PROB 11/124/334 offers some clues. Mary's second husband James Howson bequeathed to her two hundred pounds, the goods she had brought to the marriage and the two leases in the Strand, see TNA, PROB 11/96/332. Mary, as well as leaving financial legacies of eighty four pounds to a number of people (plus five shillings to each of her unnamed godchildren), left her biggest silver beaker parcel gilt, a great gilt bowl, a gilt salt, three featherbeds with the furniture and two diaper tablecloths to her cousin Alice Budgin. Thomas Saunders' wife was to have a gold ring. Alice Gowen was to receive a featherbed with the furniture, the remainder of goods and chattels were to be left to her stepson James Howson her executor.

thus highlighting two aspects of his life that are not evident in Leicester's papers. He chose to leave twenty shillings to the poor of the Strand within his parish and ten shillings to the poor of the Dutch Church.<sup>122</sup>

## Conclusion

Maynard Buckwith was clearly a master craftsman who was able to count one of the most powerful men in Britain as his patron. There is no doubt that he was able to satisfy his patron's requirements for a product that suited Leicester's aesthetic, position, and the need for Magnificence in his dress. Buckwith was also an immigrant from Europe who had brought his skills and design acumen to England. The life of an alien in London and its Liberties involved higher taxes and barriers to setting up their own business along with some unease from the native population, particularly towards artisans. The surviving evidence for Buckwith, such as the ability to identify the products he was producing, to establish who was wearing the garments, and examine his income through extant bills is unique for a alien hosier. It also demonstrates an important aspect of Leicester's wardrobe supply network of which alien artisans were a crucial component. At the outset of this chapter a series of questions were identified in order to provide a framework for a discussion of Buckwith's career, the impact of Leicester's patronage, the influence of his alien status, and his community engagement. By restating and reexamining each of these questions it is possible to reflect upon the conclusions drawn. The questions were; What was the role of a hosier as represented in Leicester's accounts? How did Buckwith fit into this specialist field? How did Buckwith's career develop through Leicester's patronage? To what extent did Buckwith's alien status help or hinder him within his career and community?

The role of the hosier identified in Leicester's accounts was to provide him with garments constructed for the lower half of the body, predominantly breeches, but excluding knitted stockings. Hosiers also produced livery for members of the household. Further more they also supplied additional materials to those purchased by Leicester's fabric suppliers. Leicester used hosiers who were grounded in the London Drapers' Company tradition of constructing livery alongside his alien hosiers to dress himself and his household. The hosier, like the tailor, worked with other suppliers to ensure that Leicester was dressed in a suitable manner.

Buckwith fitted into the specialist field of a hosier as an alien who worked outside the Livery Company system. For Leicester he clearly focussed on the production of hose. He was identified as Leicester's hosier for at least the period through the 1560's and early 1570's, possibly longer. Initially a close connection to Leicester's household saw him receiving board and wages, although once he bought his denization he no longer charged for these expenses. While a connection to the household continued it is evident

---

122 TNA PROB 11/81/189.

that Buckwith was able to establish a home and business, where he still produced hose for Leicester into the mid-1570's. Parallels can be drawn between the Draper/hosier Tempest and the alien hosier Buckwith who supplied similar products based in the craft of producing hose, livery and the additional materials required to complete the garments. In Buckwith's case he was not far removed from Tempest in his business practise, but lacked the Livery Company support that Tempest enjoyed.

Buckwith's career developed through Leicester's patronage in a number of ways. The financial resources that a long-term noble client offered, provided they paid their bills, gave Buckwith opportunities to establish a home and business. He was able to buy his patent of denization, and purchase the leases for at least two properties in his parish of St Mary le Strand. Leicester's patronage also created favourable circumstances for establishing connections, with other suppliers to the court such as Ruswell the earl of Oxford's tailor. This then establishes Buckwith's business well within the court supply network. Buckwith's transition from hosier to tailor was not a great leap for a master craftsman based in the garment-making tradition though why this step was taken is not clear. It is also uncertain when, or if, Leicester's patronage of Buckwith ceased in Leicester's lifetime. However Buckwith's will established him as a reasonably financially successful businessman, a success built largely on Leicester's patronage.

The extents to which Buckwith's alien status helped or hinder him within his career and community is difficult to determine although he clearly worked towards limiting any detrimental effects. There is no escaping the fact that Buckwith's alien status carried with it some degree of stigma as seen through the continual surveying of the stranger population and the reaction of the City Livery Companies to alien artificers. His ability to set up a shop in the Strand was only enabled through the purchase of his denization. His patent required him to pay customs as an alien, at a higher rate than a native. Whether this prevented Buckwith from importing goods is yet to be established, however it would have restrained any profit he could make on imported goods. The financial implications of being a stranger were clearly more onerous than that of a native. However for Buckwith's chief client, Leicester, an alien craftsman was a welcome addition to his wardrobe network. He developed friendships within the parish and the records would suggest he was a respected figure within the community. While it would have been common knowledge that Buckwith was Leicester's hosier the impact of this on his standing within his community is unknown.

Through this examination of Maynard Buckwith and the role of the hosier in Leicester's wardrobe supply network it has been possible to shed light on one of the key artificers who supplied crucial components of the wardrobe. It has also provided the opportunity to focus on an alien craftsman living and working in the Liberties of London. Indeed this examination, and that in the previous chapter, have begun to answer more closely questions posited at the beginning of this thesis – who were

Leicester's wardrobe suppliers and how exclusive was his supply network? What has been demonstrated here is that Buckwith and Whittell shared the same client and ostensibly the same craft-based skills. Each were successful in business, due in large part to Leicester's patronage. Whittell's membership of the Merchant Taylors' Company resulted in a rich resource for exploring his business practise and his community engagement. Buckwith presents more of a challenge. Each represents a different aspect of Leicester's wardrobe supply network and together begins to show the complexity of that network. What has been made clear is that both these figures have proved fruitful subjects who require further biographical research, as do many of Leicester's suppliers identified through the compilation of a list of merchants and artificers supplying different elements of Leicester's wardrobe.





## Chapter Seven: Conclusion.

The early modern English court created a visual spectacle as members consumed material culture designed to demonstrate the magnificence of the monarch and their court. These products were produced locally or sourced from outside the kingdom. Guy argues that ‘Court displays provided a method of transmitting political, diplomatic, and religious messages as well as glorifying the Tudor dynasty.’<sup>1</sup> The splendour of the court was visible to those who visited or were able to view the court as it moved about the kingdom.<sup>2</sup> The people might witness triumphal entries into cities or pageants, each designed to emphasise the grandeur of the monarch. Patronage by the monarch and the court saw the flourishing of the arts, industry and ever-increasing exploration of the globe. Each of these aspects fed into the consumption of material culture by a court that valued the skills of master craftspeople and, in doing so, supported networks of artisans and merchants across the kingdom and beyond.

Throughout the Tudor and Stuart period the monarch maintained a network of royal servants connected to the Household who were charged with supplying their needs. Members of the court established their own networks which might be created through familial ties or the recommendation of a fellow courtier. For those courtiers who were chiefly based at court their networks would invariably be based in London and its environs. Archer has stressed that ‘the City’s fundamental stability in this period’ was supported by ‘the role of personal connections and the importance of key individuals as brokers between City and Court’.<sup>3</sup> Archer has identified ‘those who supplied luxury goods for the Court’ as one important group.<sup>4</sup> Clearly this situation could prove to be a mutually beneficial relationship as the courtier’s patronage might result in a flourishing career for the supplier, positive outcomes for his or her family and the creation of important social contacts. For the patron the network supported and supplied the material culture necessary to be successful at court, and extended credit to facilitate patronage. Yet the ramifications of long-term patronage extended well beyond the immediate exchange of goods. It enabled the members of the network to establish businesses, engage apprentices in order to perpetuate the craft, participate in community governance and dispense charity. Courtly patronage touched the lives of men and women, strangers and the English, the young and the old.

What has been brought into focus through this research is the patronage of a

---

1 Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 424.

2 The splendour of the royal progress has been noted by scholars. See, for example, RT Spence ‘A Royal Progress in the North: James I at Carlisle Castle and the Feast of Brougham, August 1617,’ *Northern History*, vol.27, iss.1, 1991, pp. 41–89. Spence describes a royal progress as (p. 42) ‘a huge and magnificent enterprise, colourful and noisy, an unrivalled spectacle in the provincial life of Tudor and Jacobean England.’

3 Archer, ‘City and Court Connected’, p. 158.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 159.

network of suppliers by a single courtier, Leicester. In beginning this research, I was particularly interested in what Leicester was wearing, his consumption of dress and who was making his wardrobe. As the project progressed I recognised the value of the information contained within the extant documents and portraits. These crucial pieces of evidence informed research on the production and consumption of material culture in the early modern English court along with the impact of noble patronage. Indeed, through individuals named in Leicester's papers the ability to identify and locate suppliers within the network has offered the perfect opportunity to shed new light on under-researched communities. The papers also name individuals who were receiving clothing as livery or for other purposes. This information builds a broader picture of those connected with a courtier's household. For me it also confirmed the value of interdisciplinary research as a means of providing context. This context in turn sheds new light on the supply and production networks within sixteenth-century London and its environs. It grounds the people in their communities and contributes to an historiography that has not previously explored the careers of individuals within a supply network, production rates and the end products they provided. The interrogation of evidence for Leicester's wardrobe has demonstrated the value of the study of material culture to inform a broad range of fields within the history arena. Through understanding these links one can begin to interpret how the elements of dress described in written material, and depicted in portraiture, reflect not only Leicester and his fellow courtiers, but also the life and careers of those through whose hands the material culture was created and passed.

As an exemplar of a courtier at the early modern English court Leicester has proved an extremely worthy candidate through whom to explore consumption of material culture, magnificence in dress and the functioning of production networks engaged by members of the court. Although Leicester was primarily chosen because of the quantity of extant material offering information on his dress, the fact that he was a remarkably interesting subject has been a bonus. As a high profile figure, previously examined for his patronage of literature, religion, and politics, how he looked and his spending had been vilified by many. Yet, surprisingly, there had been no in-depth analysis of his spending or an attempt to place Leicester's wardrobe expenditure in context. The analysis carried out through this dissertation offers new insights into this high-ranking courtier's wardrobe and the costs associated with the magnificent dress required of such a position.

There have been few attempts to explore the networks of supply and production for one person's wardrobe in the early modern English court. The further I investigated Leicester's networks, and their connections across the City and the Liberties of London, the more it became apparent that these people were embedded within their own communities. However, the tendrils generated by each participant in the network,

as part of their work for Leicester, demonstrated that Leicester's patronage impacted widely within the City, extending nationally and internationally. Yet Leicester was one of a number of courtiers who sought to satisfy their dress requirements in the City. This speaks of a vast net of interconnected merchants and artisans who supplied the court as part of their business practise. These networks must have intersected regularly, apparent in the case of Maynard Buckwith who produced hose for Leicester, but was also supplying materials to the earl of Oxford's tailor. There is little doubt that these connections will continue to be uncovered as this research continues to inform future findings.

There are several striking findings that have come out of this research. In particular I find the ethnic mix of the participants in Leicester's wardrobe network and the engaging of master craftspeople early in their careers interesting. Both speak of a courtier who was open to the difference a stranger might bring and to youthful ideas. These findings offer a new perspective on the notion that it was the elite of the City that supplied the court. What is more, the long-term patronage of these suppliers also references a person who was loyal, trustworthy and valued stability, along with good credit arrangements.

Process, concerning, in particular, the production of dress, is an aspect that I find of special interest. The opportunities that the process of production provides for interaction between supplier and client can be utilised to demonstrate the degree of contact. Leicester's active participation in his wardrobe production is indisputable given that elements of dress were fitted directly to his body. Quantifying the interaction between the client and the master craftsperson has not been explored in any depth by researchers previously. The ability to identify particular garments made by individuals and the fitting of those products to the courtier's body offers new insights into the production process. It also highlights the importance of a good working relationship to ensure long-term patronage. Through the interrogation of sources for this research it has been possible to focus on key points of contact for the artificer and the client, particularly for Leicester's tailor and hosier.

In depth examinations of the careers of sixteenth-century artificers have been few in number. This lack is not a true reflection of the value of carrying out such a study in the furthering of understanding of the individual's role in the wardrobe network. Certainly the individuals that formed Leicester's network were integral to the production of his wardrobe. Their skill, design aesthetic, and business practise were all reflected in the elements of dress they provided. The biographical approach to the two artificers whose careers have been examined further in the course of this dissertation focuses on the products they supplied and the impact of Leicester's patronage. It might be argued that to define a person by what he made and who he worked for puts too tight a constraint on his biography. However this research shows how further

information can be teased out of extant evidence and demonstrates that it does provide a fruitful framework on which to build a picture of a person's life.

In this conclusion the questions posed in the introduction to the dissertation will be restated and addressed in turn. Such an approach offers the opportunity to reflect further on the conclusions drawn in each chapter and their relevance to the questions. This approach highlights the value of such research and offers pointers for future research directions based on this dissertation.

*What was Leicester wearing?* When considering what Leicester was wearing it has been possible to align Leicester's clothing with his contemporary courtiers, particularly the courtiers who were member Knights of the Order of the Garter, who offer a suitable visual comparator through portraiture. The written documentation supports the visual evidence for Leicester's dress indicating the garments and jewellery depicted in his portraits were likely to have been in his wardrobe. Unfortunately the lack of substantive evidence for his contemporaries' wardrobes makes the drawing of the same conclusions difficult. However, from what little evidence that does survive, it would appear that these men, too, were depicted in garments and jewels from their own wardrobes. While not at the extremes of fashion, Leicester wore garments that reflected his position and his family lineage, much as his father and brother John had done before him. Leicester also chose to wear garments that reflected a certain European styling. Prominent amongst these were Dutch and Spanish garments. These types of garments were an indication of Leicester's personal taste. The prominence of Dutch styled garments was also indicative of his interest in, and support of, the Dutch nation. Leicester chose to import jewels, through his goldsmith supplier Lonyson, from Flanders. He also commissioned table linen to be woven in the Low Countries. Tapestries that bore his arms were also likely to have originated in the Low Countries. Through his dress and his household textiles Leicester, to a certain degree, demonstrated his politics.

What Leicester was wearing also reflected the makeup and connections of his wardrobe network. Through well-established court suppliers, Leicester was able to access high quality fabrics, laces and accessories which were incorporated into elements of dress. By using his connections to merchants such as the Spinola family Leicester was able to access wider resources for his wardrobe than those available to him in London. The background and training of the master craftspeople that constructed the elements of dress for Leicester's wardrobe was reflected in the products they supplied. Each member of the network strove to satisfy Leicester's dress requirements. It is probable that Whittell's engaging of alien journeymen in his business was a reaction to Leicester's preference for European styling. Process, too, was exhibited in what Leicester was wearing. The successful construction of a garment that passed through the hands of numerous suppliers demonstrated the communication systems and working

methods used across the wardrobe network. If this communication failed the network failed. The working methods saw master craftspeople work alongside journeymen and apprentices to produce garments. In this way skills were passed on to the next generation of master craftspeople.

What Leicester was wearing reveals much more than just the garments depicted in portraits or described in accounts. His clothes embodied his history, his position, and his aspirations. They also demonstrated his politics, his connections and his patronage. Additionally they also reflected the effectiveness of his wardrobe network and spoke of the background, and abilities of each member involved in that network and the continuation of high quality craftsmanship within the City and the Liberties of London.

*How far was Leicester's role at court reflected in his wardrobe?* It was necessary for Leicester's wardrobe to function well in any situation he might find himself in. Predominately these events were based at court next to the Queen. In these circumstances his dress was required to reflect the magnificence of the monarch and the spectacular nature of the court itself. Because he was considered the strongest English suitor for the Queen's hand, Leicester required his wardrobe to radiate with a brilliance that surpassed his rivals. It was essential that Leicester's dress demonstrated his nobility and marked him out to all those that caught sight of him as one of the power brokers of the kingdom. Certainly the jewels he wore constantly, to show his membership of the Order of the Garter, would have added to the impact of the spectacle. The continued maintenance of such jewels demonstrated that Leicester wore these markers of status at every opportunity, at court and in public. Ceremonial robes worn to distinguish membership of elite groups such as the Knights of the Garter, St Michael and Leicester's robes as an earl all confirmed Leicester's place at court in support of his Queen. These garments remained in his wardrobe until his death and were in constant service. Leicester's membership of these groups also dictated the garments to be worn beneath the robes, emphasising the status of the wearer. Even when he was not at court the magnificence of the court was reflected in his dress. It could be argued that this was even more important as it created a sense of awe in the Queen's subjects when they viewed members of the court, as seen in the description of Leicester in Warwick, thus demonstrating the power of the language of dress.<sup>5</sup>

As Master of the Horse Leicester had an ongoing relationship with suppliers to the Stables. A number of these suppliers were also supplying Leicester's personal wardrobe, likely blurring the line between his personal wardrobe and that of his wardrobe as Master of the Horse. The garments he wore were centred in the roles he fulfilled at court. It is abundantly clear that Leicester's role at court was not only reflected in but

---

5 Kemp, *Black Book*, p. 36.

dominated his wardrobe.

*How far was Leicester's consumption of dress excessive for his position?* Providing some context for Leicester's wardrobe has demonstrated that the language of dress was well understood in the England of Elizabeth 1. To fail to dress suitably for his position would have been disastrous for Leicester's career. Examination of Leicester's wardrobe, its production, and Leicester's wardrobe expenditure has enabled a reassessment of Leicester's use of dress. Having previously been labelled a spendthrift on his appearance through close examination of the context of his spending it has been possible to refute this claim and locate him within a pool of courtiers whose dress was on a par with Leicester's. Interestingly Leicester's consumption of dress was not excessive when examined alongside his contemporaries. What is more, the circumstances of his attainder and subsequent loss of goods prior to his rise to Master of the Horse demanded a substantial investment in his wardrobe immediately prior to and at Elizabeth's accession. This investment is, in part, evident in his surviving household accounts and therefore gives a distorted picture of spending. Each item in the wardrobe was required to meet the standards for dress at court, and Leicester's position in particular.

When considering actual numbers of specific items of dress it has been possible to make direct comparisons with members of Leicester's family to better determine what quantities of garments were necessary in a courtier's wardrobe. This has led to the conclusion that Leicester did not consume disproportionately in his wardrobe. This finding supports Kutcha's argument that conspicuous consumption of dress in the Elizabethan court was expected, plainly demonstrating the social order.<sup>6</sup>

*Who were Leicester's wardrobe suppliers and how exclusive was his supply network?* The ability to establish who was involved in Leicester's wardrobe supply network relies on partial evidence that fails to provide a complete picture. There is no clear indication of on-going relationships for many of those named in the network, though this may well be due to the patchy nature of the evidence. From the names of suppliers that have been determined, these are limited to distinct periods of time. The list of names drawn from the surviving evidence highlights the diverse nature of Leicester's wardrobe network (see Appendix 3.1). These names signify at the least, a single supplier, but more likely, a thriving shop or workshop where numerous people were involved in the commerce of dress supply and production. It is clear that Leicester's dress was the culmination of a complex supply network formed of stranger and English merchants and master craftspeople. Leicester's named suppliers currently form the most comprehensive list of known wardrobe suppliers to a single figure, next to the list of suppliers to early modern monarchs. The people who made up this network were

---

6 Kutcha, 'The semiotics of masculinity', p. 241.

a mixture of ages, career stages and ethnic backgrounds. Included were freemen of the City of London, non-freemen, denizens, non-denizens, wives trading with their husbands, and women trading as *femme sole*.

The make up of the network crossed social borders of society, ranging from the City elite to the humble artisan. Wealthy merchants, such as Spinola, and leaders of Livery Companies, such as Pecoek, were dealing with artificers including Buckwith and Crockeham. Leicester himself had dealings with all of these people. Through visiting artificers in their shops he dealt with not only the master craftsman named in evidence but also the unnamed journeyman and apprentices. Leicester also socialised with a number of his wealthy suppliers such as Spinola and Gresham. Incomplete evidence survival has resulted in the inability to flesh out many of the figures behind the names, with numerous people remaining elusive in the City records. This has led to a disproportionate focus on the wealthy suppliers. A more concentrated interrogation of the evidence is needed to shed further light on the less wealthy and marginalised members of the wardrobe network. What all of the suppliers had in common was a client who required a wardrobe that had to satisfy the Queen's need for a magnificent court and Leicester's need to demonstrate his position and nobility. In order to achieve this the network had to function in a collaborative manner.

For the merchants and master craftspeople that formed the network the proportion who were aliens varied considerably. A clear dominance of English merchants is obvious. English artificers, while still higher in number, are less dominant. The grouping of strangers more prominently within the artificers is not entirely unexpected given the number of craftspeople recorded in the returns of aliens. It would appear, however, that Leicester chose to include these strangers within his wardrobe network to draw on the European styling they offered, Dutch being the most prominent. Evidence suggests that the proportion of strangers in Leicester's network was higher than that of his contemporaries. This conclusion would set his wardrobe network apart from his fellow courtiers. Unfortunately there is a lack of evidence for the wardrobe networks of his contemporaries, which precludes a conclusive finding.

It appears that initially Leicester engaged a series of artificers within his household. Hosiers Richard Tempest, Hance, and Buckwith all appear to have been members of the household at the very beginning of the evidence. Tempest was engaged early in his career while Hance and Buckwith, as non-denizens, would have benefited by a position in the household where they could have worked without the interference of the City authorities. This situation appears to have ceased for Buckwith once his denization was purchased.

Few women were expressly named in the wardrobe supply network. This understates the role of women within the network. Where women such as Alice Mountague,



Mrs Dane and Mrs Cowdrye were named, they appeared to act as *femme sole* even though each was married. However there were many women who were involved in the network who are unnamed. The fact that numerous women carried on their husband's business after his death, speaks of the probable input they had in the business when their husband was alive. It is most likely that, if the business was based where the dwelling was located, the master craftsman's wife played an integral role in the business. For Lonyson's wife to be running the business while he was sourcing jewels for Leicester in Flanders she would have had to have had an intimate knowledge of the operation. For the vast number of women who were no doubt involved in the supply network for Leicester's wardrobe it is probable that only a very few names will be identified.

For Leicester's wardrobe network to function smoothly it relied on each member maintaining meticulous records of all transactions and completing their respective task in order to achieve the desired end product. The whole network was underpinned by clear communication that emanated from Leicester and was facilitated by his wardrobe officers. Each member of the network dealt with Leicester on some level. Those that fitted garments and shoes to his body had the most intimate access. The two artificers who had the most contact with Leicester were his hosier and his tailor. These two men also made the most contact across the network with merchants and fellow artificers. Leicester's patronage of these two men in particular cemented their position within the supply network and their communities.

It is clear that Leicester's role as Master of the Horse impacted on his wardrobe supply network. Suppliers to the Stables also figured amongst Leicester's suppliers. These people also supplied goods to the Great Wardrobe. Various members of Leicester's wardrobe network supplied other members of the court. It could be conjectured that for most of the suppliers to Leicester's wardrobe he was likely to have been just one of a number of clients they served. However the degree to which they were able to offer their services to other clients would have been dictated by the workload they undertook from Leicester. For instance it would have been more difficult for Leicester's tailor and hosier to produce garments for clients as demanding as Leicester when their trade was so labour-intensive. When considering the size of both Whittell and Buckwith's workshops the ability to examine the number of garments each produced for Leicester in a year has been invaluable. The comparable size of each workshop paints a picture of busy centres of production that were hubs for employment and learning. While it is possible to identify some of the people likely to be working in Whittell's workshop for periods of time, and the garments they were working on for Leicester, unfortunately it has not been possible to determine who was carrying out specific tasks and whether they were all engaged in work solely for Leicester. Information for Buckwith's workshop is less substantive. It has only been possible to estimate the numbers of people working in his workshop. Furthermore this is complicated by the fact that

Buckwith also ran a shop selling materials to other court tailors. Buckwith combined roles as a practising hosier, later a tailor, and a shopkeeper. What this evidence has demonstrated is that Leicester's wardrobe network was exclusive to him, but he was not necessarily his supplier's only client.

*Was Leicester's use of the Great Wardrobe a privilege extended to others within the court?*

Leicester's use of the Great Wardrobe suppliers was tied very much to his role at court. As Master of the Horse, he, or his deputy, took delivery of materials supplied to the Stables. With such a connection it is not surprising that the same names appear in Leicester's papers supplying his wardrobe and household. Little evidence exists that would suggest that others had access to these suppliers for their own wardrobe. However there are exceptions. Adam Bland appears in numerous courtiers' account books demonstrating he was not solely concerned with work for the Great Wardrobe. This is perhaps a reflection of the trade he practiced, goods he was supplying and the workforce he managed. Much of the work Bland carried out for the Queen was furring garments and maintenance of furs. For Leicester he carried out similar duties. While fewer garments were furred than those that passed through other artificers' workshops, furring garments was labour-intensive. For Bland to be able to service a wider client base he would necessarily have had a workshop of artificers to draw from. There is little evidence to suggest the use of suppliers to the Great Wardrobe being patronised by other courtiers. This would suggest that few in the wider court were able to engage the Queen's artificers in the same way that Leicester was capable of, except perhaps in the construction of gifts for the Queen. Leicester's role at court then, saw him in a position that gave him access to these master craftspeople and suppliers to the Great Wardrobe for his own wardrobe, a position shared by few other contemporary courtiers.

Upon reflection it is apparent that, in many ways, this research has merely scratched the surface of the network of suppliers to the early modern English court and those who contributed to Leicester's wardrobe in particular. It has certainly highlighted many areas that require further investigation. Indeed with every new finding more unanswered questions have been revealed. However this research has succeeded in carrying out a substantial proportion of the ground-work necessary on which future study can be built. The collation of data for Leicester's wardrobe consumption can be used as a benchmark to evaluate dress consumption by other courtiers through the period. As a consequence of the list of suppliers' names gathered, key areas of specialism, and particular individuals, can be selected for further scrutiny. With the gleaning of additional names of known dress suppliers to the court, a broader understanding can be reached of the links developed across the supply network, connecting the City and the court. The statistics gathered on apprenticeship provide a starting point to explore the practise of training the next generation of masters across the court tailor network. Finally the role of the alien community in supplying and

directing the fashions and fashioning of the court can be explored further through a focussed study that builds on the networks established through this research. Leicester's dress was splendid and its splendour resonates through the centuries to reveal the communities involved in its construction.





## Glossary of Terms

### Glossary of Sixteenth–Century Men’s dress terms and fabrics types used in this dissertation.<sup>1</sup>

**Aglets:** Ornamental metal tags that could be applied as decorative elements or attached to ribbon points (points).

**Arming shoes:** Shoes designed to be worn beneath the sabatons of a suit of armour.

**Billament Lace:** Decorative braid of silk and gold applied to garments.

**Boothose:** Worn over stockings with richly embroidered tops that could be turned down over the boots.

**Bologna sarcenet:** Fine silk fabric from Bologna.

**Bombaste/Bumbaste:** Padding, most likely cotton.

**Bridge Satin:** Silk satin from Bruges.

**Buskins:** Knee–high pull on boots with a turn down top, made of leather and silk.

**Buckram:** A fabric that was possibly woven from cotton and linen.

**Cannions/venetians:** Short close fitting extension of the trunk–hose.

**Carcenet:** A necklace like a collar.

**Chamlet/camlet:** Warp faced tabby woven cloth which could be made from a range of fibres including wool, silk, mohair or camel hair.

**Cloak /cloke:** Outer garment, long or short, worn on the upper section of the body.

**Cloth of gold:** Fabric woven from gold metal threads and silk, used by royalty and nobility.

**Coat/cote:** Outer garment worn on the upper section of the body.

**Collar of Order of the Garter:** Jewelled insignia of the Order consisting of a wide chain of buckled Garters and knots of intertwined cords from which the Greater George is suspended.

---

1 **Sources for the Glossary definitions are as follows:** M Hayward (ed.), *Dress at the Court of King Henry the VIII*, Maney, Leeds, 2007; C W Cunnington and P Cunnington, *Handbook of English Costume in the 16th Century*, Faber and Faber Limited, London, 1954; J Ashelford, *A Visual History of Costume. The Sixteenth Century*, BT Batsford Ltd, London, 1983; E M Veale, *The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, London Record Society, London, 2003; N Cox & K Dannehl, *Dictionary of Traded Goods and Commodities, 1550–1820*, 2007, online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=739> accessed 12 May 2012.

**Cotton:** Either a woollen cloth with a raised nap or cotton used for bombaste.

**Cut & Bias (byas) cut:** Decorative technique achieved by cutting the fabric vertically, on the bias or horizontally.

**Cypras/cipras/sypras band:** Fine fabric band for decorating a hat.

**Damask:** A monochrome figured fabric with reversible pattern.

**Doublet:** Close fitting outer garment for the upper body worn over the shirt, petticoat or waistcoat.

**Dress:** Clothing, apparel, materials and jewellery used to cover the body.

**Dutch Cloak:** A sleeved cloak, usually guarded.

**English Worsted:** Woollen cloth made from combed long staple wool fibre, made in England.

**Furins/Furis Velvet:** Silk velvet from Florence.

**Frieze:** A woollen cloth with a nap.

**Fryado/Frisado:** Heavy worsted woollen cloth.

**Fustian:** Twill union cloth of linen and wool.

**Garter:** Insignia of Knight of the Order of the Garter, worn on left leg below the knee.

**George, Greater and Lesser:** The Greater George a jewelled insignia of the Order of the Garter depicting St George slaying the dragon. The lesser George shows the same image encircled by the garter, called a badge, and worn on less formal occasions from jewelled chain or ribbon.

**Girdle:** Narrow belt that followed the waistline of the doublet, from which the hanger was suspended to hold the scabbards for the rapier and dagger.

**Gorget plates:** Armour worn at the neck.

**Gown:** A loose outer garment, with long sleeves.

**Guard/Welt:** Decorative border.

**Guernsey:** Knitted fabric, possibly from Guernsey, most likely of wool.

**Hose:** Generic term for garments that cover the lower section of the body below the waist. These include trunk-hose (upper section covering the hips and padded), nether-stocks (stockings), slops, galligaskin hose, cannions.

**Jean/Jene:** Denotes a fabric produced in Genoa.

**Jerkin:** Sleeveless garment for the upper body, usually worn over the doublet.

**Kersey:** Coarse woollen cloth, a double twill.

**Kirtle:** Long garment consisting of skirt and bodice worn under a gown or mantle.

**Lace:** A braid applied to decorate a garment.

**Livery:** Special clothing supplied to servants.

**Lucerne, luzarne, loesse, loosh vellen, pelles linxia:** Lynx skin. One of the most expensive furs in use during the early sixteenth century.

**Murrey:** Purple red colour.

**Nightcap:** Head covering worn indoors.

**Nightgown:** A loose, often fur lined, gown worn indoors for warmth or outdoors as an outer garment.

**Panes:** Strips of fabric similar to broad ribbons, caught into the main construction of the garment at top and bottom through which the lining was visible and possibly pulled out between.

**Partlet:** A garment worn over the shoulders and neck with a collar from 1530s.

**Peascod:** Exaggerated style of doublet with a padded belly.

**Petticoat:** Close fitting body covering worn under the doublet.

**Pickadil:** Stiffened tabs, creating a scallop-like edge, at doublet collar, wings and skirt.

**Pinked:** Fabric decorating technique achieved by creating small holes and slits in the fabric forming a pattern.

**Pomell lace:** A lace possibly in the form of a narrow braid.

**Ribbon points/points:** Ties of silk ribbon with aglets at the ends to join garments and to create decorative elements.

**Ruff:** Collar pleated or gathered into a band on the shirt or separate, often starched and goffered; with matching cuffs.

**Sable:** Dark brown fur from the sable marten.

**Sarcenet:** Plain weave silk fabric used primarily for lining garments.

**Satin:** Lustrous silk fabric with long floating surface threads.

**Skirts:** Lower section of the doublet below the waist seam.

**Stammel:** Fine woollen cloth.

**Stockings/stocks/netherstocks:** Lower section of the leg covering, knitted or tailored.



**Socks:** Lower section of the leg covering, particularly foot covering.

**Spanish Cloak:** Short outer garment, worn on the upper section of the body, may have a hood.

**Stomacher:** A V-shaped panel worn at the front beneath the doublet.

**Taffeta/taffity:** Plain weave silk fabric.

**Tippet:** Short shoulder cape worn with a gown or doublet.

**Waistcoat:** Close fitting upper body covering, could be worn under the doublet.

**Wardrobe:** Collected elements of dress.

**Wings:** Roll or stiffened fabric that hid the join between the sleeves and the armhole

### **Measurements:**

**di:** dimidium meaning half a measure.

**ell:** English ell equivalent to 45 inches, Flemish ell equivalent to 27 inches.

## References and Bibliography

### Primary Sources – Manuscripts

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS. Add. C. 94. 1545–1551 Wardrobe lists of John Dudley, Viscount Lisle, 1545-51, made by J. Hough [vii + 21 leaves].

MS. Eng.hist.c.474. Herrick Family Papers.

MS. Douce 171. Accounts of the earl of Essex, 1576.

MS. Rawl. Letters 106, f. 208, 209. Receipt for payment by Gilbert Abbot Archbishop of Canterbury.

British Library, London

Additional Charters: Add. Ch 74023. A charter drawn up by the surviving executors to the will of Edward Lord Windsor, 1590.

Additional Manuscripts: Add. MS 27449. Collection of accounts including a tailors bill for the Duke of Norfolk, 1527, 1528.

Additional Manuscripts: Add. MS 35328. Copies of warrants from Queen Elizabeth to John Fortesque of the Great Wardrobe. 1566.

Additional Manuscripts: Add. MS 78172. Vol. V. New Year's gifts lists given and received by Lord Robert Dudley, 1563/4.

Additional Manuscripts: Add. MS 78176 Vol. IX. An Inventory of Household Goods of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, 1582.

Additional Manuscripts: Add. MS 78177. An Inventory of Household Goods of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, 1582.

Cotton Galba C/VI, f. 310X. Records and papers concerning England and the Low Countries, 1576–1580, Davison to Leicester 26 March 1579

Egerton MS 2806. A book of copies of Warrants for the Great Wardrobe, 1568–1589.

Harley Roll D.35. I-XI. 1062. Probate Inventory of the goods and chattels of Robert Dudley, late Earl of Leicester, 1588.

Harley MS 260, f. 362, Letter, the earl of Leicester to Francis Walsingham, 2 November 1572

Harley MS 260, f. 363. Letter, Leicester to Walsingham, 2 November 1572.

Lansdowne MS 45/84, f.207. The Book of the Earl of Arundell's debts, 1585.

Lansdowne MS 118. Burghley Papers, 1552–1557.

Stowe MS 670. Collection of arms copied from a MS by Robert Cooke, Clarenceux, 17th–18th century.

Cornwall Record Office, Truro, Cornwall

AR/21/14. An inventory of apparel from 11 December 1559, thought to be for Sir John Arundell of Lanherne.

Drapers' Company, Drapers' Hall, London

MB 1. Court of Assistants Minutes 1543–1551.

MB 4. Court of Assistants Minutes 1547–1552.

MB 5. Court of Assistants Minutes 1552–1557.  
MB 7. Court of Assistants Minutes 1557–1560.  
MB 8. Court of Assistants Minutes 1567–1574.  
MB 9. Court of Assistants Minutes 1574–1584.  
MB 10. Court of Assistants Minutes 1584–1594.  
RA 4. Renter Warden Accounts 1559–1560.  
RA 5. Renter Warden Accounts 1572–1573.  
WA 4. Wardens' Accounts 1547–1562.  
WA 5. Wardens' Accounts 1568–1589.  
Alphabetical list of Freemen.

Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC, USA

L.a.39. Letter from Anthony Bagot to Richard Bagot, 6 May 1587.  
STC 2099 Copy 3. Franz Hogenberg engraved portrait of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester in the holie bible, 1568.  
X.d. 428 (133). Cavendish-Talbot manuscripts, account of household expenses Elizabeth Countess of Shrewbury 1559.  
X.d. 428 (134). Cavendish-Talbot manuscripts, account of household expenses Elizabeth Countess of Shrewbury ca.1565.

The Goldsmiths' Company Library, London

Court Book K Part I. Court Minutes, 1557–1569.  
Court Book L. Court Minutes, 1569–1578.  
Catalogue of Members of the Goldsmiths' Company, record cards.

Guildhall Library, London

MS 34010/1. Merchant Taylors' Company, Ordinary Court Minutes, 1562–1574/5.  
MS 34010/2. Merchant Taylors' Company, Ordinary Court Minutes, 1574/5–1595.  
MS 34010/3. Merchant Taylors' Company, Ordinary Court Minutes 1575–1601.  
MS 34035/1. Merchant Taylors' Company, Index of Freemen.  
MS 34037/4. Merchant Taylors' Company, Index of Freemen.  
MS 34038/1. Merchant Taylors' Company, Apprenticeship Bindings, 1583–1593.  
MS 34048/4. Merchant Taylors' Company, Master and Wardens' Accounts, 1545–1557.  
MS 34048/5. Merchant Taylors' Company, Master and Wardens' Accounts, 1569–1581.  
MS 34048/6. Merchant Taylors Company, Master and Wardens' Accounts, 1581–1592.  
MS 15857/1. Haberdashers' Company, Register of Freedom Admissions, 1526–1641.  
MS 15842/1. Haberdashers' Company, Court Minutes, 1583–1562.  
MS 12079/1. Armourers' and Brasiers' Company, Freedom Registers and Apprenticeship Bindings, 1535–1602.  
MS 11592A. Grocers' Company, Register of Freemen, 1345–1652.  
MS 30719/1. Skinners' Company, Freemen and Apprentices, 1496–1603.

MS 7351. Cordwainers' Company, Audit Book, 1595–1636.

Hampshire Record Office, Winchester, Hampshire

44M69/G3/93. Jervoise Family of Herriard, Justices of the Peace. Recognisances to keep the terms of the proclamation concerning hose and cloth, 1562.

Kent History and Library Centre, Maidstone, Kent

U1475 A4/1. Papers of Sir Henry Sidney, The Accompt of William Blounte 1565–1569.

U1475 A4/2. The Accompte of Wyllm Blunte gent seruante to the right honourable Sir Henry Sidney, 1570–1571.

U1475 A4/6. Papers of Sir Henry Sidney, Thacompt of John Leke 1578–1579.

U1475 A5/1. Papers of Sir Henry Sidney, Declaration of all the disbursements on behalf of Sir Henry Sidney 1560–1561.

U1475 A5/4. Papers of Sir Henry Sidney, 1565–66 apparel and goldsmiths's work account.

U1475 A5/6. Papers of Sir Henry Sidney, Thacompt of Johan Knight wydowe late wife of Ralf Knight deceased 9–10 Eliz.

Leathersellers' Company Archives, Leathersellers' Hall, London

ACC 1/1 Liber Curtes, 1540–1588.

Lincolnshire Archives, Newland, Lincoln

ANC/10/A/6. Inventory of apparel lent to the sons of the duchess of Suffolk, 1551.

ANC/10/A/5. Inventory of apparel lent to the sons of the duchess of Suffolk, 1551.

ANC/7/A/2. Wardrobe accounts of the duchess of Suffolk and Richard Bertie 1560–1562.

London Metropolitan Archives, London

P69/ALH4/A/001/MS17613. All Hallows, Lombard Street, composite register, 1549/50–1655.

P69/ALH3/A/001/MS05022. All Hallows, Honey Lane, composite register, 1538–1697.

P69/ANL/A/001/MS09016. St Antholin, Budge Row, composite register, 1538–1741.

P69/BEN1/A/001/MS04097. St Benet Fink, composite register, 1538–1720.

P69/BOT4/A/001/MS04515/001. St Botolph Bishopsgate, composite register, 1558–1628.

P69/DUN2/A/001/MS10342. St Dunstan in the West, composite register, 1558–1632.

P69/GIS/A/001/MS06418. St Giles Cripplegate, composite register, 1561–1588.

P69/GRE/A/001/MS10231. St Gregory by St Paul, composite register, 1559–1627.

P69/MRY1/A/001/MS07666. St Mary Abchurch, composite register, 1558–1736.

P69/MRY10/A/001/MS11529. St Mary Magdalen Old Fish Street, composite register, 1539–1645.

P69/MTN1/A/001/MS10212. St Martin Ludgate, composite register, 1539–1655.

P69/PAN/A/001/MS05015. St Pancras Soper Lane, composite register, 1538–1698.

P69/TMS1/A/001/MS09009. St Thomas Apostle, composite register, 1558–1680.

- P69/BEN3/B/001/MS00877/001. Vestry minute book for St Benet Paul's Wharf, 1578–1674.
- CLC/281/MS02859. Assessment of a subsidy, taxed by the high collectors of the City of London, 1559.
- CLC/281/MS02942. High assessors' book for the City of London for payment of a subsidy granted in 13 Elizabeth, 1572.

Longleat House Archives, Longleat House, Wiltshire

- Devereux Papers DE Vol.III. Private papers, deeds, accompts, rentals, etc., chiefly of Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex, Robert his son, 2nd Earl, and Robert, his grandson, 3rd Earl; 1536-1625.
- Devereux Papers DE Vol.V. Accompt of receipts and disbursements from Michaelmas, 1576, to Michaelmas, 1586.
- Dudley Papers DU Vol.II. Correspondence of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester June 1571-September 1588.
- Dudley Papers, DU Vol.IV. Letters and papers of, or relating to, Amy Robsart and Lettice Knollys, 1560–1627.
- Dudley Papers DU Vol.XII. Wardrobe disbursement book, 1570/1–1573/4.
- Dudley Papers DU Vol.XIII. Wardrobe Inventory, 1588.
- Dudley Papers DU Box V. Bills and warrants, 1555–1570.

Mercers' Company Archives, Mercers' Hall, London

- Acts of Court 1560-1595.
- Renter Wardens Accounts 1553–1577.
- Renter Wardens Accounts 1577–1603.

The National Archives, Kew, Richmond

- C 1/1027/46. Court of Chancery: Six Clerks Office: Early Proceedings, Richard II to Philip and Mary. Plaintiffs, William Lytcote and William Pecoke. Defendants, the mayor and sheriffs of London, 1538–1544.
- C 24/269, Part 1, No.68. Depositions in the case Judith Ruswell vs. Oxford, 1599.
- C 38/25. From Reports of Masters in Chancery, 28 January 1616.
- C 47/3/38. New Year's gifts given to and by Elizabeth I, 5 Elizabeth I, 1562–1563.
- C 47/3/39. New Year's gifts given to and by Elizabeth I, 19 Elizabeth I, 1576–1577.
- C 66/1016. Patent Rolls, part 8, 17 November 1564 – 16 November 1565.
- C 113/32. Clothiers' account books, with assignment and will: London, with fabric sample book, 1673–1798.
- E 101/429/3. Account book of the Great Wardrobe relating to the coronation of Queen Elizabeth, 1558–1559.
- E 101/429/5. Warrants subsidiary to accounts of the Great Wardrobe, 1558–1559.
- E 133/9/1446. Thomas Appleton v blank, a dispute over tithes for the rectory at Edwardston, 1600–1601.
- E 154/2/39. Inventories of goods of attainted persons; Duke of Northumberland, Marquis of Northampton, Sir John Gates, Sir Andrew Dudley, Sir Thomas Palmer, Earl of Warwick and archbishop of Canterbury, 1553–1554

- E 178/1446. An inventory of the goods of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, a Crown debtor, at Leicester House, 1589–1590.
- E 179/145/252. Lay Subsidy Returns for London, 19 Elizabeth, 1576–7.
- E 190/3/2. The Port of London: Overseas inwards Easter 1565–Michaelmas 1565.
- E 190/5/5. The Port of London: Imports by aliens Michaelmas 1571–Michaelmas 1574.
- KB 27/1075 E1530 C. Records of the Court of King's Bench and other courts, 22 April 1530–21 April 1531.
- LC 2/4/1. Funeral expenses of Edward VI, 1553.
- LC 5/32. Copies of warrants for the Great Wardrobe 1554–1569.
- LC 5/33. Copies of warrants for the Great Wardrobe 1562–1585.
- LC 5/34. Copies of warrants for the Great Wardrobe 1567–1575.
- LC 5/35. Copies of warrants for the Great Wardrobe 1575–1585.
- LC 5/36. Copies of warrants for the Great Wardrobe 1585–1593.
- LC 5/37. Copies of warrants for the Great Wardrobe 1593–1603.
- LC 5/49. Copies of warrants for the Great Wardrobe 1516–1603.
- LC 9/54. Accounts and Miscellanea of the Great Wardrobe, Michaelmas 1560–Michaelmas 1561.
- LC 9/55. Accounts and Miscellanea of the Great Wardrobe, Michaelmas 1561–Michaelmas 1562.
- LR 2/116. Inventory of the goods of Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, 1547–1548.
- LR 2/118. Miscellaneous Books, Inventories, John, Duke of Northumberland, Marquis of Northampton, Sir John Gates, kt, Sir Andrew Dudley, kt, Sir Thomas Palmer, kt, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1553–1554.
- PROB 1/1. Last will and testament of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester (copy), 1588.
- PROB 11/37/342. Last will and testament of Jane Dudley, duchess of Northumberland, 1555.
- PROB 11/44/264. Last will and testament of Roger Tempest, 1561.
- PROB 11/49/17. Last will and testament of Rowland Frysse, 1567.
- PROB 11/50/283. Last will and testament of William Tempest, 1568.
- PROB 11/54/471. Last will and testament of Anthony Forster, 1572.
- PROB/11/55/304. Last will and testament of William Chelsham, 1573.
- PROB 11/59/163. Last will and testament of William Storer, 1577.
- PROB 11/61/539. Last will and testament of Margaret Dane, 1579.
- PROB 11/62/551. Last will and testament of Francis Barker, 1580.
- PROB 11/68/521. Last will and testament of Oliver Hugins, 1585.
- PROB 11/71/127. Last will and testament of David Smith, 1587.
- PROB 11/72/569. Last will and testament of Thomas Cure, 1588.
- PROB 11/81/189. Last will and testament of Maynard Bockwaye, 1593.
- PROB 11/94/511. Last will and testament of Edward Humfrey, 1599.
- PROB 11/96/332. Last will and testament of James Howson, 1600.
- PROB 11/124/334. Last will and testament of Mary Howson, 1614.
- PROB 11/155/246. Last will and testament of William Whittell the younger, 1629.

SP 12/4, f.27-50. Licence for Benedict Spinola, a free denizen, to import and export certain kinds of cloth and merchandise, wines &c, 1559.

SP 12/4, f.212. Accounts of the Great Wardrobe, Queen Mary with funeral expenses, 1559.

SP 12/20, 63, ff.135-136, List of London merchants (non-Mercers) trading in silk, 1561.

SP 12/35, ff.81-84v. A list of goods imported into the Kingdom, 1564.

SP 12/42, f.91. A summary of the charges of apparel of the earl of Oxford, 1562–1566.

SP 15/20, f. 222. Inventory of linen and apparel, 1571.

SP 15/26. State Papers Domestic, Edward VI - James I: Addenda. Letters and Papers.

SP 46/9, f. 18. Small collections of private papers, Sexton Papers (ff. 1-130): Blaise Freman to Barbery Herdson, widow, in London: Roger Monttagu left her cloths with him on his departure; needs her instructions; Danske; 1 January 1557.

SP 46/27, f. 89. Exchequer, Sakevyle to Fanshawe: The Queen orders the bale of silk forfeited to be granted to Mrs Smythe, her silkwoman and all such forfeitures in the future, 1561.

SP 70/76. State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth I, 1 January 1565 – 28 February 1565.

SP 70/77. State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth I, 1 March 1565 – 30 April 1565.

SP 83/5. State Papers Foreign, Holland and Flanders, 1 January 1578 – 31 March 1578.

WARD 2/58/215/10iii. Court of Wards and Liveries: Letter from Sir Thomas Chamberlain, knight, at Antwerp to Master Harry Sharnington, esquire, in London, sending him samples of Flemish linen and canvas cloth, dated 12 January 1556.

Staffordshire Record Office, Stafford

D603/K/1/4/63. A list of persons to receive funeral garments for the funeral of Lady Anne Paget, 1587.

Victoria & Albert Museum, London

D.586 & D.586A–1894 to D.614 & D614A–1894. The Almain Armourers Album – a folio of drawings for armour, 1557–1587.

D.593–1894. Illustrated online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1069325/the-earl-of-leicester-design-jacob-halder/>> 1557–1587.

Westminster City Archives, Westminster, London

St Mary le Strand Parish Registers, Vol. 1, 1558–1601.

## Published Primary Sources

- Acts of the Privy Council of England: Volume 4: AD 1552–1554*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1892.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume V: AD 1554–1556*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume VII: AD 1558–1570*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume VIII: AD 1571–1575*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume X: AD 1577–1578*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume XI: AD 1578–1580*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume XII: AD 1580–1581*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume XIII: AD 1581–1582*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume XIV: AD 1586–1587*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Volume XV: AD 1587–1588*, JR Dasent, (ed.), Tanner Ritchie, Burlington, 2005.
- Adams, S, (ed.), *Household Accounts and Disbursement Books of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1558–61, 1584–86. Camden Fifth Series, Vol. 6*, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 1995.
- Adams, S, IW Archer, and GW Bernard, (eds), 'A 'Journall' of Matters of State Happened from Time to Time as well Within and Without the Realme from and Before the Death of King Edw. the 6th Untill the Yere 1562 Certayne Brife Notes of the Controversey Betwene the Dukes of Somerset and Duke of Nor[t]humberland', in IW Archer, S Adams, GW Bernard, M Greengrass, PEJ Hammer, and F Kisby (eds), *Religion, Politics, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England. Camden Fifth Series, Volume 22*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, pp 35-136.
- Anon, *A Collection of Inventories and Other Records of the Royal Wardrobe and Jewelhouse; And of the Artillery and `munition in Some of the Royal Castles, 1488-1606*. Edinburgh, 1815.
- Armytage, GJ, (ed.), and JL Chester (extractor), *Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Bishop of London 1520-1610, Volume I*, Harleian Society, London, 1887.
- Arnold, J, (ed.), *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd*, Maney, Leeds, 1988.
- Bannerman, WB, (ed.), *The Registers of St. Mary le Bowe, Cheapside, All Hallows, Honey Lane and of St. Pancras, Soper Lane, London. Part I – Baptisms and Burials*, The Harleian Society, London, 1914.
- (ed.), *The Registers of St Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury, London*, The Harleian Society, London, 1931.
- Bannerman, AMB, (ed.), *The Register of St Matthew, Friday Street London 1538-1812 and The United Parishes of St Matthew & St Peter Cheap Marriages 1754-1812*, The Harleian Society, London, 1933.
- Batho, GR, (ed.), *The Household Papers of Henry Percy Ninth Earl of Northumberland*, Camden Third Series, Vol. XCIII, Royal Historical Society, London, 1962.
- Beaven, AB, (ed.), *The Aldermen of the City of London Temp. Henry III-1912, Volume II*, The



- Corporation of the City of London, London, 1913.
- Bindoff, ST, (ed.), *The House of Commons: 1509-1558, I*, Secker & Warburg, London, 1982.
- Boyd, P, (ed.), *Roll of the Drapers' Company of London. Collected from the Company's Records and other sources*, JA Gordon, Croydon, 1934.
- Bruce, J, (ed.), *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth by Sir John Hayward*, The Camden Society, London, 1840.
- Burton, JW, (ed.), *The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Gresham Compiled Chiefly from his Correspondence Preserved in Her Majesty's State-Paper Office, 2 Volumes*, Robert Jennings, London, 1839.
- Burke, AM, (ed.), *Memorials of St Margaret's Church Westminster*, Eyre & Spottiswoode Ltd, London, 1914.
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office, Edward VI, Volume III: 1549-1551*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1925.
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office. Edward VI, Volume IV A.D. 1550-1553*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1926.
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Elizabeth I, Volume VII 1575-1578*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1982.
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Prepared under the superintendence of the Deputy Keeper of the Records, Elizabeth I, Volume III, 1563-1566*, JH Collingridge & RB Wernham, (eds), Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1960.
- Calendar of Patent Rolls 41 Elizabeth I (1598-1599) Part 1 (Calendar), Volume 328*, SR Neal, & C Leighton (eds), The Lists and Records Society, London, 2009.
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the Reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, 1547-1580. Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office*, R Lemon, (ed.), Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, London, 1856.
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the reign of Mary I, 1553-1558*, CS Knighton, (ed.), Public Record Office, London, 1998.
- Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas Vol. II Elizabeth 1568-1579*, MA Hume, (ed.), Lord Commissioners, London, 1894.
- Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 8: 1566-1568*, AJ Crosby, (ed.), 1871, pp. 98-112, online accessed 10 September 2011 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=72111&strquery=dannett>>
- Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 12: 1577-78*, AJ Butler, (ed.), 1901, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=73282&strquery=davison>>
- Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 13: 1578-79*, AJ Butler, (ed.), 1903, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=821>>
- Carlisle, N, (ed.), *Collections for A History of the Ancient Family of Bland*, London, 1826.
- Castiglione, B, (1528), translated by Thomas Hoby (1556), *The Courtier of Covnt Baldessar Castilio diuided into foure bookes*, Wyllyam Seres at the signe of the Hedghogge, London, 1561.
- Chester, JL, (ed.), *The Parish Registers of St. Thomas the Apostle, London Containing the Marriages, Baptisms, and Burials From 1558-1754*, London, 1881.
- Chester, JL, & GJ Armytage (eds), *The Parish Registers of St. Antholin, Budge Row, London, containing the Marriages, Baptisms, and Burials from 1538 to 1754 and of St John Baptist on Wallbrook, London containing the Baptisms and Burials from 1682 to 1754*, The

- Harleian Society, London, 1883.
- (eds), *Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Bishop of London, 1560-1610*, The Harleian Society, London, 1887.
- Clarke, AWH, *The Register of St. Clement Eastcheap and St. Martin Orgar. Part 1*, The Harleian Society, London, 1937.
- Colthorpe, M, & LH Bateman, *Queen Elizabeth I and Harlow*, Harlow Development Corporation, Harlow, 1977.
- Corder, J, (ed.), *A Dictionary of Suffolk Crests*, Boydell, Woodbridge, 1998.
- Croot, PEC, (ed.), *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 12: Chelsea*, Victoria County History, London, 2004.
- Crossley, EW, 'A Templenewsam Inventory, 1565', *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, XXV, 1920, pp. 91–100.
- Cust, L, 'The Lumley Inventories', *Walpole Society*, 6, 1918, pp. 15–35.
- Della Casa, J, *Galateo; or rather, a treatise of the maners and behaiours, it behoueth a man to use and eschewe in his familiar conuersation*, translated by Robert Peterson, London, 1576.
- Dietz, B, (ed.), *The Port and Trade of Early Elizabethan London Documents*, London Record Society, London, 1972.
- Duncan, LL, (ed.) & SA Smith, (compiler), *Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury 1558-1583 Vol. III*, The British Record Society, London, 1898.
- Elton, GR, (ed.), *The Tudor Constitution. Documents and Commentary*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960.
- Emmison, FG, (ed.) *Tudor Secretary Sir William Petre at Court and Home*, Longmans, London, 1961.
- Fitch, M, (ed.), *Index to Testamentary Records in the Commissary Court of London Now Preserved in Guildhall Library London Volume III 1571-1625*, The British Record Society, London, 1985.
- Foster, J, (ed.), *London Marriage Licences, 1521-1869*, Bernard Quaritch, London, 1887.
- Fry, EA, (ed.), *Abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem for the City of London Returned into the Court of Chancery During the Tudor Period, Part III: 19–45 Elizabeth, 1577–1603*, Tanner Ritchie Publishing, Burlington, 2010.
- Fry, GS, (ed.), *Abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem Relating to the City of London Returned into the Court of Chancery Part I: Henry VII to 3 Elizabeth, 1485–1561*, Tanner Ritchie Publishing, Burlington, 2010.
- Gage, J, *The History and Antiquities of Hengrave in Suffolk*, James Carpenter, London, 1822.
- Goldring, E, 'The Earl of Leicester's Inventory of Kenilworth Castle, c.1578', *English Heritage Historical Review*, vol.2, 2007, pp. 36–59.
- Hakluyt, R, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of The English Nation, Vol. 11*, 1589, online accessed 11 July 2008, <<http://ebooksread.com/pdf/12693-8.pdf>>
- Hessels, JH, (ed.), *Epistvlae et Tractatus, Volume 3, Part I*, Cambridge, 1897
- Hayward, M, (ed.), *Dress at the Court of King Henry the VIII*, Maney, Leeds, 2007.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Twelfth Report Appendix Part IV. The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland G.C.B Preserved at Belvoir Castle. Volume I*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1888.
- *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, KG Preserved at Hatfield House Hertfordshire. Part VII*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1899.
- *Report on the Manuscripts of the earl of Ancaster Preserved at Grimsthorpe*, SC Lomas,

- (ed.), His Majesty's Stationery Office, Dublin, 1907.
- *Report on the Pepys Manuscripts Preserved at Magdalene College, Cambridge*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1911.
- *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de Lisle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place, Volume One*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1925.
- *Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings. Esq.. of The Manor House. Ashby De La Zouche, Vol. 1*, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1928.
- *Report on the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Bath Preserved at Longleat. Volume IV. Seymour Papers 1532-1686*, M Blatcher, (ed.), Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1968.
- *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable, the Marquess of Bath Preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire: Talbot, Dudley and Devereux Papers, 1533–1659. Volume 5*, GD Owen, (ed.), Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1980.
- Hopkinson, HL, (ed.), *Report on the Ancient Records in the Possession of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St John Baptist in the City of London*, Waterlow and Sons Limited, London, 1915.
- Howard, JJ and GJ Armytage (eds), *The visitation of London in the year 1568: taken by Robert Cooke, Clarenceux King of Arms*, The Harleian Society, London, 1869.
- Hughes Clarke, AW, (ed.), *The Registers of St Mary Magdalen Milk Street 1558-1666 and St Michael Bassishaw London 1538–1625*, The Harleian Society, London, 1942.
- Hughes, PL, and JF Larkin (eds), *Tudor Royal Proclamations. Volume II The Later Tudors (1553–1587)*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1969.
- Huntington Library, *Guide to British Manuscripts in the Huntington Library*, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino, 1982.
- Jackson, JE, 'Amye Robsart', *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, XVII, 1878, pp. 47–93.
- 'Longleat Papers No. 3', *The Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine*, XVIII, 1879, pp. 9–48.
- Keene, D, and V Harding, (eds), *A Survey of Documentary Sources for Property Holding in London Before the Great Fire*, London Record Society, London, 1985.
- *Historical gazetteer of London before the Great Fire - Cheapside; parishes of All Hallows Honey Lane, St Martin Pomary, St Mary le Bow, St Mary Colechurch and St Pancras Soper Lane*, 1987, online accessed 28 September 2011, < <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=8>>
- Kemp, T, (ed.), *The Black Book of Warwick*, Henry Cooke and Son, Warwick, 1889.
- Kitto, JV, (ed.), *The Accounts of the Churchwardens of St Martin-in-the-Fields, 1525–1603*, London, 1901.
- Kirk REG and EF Kirk, (eds), *Returns of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London From the Reign of Henry VIII to that of James I, Parts I to IV*, Aberdeen, 1900–1908.
- Kingsford, CL, 'Essex House, formerly Leicester House and Exeter Inn', *Archaeologia or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity*, LXXIII, 1923, pp. 1–54.
- Lang, RG, (ed.), *Two Tudor Subsidy Assessment Rolls for the City of London 1541 and 1582*, London Record Society, London, 1993.
- Lant, T, *Philippus Sidneius, Eques ille clarissimus de cuius singulari virtute & ingenio nulla unquam ætas conticescet ... The most honorable and thrice renowned Knight Sr Phillip Sidney, of whose singular vertue and witt all ages will speak, etc. ([f. 2.] Sequitur celebritas & pompa funeris quemadmodū a Clarencio Armorum et Insignium rege instituta est ... Delineatū & inuentū hoc opus primū est a Tho. Lant generoso, famulo huius honoratissimi*

- Equitis: insculptum deinde in ære a Derico Theodor D'ebrij in vrbe Londinensi 1587. Here followeth the manner of the whole proceeding of his ffunerall which was celebrated in St Paules the 16. of ffebr. 1586, etc.*, 1588, online accessed 25 April 2008, <[http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search?FILE=../session/1221130044\\_21414&SCREEN=CITATIONS](http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search?FILE=../session/1221130044_21414&SCREEN=CITATIONS)>
- L'Estrange, J and W Rye, (eds), *Calendar of the Freemen of Norwich from 1317 to 1603*, Elliot Stock, London, 1888.
- Levey, S, (ed.), *Of Household Stuff. The 1601 Inventories of Bess of Hardwick*, The National Trust, London, 2001.
- Madge, SJ, (ed.), *Abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem for the City of London Returned into the Court of Chancery During the Tudor Period. Part II 4-19 Elizabeth, 1561-1577*, The British Record Society, London, 1901.
- Malden, Henry Elliot, (ed.), *Devereux Papers with Richard Broughton's Memoranda (1575-1601). Camden Miscellany Vol. XIII*, Camden Society, London, 1923.
- Mason, T, (ed.), *A Register of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials in the Parish of St Martin in the Fields In the County of Middlesex From 1550 to 1619*, The Harleian Society, London, 1898.
- Nelson, AH, (ed.), *London Lay Subsidy Rolls 1593-1600*, 2004, online accessed 20 September 2011, <<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ahnelson/SUBSIDY/intro.html>>
- Nevinson, JL, 'Prince Edward's clothes', *Costume*, 2, 1968, pp.3-8.
- Nichols, J, (ed.), *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth. Volume 1*, John Nichols and Son, London, 1823.
- Nichols, JG, (ed.), *The Unton Inventories Relating to Wadley and Faringdon, Co. Berks in the Years 1596 and 1620*, Berkshire Ashmolean Society, London, 1841.
- (ed.), *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London From A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*, The Camden Society, London, 1848.
- Page, W, (ed.), *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England, 1509-1603*, The Huguenot Society, Volume VIII, Lymington, 1893.
- Prideaux, WS, (ed.), *Memorials of the Goldsmiths' Company Being Gleanings From Their Records Between the Years 1335 and 1815. Volume 1*, Goldsmiths' Company, London, 1896.
- Raines, FR, (ed.), *The Stanley Papers Part II. The Derby Household Books*, The Chetham Society, Manchester, 1853.
- Ramsay, GD, (ed.), *John Isham. Mercer and Merchant Adventurer*, Northamptonshire Record Society, Gateshead, 1962.
- Robertson, JC, 'Furnishings seized in London, 1575', *Furniture History*, 25, 1989, pp. 36-41.
- Robinson, CJ, (ed.), *A Register of the Scholars Admitted into Merchant Taylors' School, From A.D. 1562 to 1874 Compiled from Authentic Sources and Edited with Biographical Notices. Volume I*, Farncombe & Co, Lewes, 1882.
- Rye, WB, *England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First*, John Russell Smith, London, 1865.
- Sandys, W, 'Copy of the inventory of Archbishop Parker's goods at the time of his death', *Archæologia or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity*, XXX, 1844, pp. 1-30.
- Schmidt, AJ, 'A Household Inventory, 1581', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol.101, no.5, 1957, pp. 459-480.
- Scouloudi, I, (ed.), *Returns of Strangers in the Metropolis 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639. A Study of an Active Minority*, Huguenot Society of London, Quarto Series, Volume LVII, London, 1985.
- Shirley, EP, 'An inventory of the effects of Henry Howard, K.G., earl of Northampton, taken

- at his death in 1614, together with a transcript of his will', *Archaeologia or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity*, XLII, 1869, pp. 347–378.
- Smith, SA and EA Fry (eds), *Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury 1584–1604. Vol.IV*, The British Record Society, London, 1901.
- Stow, J, *The Chronicles of England, from Brute unto this present yeare of Christ 1580*, London, 1580.
- Stype, J, 'A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster, The Parish Church of St Margaret Moyses', online accessed 12 August 2012 <[http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/stype/TransformServlet?page=book3\\_205&display=normal](http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/stype/TransformServlet?page=book3_205&display=normal)>
- Thomas, WJ, 'Pictures of the great earl of Leicester', *Notes and Queries*, 3rd Series, 2, 1862, pp. 201–202, 224–226.
- Venn, J, and JA Venn (eds), *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees: a Catalogue of those who have been Matriculated or been admitted to any Degree in the University of Cambridge from 1544 to 1659*, University Press, Cambridge, 1913.
- Welch, C, (ed.), *Register of Freemen of the City of London In the Reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI*, London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, London, 1908.
- Williamson, GC, *George, Third Earl of Cumberland (1558–1605) His Life and His Voyages*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1902.
- Yorke, P, (ed), *Miscellaneous State Papers From 1501 to 1726*, Vol. I, London, 1778.

## Unpublished Manuscripts, Thesis & Dissertations

- Adamson, NL, *Urban Families The Social Context of the London Elite, 1500–1603*, unpublished dissertation submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Toronto, 1983.
- Benbow, RM, *Notes to Index of London Citizens Involved in City Government, 1558–1603, Volumes One and Two*, unpublished manuscript held at the Institute of Historical Research, London.
- Clark, JEL, *The Buildings and Art Collections of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (with notes on portraits)*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1981.
- Fitch, M, *Notes on Trades and Occupations in Medieval London*, unpublished manuscript housed at the library of the Institute of Historical Research, London, 2003.
- Hamilton, P, *Haberdashery for Use in Dress 1550–1800*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Wolverhampton, 2007.
- Hayward, M, *The Possessions of Henry VIII: A Study of Inventories*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London, 1997.
- Hovland, S, *Apprenticeship in Later Medieval London (c.1300-1530)*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of London, 2006.
- Howey, CL, *Busy Bodies: Women, Power and Politics at the Court of Elizabeth I, 1558–1603*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The Graduate School-New Brunswick Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2007.
- Lloyd, PS, *Diet, Luxury and Social Identity in England, 1540-1640*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Leicester, 2009.
- Marty, PJW, *The Kenilworth Entertainment, 1575. Staging England in the Age of Elizabeth I*, unpublished dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2003.
- Partridge, M, *Images of the Courtier in Elizabethan England*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Birmingham, 2008.
- Riello, G, *The Boot and Shoe Trades in London and Paris in the Long Eighteenth Century*, unpublished dissertation submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University College London, 2002.
- Sleigh-Johnson, N, *The Merchant Taylors Company of London 1580–1645 with Special Reference to Government and Politics*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University College London, 1989.
- Swetman, R, *Dancing, galloping orators: The disposition of the body in Early-Modern England*, unpublished dissertation submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts, University of East Anglia, 2009.
- Vaughan, J, *Secretaries, Statesmen and Spies: The Clerks of the Tudor Privy Council, c. 1540-c.1603*, unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of St. Andrews, 2006.
- Wedge, T, *Dressed Fit for a Queen: The Wardrobe of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, unpublished dissertation submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts, Textile Conservation Centre, University of Southampton, 2008.
- Weston, JP, *My Verie Good Lorde: The Influence of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, unpublished dissertation, submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts, University of Richmond, Virginia, USA, 1994.

## Published Secondary Sources

- Adams, S, 'Faction, Clientage and Party English Politics, 1550-1603', *History Today*, vol.32, no.12, 1982, pp. 33–39.
- 'The Dudley Clientele and the House of Commons, 1559-1586', *Parliamentary History*, vol.8, part 2, 1989, pp. 216–239.
- 'Queen Elizabeth's eyes at court', in D Starkey (ed.), *Rivals in Power. Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties*, Macmillan, London, 1990, pp. 146–173.
- 'Favourites and factions at the Elizabethan court', in R Asch and A Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility. The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450–1650*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991, pp. 265–287.
- 'The Papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester I. The Browne-Evelyn Collection', *Archives. The Journal of the British Records Association*, vol.22, no.83, 1992, pp. 63–85.
- 'The Papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester II. The Atye-Cotton Collection', *Archives. The Journal of the British Records Association*, vol.20, no.90, 1993, pp. 131–144.
- 'Because I am of that countreye and mynde to plante myself there': Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester and the West Midlands', *Midland History*, vol.20, 1995, pp. 21–74.
- 'At home and away: The Earl of Leicester', *History Today*, vol.46, no.5, 1996, pp. 22–28.
- 'The papers of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester III. The Countess of Leicester's Collection', *Archives. The Journal of the British Records Association*, vol.22, no.94, 1996, pp. 1–26.
- 'The Court as an Economic Institution: the Court of Elizabeth I of England (1558-1603)', in S Adams, *Leicester and the Court Essays on Elizabethan Politics*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2002, pp. 114–130.
- *Leicester and the Court. Essays on Elizabethan Politics*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2002.
- 'Dudley, Robert, earl of Leicester (1532/3–1588)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 18 February 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8160>>
- 'Dudley, Ambrose, earl of Warwick (c.1530–1590)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 25 June 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8143>>
- 'Sidney, Mary, Lady Sidney (1530x35–1586)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 27 June 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69749>>
- 'Dudley, Sir Robert (1574–1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 10 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8161>>
- 'Dudley, Lettice, countess of Essex and countess of Leicester (1543–1634)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 7 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8159>>
- 'Davison, William (d.1608)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 4 Jan 2013, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7306>>
- Archer, IW, *The Pursuit of Stability. Social Relations in Elizabethan London*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- Archer, I, *The History of The Haberdashers' Company*, Phillimore & Co., Chichester, 1991.
- 'City and Court Connected: The Material Dimensions of Royal Ceremonial, c. 1480-1625', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol.71, no.1, 2008, pp. 157–179.

- ‘Conspicuous Consumption Revisited: City and Court in the Reign of Elizabeth I’, in M Davies and A Prescott (eds), *London and the Kingdom: Essays in Honour of Caroline M. Barron*, Shaun Tyas, Donington, 2008, pp. 38–57.
  - ‘Cure, Thomas (d. 1588)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 29 March 2013, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/93684>>
  - ‘Fish, Walter (d.1585)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 19 September 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/93685>>
  - ‘Smith, David (d. 1587)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 19 September 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/93686>>
- Archer, JE, E Goldring and S Knight (eds), *The Progresses, Pageants & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
- Arnold, J, ‘A study of three jerkins’, *Costume*, no.5, 1971, pp. 36–43.
- *A Handbook of Costume*, MacMillan, London, 1973.
  - ‘Decorative features: pinking, snipping and slashing’, *Costume*, no.9, 1975, pp. 22–26.
  - ‘Elizabeth and Jacobean Smocks and Shirts’, *Waffen und Kostumkunde*, vol.19, no.2, 1977, pp. 89–110.
  - ‘The ‘coronation’ portrait of Queen Elizabeth I’, *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.120, 1978, pp. 727–741.
  - ‘Sweet England’s Jewels’, in *Princely Magnificence Court Jewels of the Renaissance, 1500–1630*, Debrett’s Peerage Limited, London, 1980, pp. 31–40.
  - *Patterns of Fashion. The Cut and Construction of Clothes for Men and Women c.1560–1620*, Macmillan, London, 1985.
  - ‘The kirtle, or surcoat, and mantle of the Most Noble Order of the Garter worn by Christian IV, King of Denmark and Norway’, *The Antiquaries Journal*, vol.LXXII, 1992, pp. 141–167.
  - ‘Liveries at the Court of Queen Elizabeth I’, in AG Cavagna and G Butazzi (eds), *Le Trame Della Moda: Atti del Seminario Internazionale svoltosi a Urbino il 7-8 ottobre 1992 promosso dal Centro Italiano per lo Studio della Storia del Tessuto e dal Centro Studi sulle Società d’antico Regime Europa delle Corti*. Roma: Bulzoni Editore s.r.l., 1995, pp. 253–285.
- Arnold, J, J Tiramani and S Levey, *Patterns of Fashion The Cut and Construction of Linen Shirts, Smocks, Neckwear, Headwear and Accessories for Men and Women*, Macmillan, London, 2008.
- Ashelford, J, *A Visual History of Costume. The Sixteenth Century*, BT Batsford Ltd, London, 1983.
- *Dress in the Age of Elizabeth I*, BT Batsford Ltd, London, 1988.
  - *The Art of Dress. Clothes and Society 1500–1914*, The National Trust, London, 1996.
- Ashmole, E, *The Institution, Laws & Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, London, 1672.
- Auerbach, E, *Nicholas Hilliard*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1961.
- Auerbach, E, and C Kingsley Adams, *Paintings and Sculpture at Hatfield House*, Constable & Co. Limited, London, 1971.
- Axton, M, ‘Robert Dudley and the Inner Temple Revels’, *The Historical Journal*, vol.13, no.3, 1970, pp. 365–378.
- Aylmer, GE, ‘Herrick, Sir William (bap.1562, d.1653)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 1 Jan 2013, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13076>>



- Baker, JH, 'A History of English Judges' Robes', *Costume*, no.12, 1978, pp. 27–39.
- Baldwin, FE, *Sumptuary Legislation and Personal Regulation in England*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1926.
- Baldwin, RCD, 'Aldersey, Thomas (1521/2-1598)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 21 September 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/73473>>
- Baldwin Smith, L, "Christ, what a fright": The Tudor portrait as an icon', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol.4, no.1, 1973, pp. 119–127.
- Barry, J, and C Brooks, *The Middling Sort of People. Culture, Society and Politics in England, 1550-1800*, Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 1994.
- Bath, M, *Emblems for a Queen. The Needlework of Mary Queen of Scots*, Archetype, London, 2008.
- Batho, GR (ed.), *The Household Papers of Henry Percy Ninth Earl of Northumberland*, Camden Third Series, vol. XCIII, Royal Historical Society, London, 1962.
- Beard, G, *Upholsterers and Interior Furnishing in England 1530-1840*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1997.
- Beaudry, MC, *Findings. The Material Culture of Needlework and Sewing*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2006.
- Beck, SW, *Gloves, Their Annals and Associations: A Chapter of Trade and Social History*, Hamilton, Adams & Co., London, 1883.
- Beer, BL, 'London and the rebellions of 1548-1549', *The Journal of British Studies*, vol.12, no.1, 1972, pp. 15–38.
- Benhamou, R, 'The Restraint of Excessive Apparel: England 1337-1604', *Dress*, vol.15, 1989, pp. 27–37.
- Bennell, J, 'Spinola, Benedict (1519/20–1580)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 1 September 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52156>>
- Benson, J, and L Ugolini (eds), *A Nation of Shopkeepers. Five Centuries of British Retailing*, IB Tauris & Co Ltd, London, 2003.
- Birbari, E, *Dress in Italian Painting 1460-1500*, John Muarry, London, 1975.
- Bischoff, C, 'Complicated Exchanges: The Handling of Authorised and Unauthorised Gifts' *The Court Historian. Gift-Giving in Eighteenth-Century Courts*, vol.14, no.2, 2009, pp. 133–148.
- Black, JA, and M Garland, *A History of Fashion*, Orbis Publishing, London, 1975.
- Black, JB, *The Reign of Elizabeth 1558 –1603*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1949.
- Blakeley, E, 'Tournament garniture of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester', *Royal Armouries Yearbook*, no.2, 1997, pp. 54–63.
- Blanchard, I, 'Gresham, Sir Thomas (c.1518-1579)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 2 March 2012, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11505>>
- Blayney, PWM, *The Bookshops in Paul's Cross Churchyard*, Occasional Papers of the Bibliographical Society, No. 5, London, 1990.
- Blondé, B, and N Coquery, 'Introduction', in B Blondé, E Briot, N Coquery and L Van Aert (eds), *Retailers and Consumer Changes in Early Modern Europe. England, France, Italy and the Low Countries*, Presses Universitaires Francois-Rabelais, Tours, 2005, pp. 5–19.
- Blondé, B, E Briot, N Coquery, and L Van Aert (eds), *Retailers and Consumer Changes in Early Modern Europe. England, France, Italy and the Low Countries*, Presses Universitaires Francois-Rabelais, Tours, 2005.
- Bolton, P, 'The Chester Companies in the Seventeenth Century', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, vol.156, 2007, pp. 75–104.

- Boucher, F, *A History of Costume in the West*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1967.
- Boutell, C, and AC Fox–Davies, *The Handbook to English Heraldry*, Reeves & Turner, London, 1914.
- Boulton, J, ‘London 1540–1700’, in P Clark, P. (ed). *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain Volume II 1540–1840*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- Bracken, S, ‘Robert Cecil as art collector’, in P Croft (ed.) *Patronage, Culture and Power. The Early Cecils 1558–1612*, Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, New Haven, 2002, pp. 121–137.
- Brennan, MG, *The Sidneys of Penshurst and the Monarchy, 1500-1700*, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot, 2006.
- Brewer, J, and R Porter (eds), *Consumption and the World of Goods*, Routledge, London, 1993.
- Brilliant, R, *Portraiture*, Reaktion Books Limited, London, 1991.
- Brindley, D, *The Collegiate Church of St Mary Warwick*, RJI Smith & Associates, Much Wenlock (Shropshire), 1997.
- Brooke, I, *English Costume in the Age of Elizabeth The Sixteenth Century*, Adam & Charles Black, London, 1950.
- Bucholz, RO, ‘The stables: Master of the Horse 1660-1837’, *Office-Holders in Modern Britain: Volume 11 (revised): Court Officers, 1660-1837*, 2006, pp.603-604, online accessed 16 September 2012 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=43902>>.
- Buck, A, ‘The clothes of Thomasine Petre 1555–1559’, *Costume*, no.24, 1990, pp. 15–33.
- Burgon, JW, *The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Gresham*, Robert Jennings, London, 1839.
- Calabi, D, and ST Christensen (eds), *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe Volume II, Cities and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400-1700*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- Camden, W, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England*, Fourth Edition, R. Bentley, London, 1688.
- Carey, G, *Thomas Russell, Draper (1529–1593)*, 2000, online accessed 23 November 2012 <<http://www.agecarey.com/Russell/Index.asp>>
- Carter, AJ, ‘Mary Tudor’s wardrobe’, *Costume*, no.18, 1984, pp. 9–28.
- Chaffers, W, *Gilda Aurifabrorum A History of English Goldsmiths and Plateworkers and Their Marks Stamped on Plate*, Reeves and Turner, London, 1899.
- Chambers, EK, *The Elizabethan Stage* (4 Volumes), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1925.
- *Sir Henry Lee. An Elizabethan Portrait*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1936.
- Chapman, HW, *Lady Jane Grey*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1962.
- Cherry, J, *Medieval Craftsmen. Goldsmiths*, British Museum Press, London, 1992.
- Chirelstein, E, ‘Emblem and reckless presence: the Drury portrait at Yale’, in L Gent (ed.) *Albion’s Classicism. The Visual Arts in Britain 1550–1660*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1995, pp. 287–311.
- Clarkson, LA, ‘The Organization of the English Leather Industry in the Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, *The Economic History Review*, vol.13, no. 2, 1960, pp. 245–256.
- Clifford, E, ‘Marriage of True Minds’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol.15, no.1, 1984, pp. 36–46.
- Clode, CM, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St John the Baptist, London, with Notices of the Lives of Some of its Eminent Members. Part I - The History*, Harrison and Sons, London, 1888.
- *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St John the Baptist*,

- London, with Notices of the Lives of Some of its Eminent Members. Part II - The Lives*, Harrison and Sons, London, 1888.
- Collier Frick, C, *Dressing Renaissance Florence. Families, Fortunes & Clothing*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2002.
- Collins, AJ, *Jewels and Plate of Queen Elizabeth 1. The Inventory of 1574*, The British Museum, London, 1955.
- Collinson, P, *Godly People. Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, The Hambledon Press, London, 1983.
- Conforti, M, and G Walton, G (eds), *Sweden A Royal Treasury 1550-1700*, National Art Gallery, Washington, 1988.
- Cooper, T, *Searching for Shakespeare*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2006.
- *A Guide to Tudor & Jacobean Portraits*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2008.
- Corbett, M, and M Norton, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth & Seventeenth Centuries. Part III*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1964.
- Cox, N, *The Complete Tradesman. A Study of Retailing 1550–1820*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, 2000.
- Croft, P, (ed.), *Patronage, Culture and Power. The Early Cecils*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2002.
- Crowfoot, E, F Pritchard and K Staniland, *Medieval Finds from Excavations in London: 4. Textiles and Clothing c.1150–c.1450*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1992.
- Cumming, V, 'The trousseau of Princess Elizabeth Stuart', *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies in London Archaeology and History Presented to Ralph Merrifield. London and Middlesex Archaeological Society Special Paper No. 2*, 1978, pp. 315–328.
- *Exploring Costume History 1500–1900*, Batsford Academic and Educational Limited, London, 1981.
- *Understanding Fashion History*, B T Batsford, London, 2004.
- Cumming, V, CW Cunnington and PE Cunnington, *The Dictionary of Fashion History*, Berg, Oxford, 2010.
- Cunningham, W, *Alien Immigrants to England*, London, 1897.
- Cunnington, CW and P Cunnington, *Handbook of English Costume in the 16th Century*, Faber and Faber Limited, London, 1954.
- Currie, E, 'Diversity and Design in the Florentine Tailoring Trade, 1550–1620', in M O'Malley and E Welch (eds), *The Material Renaissance*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2007, pp. 154–173.
- 'Fashion Networks: Consumer Demand and the Clothing Trade in Florence from the Mid-Sixteenth Centuries', in MF Rosenthal (ed.), *Cultures of Clothing in Later Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol. 39, no.3, 2009, pp. 483–509.
- Dale, MK, 'The London Silkwomen of the Fifteenth Century', *The Economic History Review*, vol. 4, no.3, 1933, pp. 324–335.
- Darlington, I, (ed.), 'Suffolk Place and the Mint', *Survey of London: volume 25: St George's Fields. The parishes of St. George the Martyr Southwark and St. Mary Newington*, 1955, pp. 22–25, online accessed 25 June 2008, <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.asp?compid=65441>>
- Davenport, M, *The Book of Costume*, Crown Publishers, New York, 1948.
- Davies, M, and A Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Tailors' Company*, Maney Publishing, Leeds, 2004.

- Deceulaer, H, 'Entrepreneurs in the Guilds: Ready-to-wear Clothing and Subcontracting in late Sixteenth and early Seventeenth-century Antwerp', *Textile History*, vol.31, no. 2, 2000, pp. 133–149.
- de la Haye, A, and E Wilson (eds), *Defining Dress, Dress as Object, Meaning and Identity*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1999.
- de Marly, D, *Fashion for Men. An Illustrated History*, BT Batsford Ltd, London, 1985.
- Dobson, RB, and DM Smith (eds), *The Merchant Taylors of York. A History of the Craft and Company from the Fourteenth to the Twentieth Century*, Borthwick Publications, York, 2006.
- Doran, S, *Monarchy and Matrimony. The Courtships of Elizabeth I*, Routledge, London, 1996.
- Dormer, EW, 'Lettice Knollys, countess of Leicester', *The Berkshire Archaeological Journal*, vol.39, no.1, 1935, pp. 82–92.
- Dovey, Z, *An Elizabethan Progress*, Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd, Stroud, 1996.
- Duffy, S, and J Hedley, *The Wallace Collection's Pictures. A Complete Catalogue*, Unicorn Press & Lindsay Fine Art Ltd, London, 2004.
- Edwards, LO, 'Evidence for Hand Knitting from Elizabethan England 1560–1600', *text: For the Study of Textile Art Design & History*, vol. 35, 2008, pp. 44–47.
- Egan, G, *Material Culture in London in a Age of Transition. Tudor and Stuart Period Finds c.1450-c.1700 from Excavations at Riverside Sites in Southwark*, Museum of London Archaeology Service, London, 2005.
- Elliot, JH, and LWB Brocklis (eds), *The World of the Favourite*, Yale University Press, London, 1999.
- Evans, J, *English Jewellery From the Fifth Century A.D to 1800*, Methuen & Co. Ltd, London, 1921.
- *A History of Jewellery 1100–1870*, Faber and Faber, London, 1970.
- Field, JF, 'Apprenticeship Migration from the North-East of England in the Seventeenth Century', *The London Journal*, vol.35, no.1, 2010, pp. 1–21.
- Fisher, FJ, (PJ Corfield and NB Harte (eds)), *London and the English Economy, 1500-1700*, The Hambledon Press, London, 1990.
- Fletcher, CRL and E Walker, *Historical Portraits. Richard II to Henry Wriothesley 1400–1600*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1909.
- Foister, S, 'Paintings and other works of art in sixteenth-century English inventories', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.123, no.938, 1981, pp. 273–282.
- 'Foreigners at court: Holbein, Van Dyck and the Painter–Stainers Company', in D Howarth (ed.) *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts. Essays in Honour of Sir Oliver Millar*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 32–50.
- 'Sixteenth-century English portraiture and the idea of the classical' in L Gent (ed.) *Albion's Classicism. The Visual Arts in Britain 1550–1660*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1995, pp. 163–180.
- *Holbein in England*, Tate Publishing, London, 2006.
- Foster, F, *The Politics of Stability A Portrait of the Rulers in Elizabethan London*, Royal Historical Society, London, 1977.
- Frick, C, *Dressing Renaissance Florence. Families, Fortunes, & Fine Clothing*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2002.
- Gelderblom, O, 'The Governance of Early Modern Trade: The Case of Hans Thijs, 1556–1611', *Enterprise & Society*, vol.4, no.4, December 2003, pp. 606–639.
- *The Decline of Fairs and Merchant Guilds in the Low Countries, 1250–1650*, 2005, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://www.lowcountries.nl/workingpapers.php>>

- ‘The Organization of Long-Distance Trade in England and the Dutch Republic, 1550–1650’, in O Gelderblom (ed.), *The Political Economy of the Dutch Republic*, Ashgate, Farnham, 2009, pp. 223–254.
- Goldring, E, ‘The earl of Leicester and portraits of the duc d’Alençon’, *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.146, no.1211, 2004, pp. 108–111.
- Talbot, Elizabeth [Bess of Harwick], countess of Shrewsbury (1527?–1608), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, online accessed 24 November 2012 <<http://www.oxforddnb.co/view/article/26925>>
- ‘Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I and the Earl of Leicester for Kenilworth Castle’, *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.147, no.1231, 2005, pp. 654–660.
- ‘The Earl of Leicester’s Inventory of Kenilworth Castle, c.1578’, *English Heritage Historical Review*, vol.2, 2007, pp. 36–59.
- ‘Portraiture, patronage, and the progresses. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth festivities of 1575’, in JE Archer, E Goldring and S Knight (eds), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, pp. 163–188.
- ‘“A mercer ye wot az we be”’: The authorship of the Kenilworth letter reconsidered’, *English Literary Renaissance*, vol.38, no.2, 2008, pp. 245–269.
- Goodison, JW, ‘George Gower, serjeant painter to Queen Elizabeth’, *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.90, 1948, pp. 261–264.
- Green, L, ‘Galvano Fiamma, Azzone Visconti and the Revival of the Classical Theory of Magnificence’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol.53, 1990, pp. 98–113.
- Greenblatt, S, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning. From More to Shakespeare*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1980.
- Grew, F and M de Neergaard, *Shoes and Pattens: Medieval finds from excavations in London*, Boydell Press, London, 2001.
- Grey, J and SJ Gunn, ‘A Letter of Jane, Duchess of Northumberland, in 1553’, *The English Historical Review*, vol.114, no.459, 1999, pp. 1267–1271.
- Gristwood, S, *Elizabeth & Leicester*, Bantam Books, London, 2007.
- Gunn SJ, ‘Dudley, Edmund (c.1462–1510)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 26 March 2008 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8147>>.
- Guy, J, *Tudor England*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1990.
- (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy*, Arnold, London, 1997.
- Hackenbroch, Y, *Enseignes. Renaissance Hat Jewels*, Studio Per Edizioni Scelte, Firenze, 1996.
- Hammer, PEJ, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics. The political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585–1597*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- ‘Absolute and sovereign mistress of her grace? Queen Elizabeth I and her favourites, 1581–1592’, in JH Elliot and LWB Brockliss (eds), *The World of the Favourite*, Yale University Press, London, 1999, pp. 38–53.
- ‘Devereux, Robert, second earl of Essex (1565–1601)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 2 March 2010, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7565>>.
- Harding, V, ‘The Population of London, 1550-1700: A Review of the Published Evidence’, *The London Journal*, vol.15, no.2, 1990, pp. 111–128.
- ‘Cheapside: Commerce and Commemoration’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol.71, no.1, 2008, pp. 77–96.

- Hare, SM, 'The Man Behind the Portrait', *Goldsmiths' Review*, 1987/1988, Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths, London, pp. 52–53.
- Harte, NB, and KG Ponting (eds), *Textile History and Economic History. Essays in Honour of Miss Julia de Lacy Mann*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1973.
- Harte, NB, 'State Control of Dress and Social Change in Pre-Industrial England', in DC Coleman and AH Johns (eds), *Trade, Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England: Essays Presented to FJ Fisher*, Littlehampton Book Services, London, 1976, pp. 132–165.
- Harvey, K, (ed.), *History and Material Culture. A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, Routledge, London, 2009.
- Haynes, A, *The White Bear: Robert Dudley. The Elizabethan Earl of Leicester*, Peter Owen, London, 1987.
- Hayward, M, 'Luxury or Magnificence? Dress at the Court of Henry VIII', *Costume*, no.30, 1996, pp. 37–46.
- 'The Sign of Some Degree?': the financial, social and sartorial significance of male headwear at the courts of Henry VIII and Edward VI', *Costume*, no.36, 2002, pp. 1–17.
- 'Unlocking one facet of Henry VIII's wardrobe: an investigation of the base', in M Hayward and E Kramer (eds), *AHRC Research Centre for Textile Conservation and Textile Studies. Third Annual Conference 11–13 July 2006. Textiles and Text: Re-establishing the Links between Archival and Object-based Research. Postprints*, Archetype Publications Ltd., London, 2007, pp. 45–51.
- *Rich Apparel. Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Farnham, 2009.
- Hazard, ME, 'A Magnificent Lord: Leicester, Kenilworth, and Transformations in the Idea of Magnificence', *Cahiers Elisabethains*, vol.31, 1987, pp. 11–35.
- *Elizabethan Silent Language*, University of Nebraska Press, London, 2000.
- Heal, A, *The London Goldsmiths 1200-1800 A Record of the Craftsmen, Their Trade-cards and Shop-signs*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1935.
- Heal, F, 'Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress', in JE Archer, E Goldring and S Knight (eds), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, pp. 46–61.
- 'Food Gifts, the Household and the Politics of Exchange in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, no.199, pp. 41–70.
- Hearn, K, (ed.), *Dynasties. Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530–1630*, Tate Publishing, London, 1995.
- *Marcus Gheeraerts II Elizabethan Artist in Focus*, Tate Publishing, London, 2002.
- Hentschell, R, 'Treasonous Textiles: Foreign Cloth and the Construction of Englishness', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol.32, no.3, 2002, pp. 543–570.
- 'Moralizing Apparel in Early Modern London: Popular Literature, Sermons, and Sartorial Display', in MF Rosenthal (ed.), *Cultures of Clothing in Later Medieval and Early Modern Europe, The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol.39, no. 3, 2009, pp. 571–595.
- Herbert, S, *A Catalogue of the Paintings and Drawings in the Collection at Wilton House, Salisbury, Wiltshire*, Phaidon, London, 1968.
- Hervey, MF, 'A Lumley inventory of 1609', *Walpole Society*, vol.6, 1918, pp. 36–50.
- Hicks, M, 'Heneage, Sir Thomas (b. in or before 1532, d. 1595)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 2 March 2010, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12921>>

- Hoffman, K, *Concepts of Identity. Historical and Contemporary Images and Portraits of Self and Family*, Harper Collins, New York, 1996.
- Howard, M, *The Tudor Image*, Tate Publishing Ltd, London, 1995.
- 'Inventories, Surveys and the History of Great Houses 1480-1640', *Architectural History*, vol.41, 1998, pp. 14–29.
- Howard, M, and E Wilson, *The Vyne A Tudor House Revealed*, National Trust Enterprises, London, 2003.
- Huggett, JE, 'Rural costume in Elizabethan Essex: A study based on the evidence from wills', *Costume*, no.33, 1999, pp. 74–88.
- Hughes, E, 'The English Monopoly of Salt in the Years 1563–71', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 40, no.159, 1925, pp. 334–350
- Hunt, A, *Governance of the Consuming Passions: A History of Sumptuary Law*, St Martin's Press, New York, 1996.
- *The Drama of Coronation Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- Jackson–Stops, G, *The Treasure Houses of Britain. Five Hundred Years of Private Patronage and Art Collecting*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1985.
- Jardine, L, *Worldly Goods. A News History of the Renaissance*, Macmillan, Basingstoke, 1996.
- Jebb, S, *The Life of Robert, earl of Leicester, the favourite of Queen Elizabeth: drawn from original writers and records*, Woodman and Lyon, London, 1727.
- Jefferson, L, 'Gifts given and fees paid to Garter King of Arms at installation ceremonies of the Order of the Garter during the sixteenth century', *Costume*, no.36, 2002, pp. 18–35.
- Jenkins, AD, 'Cosimo de' Medici's Patronage of Architecture and the Theory of Magnificence', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol.33, 1970, pp. 162–170.
- Johnson, AH, *The History of The Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London: preceded by an Introduction on London and her Gilds up to the close of the XVth Century*, Volumes I to V, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1914–1922.
- Johnston, AF, 'Sir Francis Knollys and His Progeny: Court and Country in the Thames Valley', in NL Jones and D Woolf (eds), *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2007, pp. 131–155.
- Jones, AR, and P Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- Jones, NL and D Woolf (eds), *Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2007.
- Kelsey, H, 'Drake, Sir Francis (1540–1596)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 10 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8022>>
- Kemp, T, (ed.), *The Black Book of Warwick*, Henry Cooke and Son, Warwick, 1889.
- Kendell, A, *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, Cassell, London, 1980.
- Kewes, P, IW Archer and F Heal (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013.
- Kirby, WJT, 'The Public Sermon: Paul's Cross and the culture of persuasion in England, 1534-1570', *Renaissance and Reformation*, vol.31, no.1, 2008, pp. 3–29.
- Kingsford, CL, 'Essex House, formerly Leicester House and Exeter Inn', *Archaeologia or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity*, vol.73, 1923, pp. 1–54.
- Kinney, AF, *Titled Elizabethans. A Directory of Elizabethan State and Church Officers and Knights, with Peers of England, Scotland and Ireland, 1558-1603*, Shoe String Press, Hamden (Connecticut), 1973.

- Knafla, LA, 'Stanley, Edward, third earl of Derby (1509–1572)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 17 Nov 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26262>>
- Kramer, S, 'The Amalgamation of the English Mercantile Crafts, Part II', *English Historical Review*, XXIII, 1908, pp. 236–251.
- Kuchta, D, 'The semiotics of masculinity in Renaissance England', in J Turner (ed.) *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe Institutions, texts, images*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 233–246.
- Kury, G, 'Glancing surfaces': Hilliard, armour, and the Italian model', in L Gent (ed.) *Albion's Classicism. The Visual Arts in Britain 1550–1660*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1995, pp. 395–426.
- Kybalova, L, O Herbenova and M Lamarova, (translated by C. Rosoux), *The Pictorial Encyclopedia of Fashion*, Paul Hamlyn, London, 1968.
- Landini, RO, and B Niccoli, *Moda a Firenze 1540–1580 Lo stile di Eleonora di Toledo e la sua influenza*, Pagliai Polistampa, Firenze, 2005.
- Landini, RO, *Moda a Firenze 1540–1580 Cosimo I de' Medici's Style*, Mauro Pagliai Editore, Firenze, 2011.
- Larminie, V, 'Vanlore, Sir Peter (c.1547–1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 20 November 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66557>>
- Lauer, R, and J Lauer, *Fashion Power. The Meaning of Fashion in American Society*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1981.
- Levey, S, 'References to Dress in the Earliest Account Book of Bess of Hardwick', *Costume*, no.34, 2000, pp. 13–24.
- Lawson, JA, 'Rainbow for a reign: the colours of a Queen's wardrobe', *Costume*, no.41, 2007, pp. 26–44.
- Leahy, W, *Elizabethan Triumphal Processions*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, 2005.
- Lee, FG, 'The palace of the Savoy', *Walford's Antiquarian*, no.8 (July–December), 1885, pp. 119–124.
- Lee, S, *Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century*, Archibald Constable and Company, London, 1904.
- Lemire, B, *Dress, Culture and Commerce. The English Clothing Trade before the Factory, 1660–1800*, Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 1997.
- Leopold, J, and C Vincent, 'An Extravagant Jewel: The George Watch', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, vol.35, 2000, pp. 7, 137–149.
- Lingelbach, WE, *The Merchant Adventurers of England. Their Laws and Ordinances with Other Documents*, Burt Franklin, New York, 1902.
- Loades, D, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504–1553*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996.
- *Elizabeth I. The Golden Reign of Gloriana*, The National Archives, Kew, 2003.
- *Mary Tudor. The Tragical History of the First Queen of England*, The National Archives, Richmond, 2006.
- 'Dudley, John, duke of Northumberland (1504–1553)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 5 May 2011, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8156>>
- Locke, AA, *The Hanbury Family, Volume 1*, London, Arthur L Humphreys, 1916.
- Luu, LB, *Immigrants and the Industries of London, 1500–1700*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, 2005.



- MacCaffrey, WT, 'Cecil, William, first Baron Burghley (1520/21-1598)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, online accessed 29 June 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4983>>
- 'Hatton, Sir Christopher (c.1540–1591)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, online accessed 2 March 2010, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12605>>
- MacLean, S, 'The politics of patronage: Dramatic records in Robert Dudley's household books', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol.44, no.2, 1993, pp. 175–182.
- MacLeod, C, *Tudor Portraits*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 1996.
- MacTaggart, P, and A MacTaggart, 'The rich wearing apparel of Richard, 3rd earl of Dorset', *Costume*, no.14, 1980, pp. 41–55.
- McAdam, I, 'Fiction and projection: The construction of early modern sexuality in "Elizabeth" and "Shakespeare in Love"', *Pacific Coast Philology*, vol.35, no.1, 2000, pp. 49–60.
- McCoy, R, 'From the tower to the tiltyard: Robert Dudley's return to glory', *The Historical Journal*, vol.27, no.2, 1984, pp. 425–435.
- McCracken, G, 'Dress colour at the court of Elizabeth I: an essay in historical anthropology', *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol.22, 1985, pp. 515–533.
- McDermott, J, 'Frobisher, Sir Martin (1535?–1594)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 10 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10191>>
- 'Fenton, Edward (d.1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 11 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9293>>
- McGurk, JJN, 'Devereux, Walter, first earl of Essex (1539–1576)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, online accessed 7 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7568>>
- Madden, F, B Bandinel, J G Nichols (eds), *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, Volume 7, London, John Bowyer Nichols and Son, 1841.
- Malcolm–Davies, J, "Wherein Taylors may finde out new fashions': constructing the Costume Research Image Library (CRIL)", in M. Hayward and E. Kramer (eds) *AHRC Research Centre for Textile Conservation and Textile Studies. Third Annual Conference 11–13 July 2006. Textiles and Text: Re-establishing the Links between Archival and Object-based Research. Postprints*, Archetype Publications Ltd., London, 2007, pp. 37–44.
- Mansel, P, *Dressed to Rule. Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elizabeth II*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2005.
- Marschner, J, 'Cerimonial dress in Great Britain to denote the degrees of nobility from XVIth century sources', in A.G. Cavagna and G. Butazzi (eds), *Le Trame Della Moda: Atti del Seminario Internazionale svoltosi a Urbino il 7-8 ottobre 1992 promosso dal Centro Italiano per lo Studio della Storia del Tessuto e dal Centro Studi sulle Società d'antico Regime Europa delle Corti*, Bulzoni Editore s.r.l., Roma, 1995, pp. 241–252.
- Marsh, B, 'A London Manuscript' *The Genealogist New Series. Volume 32*, George Bell & Sons, London, 1916, pp. 217–220.
- Marshall, RK, "Hir Rob Ryall': The costume of Mary of Guise', *Costume*, no.12, 1978, pp. 1–12.
- *Costume in Scottish Portraits, 1560-1830*, The Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh, 1986.
- "To be the Kingis Grace ane Dowblett': The costume of James V, King of Scots', *Costume*, no.28, 1994, pp. 14–21.
- Martin, JJ, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2006
- Mears, N, 'Courts, Courtiers, and Culture in Tudor England', *The Historical Journal*, vol.46, no.3, 2003, pp. 703–722.

- Mee, S, 'The clothing of Margaret, Parnell and Millicent Crayforde, 1569 to 1575', *Costume*, no.38, 2004, pp. 26–40.
- Merritt, JF, *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster. Abbey, Court and Community, 1525–1640*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2005.
- Mertes, K, *The English Noble Household 1250–1600 Good Governance and Politic Rule*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1988.
- Mikhaila, N, and J Malcolm–Davies, *The Tudor Tailor. Reconstructing 16th–Century Dress*, BT Batsford, London, 2006.
- 'What Essex man wore: an investigation into Elizabethan dress recorded in wills 1558 to 1603', in M Hayward and E Kramer (eds) *AHRC Research Centre for Textile Conservation and Textile Studies. Third Annual Conference 11–13 July 2006. Textiles and Text: Re-establishing the Links between Archival and Object-based Research. Postprints*, Archetype Publications Ltd., London, 2007, pp. 18–22.
- Minns, C, and P Wallis, 'Rules and Reality: quantifying the practice of apprenticeship in early modern England', *The Economic History Review*, 2011, pp. 1–24.
- Misztal, M, *The Elizabethan Courtier. Ideal versus Reality Embodied in Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej, Krakow, 2002.
- Mitchell, DM, 'By Your Leave my Masters' : British Taste in Table Linen in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', *Textile History*, vol.20, no.1, 1989, pp. 49–77.
- Monnas, L, *Merchants, Princes and Painters. Silk Fabrics in Italian and Northern Paintings 1300–1550*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2008.
- Morgan, B, 'Hawkins, Sir John (1532–1595)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2007, online accessed 10 July 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12672>>
- Morrall, A, and M Watt (eds), *English Embroidery from The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1580–1700. Twixt Art and Nature*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2008.
- Morris, RK, *English Heritage Guidebooks: Kenilworth Castle*, English Heritage, London, 2006.
- Morse, HK, *Elizabethan Pageantry. A pictorial survey of Costume and its Commentators from c.1560–1620*, The Studio Ltd, London, 1934.
- Muldrew, C, *The Economy of Obligation. The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England*, Macmillan Press Ltd, Basingstoke, 1998.
- Mulryne, JR and E Goldring (eds), *Court Festivals of the European Renaissance. Art, Politics and Performance*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, 2002.
- Murdoch, J, J Murrell, PJ Noon and R Strong, *The English Miniature*, Yale University Press, London, 1981.
- Muzzarelli, MG, 'Reconciling the Privilege of a Few with the Common Good: Sumptuary Laws in Medieval and Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol.39, no.3, 2009, pp. 597–617.
- National Portrait Gallery, 2011. 'Two Portraits of Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester', *Making Art in Tudor Britain. A Scientific Survey of Our Early Collections*, 2011, online accessed 29 December 2011, <<http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain/case-studies/robertdudley.php>>
- Nelson, AH *Monstrous Adversary: The Life of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 2003.
- Nevinson, JL, 'Shakespeare's Dress in His Portraits', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol.18, no.2, 1967, pp. 101–106.
- 'Prince Edward's clothes', *Costume*, no.2, 1968, pp. 3–8.

- ‘The dress of the citizens of London’, in J Bird, H Chapman and J Clark (eds), *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies in London Archaeology and History Presented to Ralph Merrifield*, London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, London, 1978, pp. 265–280.
- Nichols, J, *Progresses, public processions, &c of Queen Elizabeth Vol. 1*, John Nichols and Son, London, 1823.
- *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth Vol. II*, John Nichols and Son, London, 1823.
- Nichols, JG (ed), *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London From A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*, The Camden Society, London, 1848.
- Noble, M, *A History of the College of Arms, and the Lives of All the Kings, Heralds, and Pursuivants, from the Reign of Richard III*, J Debrett and T Egerton, London, 1804.
- Nolde, D, E Svalduz and MJ del Rio Barredo, ‘City Courts as Places of Cultural Transfer’, in D Calabi and ST Christensen (eds), *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe Volume II, Cities and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- Norris, H, *Tudor Costume and Fashion*, Courier Dover Publications, London, 1997.
- Oldland, J, ‘The Wealth of the Trades in Early Tudor London’, *The London Journal*, vol.31, no.2, 2006, pp. 127–155.
- ‘The Allocation of Merchant Capital in Early Tudor London’, *The Economic History Review*, vol.63, no.4, 2010, pp. 1058–1080.
- Olson, JE, ‘Nicolas des Gallars and the Genevan connection of the stranger churches’, in R Vigne & C Littleton (eds), *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550–1750*, Sussex Academic Press, Brighton, 2002, pp. 38–47.
- O’Malley, M, ‘A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes: Commission, Cost, and Meaning in Renaissance Footwear’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol.63, no.1, 2010, pp. 45–83.
- Oosterhoff, FG, *Leicester and the Netherlands 1586-1587*, Hes Publishers, Utrecht, 1988.
- Orlin, LC, *Locating Privacy in Tudor London*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
- Ormond, R (ed.), *National Portrait Gallery in Colour*, Studio Vista, London, 1979.
- Page, A, *Topographical and Genealogical History of the County of Suffolk*, Ipswich, 1847.
- Peacock, J, ‘The politics of portraiture’, in K Sharpe and P Lake (eds) *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, Basingstoke, 1994, pp. 199–228.
- Peck, DC, (ed.), *Leicester’s Commonwealth*, Ohio University Press, Athens (Ohio), 1985, online accessed 29 September 2011, <<http://www.dpeck.info/write/leic-comm3f.htm>>
- Peck, LL, *Consuming Splendor. Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- Pennell, S, ‘Consumption and Consumerism in Early Modern England’, *The Historical Journal*, vol.42, no.2, 1999, pp. 549–564.
- Perry, M, *The Word of a Prince. A Life of Elizabeth I from Contemporary Documents*, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge (Suffolk), 1990.
- Persels, JC, ‘Bragueta Humanistica, or Humanism’s Codpiece’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol.28, no.1, 1997, pp. 79–99.
- Pettegree, A, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986.
- Piper, D, *The English Face*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 1978.
- Planche, J, *History of British Costume*, Charles Knight, London, 1834.

- Pound, JF, 'The Social and Trade Structure of Norwich 1525–1575', *Past & Present*, no.34, 1966, pp. 49–69.
- Prideaux, WS, *Memorials of the Goldsmiths' Company Being Gleanings From Their Records Between the Years 1335 and 1815. Volume 1*, Goldsmiths' Company, London, 1896.
- Ramsay, GD, 'The Undoing of the Italian Mercantile Colony in Sixteenth Century London', in NB Harte and KG Ponting (eds), *Textile History and Economic History, Essays in Honour of Miss Julia de Lacy Mann*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1973, pp. 22–49.
- 'The Recruitment and Fortunes of Some London Freemen in the Mid-Sixteenth Century', *The Economic History Review*, vol.31, no.4, 1978, pp. 526–540.
- *The Queen's Merchants and the Revolt of the Netherlands*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1986.
- Rappaport, S, *Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- Read, C, 'Lord Burghley's household accounts', *The Economic History Review. New Series*. vol.9, no.2, 1956, pp. 343–348.
- Reade, B, *Costume of the Western World The Dominance of Spain 1550–1660*, George G Harrap & Co. Ltd, London, 1951.
- Reddaway, TF, 'Elizabethan London–Goldsmiths' Row in Cheapside, 1558–1645', *The Guildhall Miscellany*, vol.II, no.5, 1963, pp. 181–206.
- Reddaway, TF, and LEM Walker, *Early History of the Goldsmiths' Company, 1327–1509: Including the Book of Ordinances, 1478–88*, E Arnold, London, 1975.
- Reese, M, *The Royal Office of Master of the Horse*, Threshold Books Limited, London, 1976.
- Reynolds, G, *Costume of the Western World Elizabethan and Jacobean 1558–1625*, George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd, London, 1951.
- Ribeiro, A, *Dress and Morality*, BT Batsford, London, 1986.
- *The Gallery of Fashion*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2000.
- 'On Englishness in dress', in C Breward, B Conekin and C Cox (eds), *The Englishness of English Dress*, Berg, Oxford, 2002, pp. 15–27.
- Richardson, C, G Murdock and M Merry, 'Clothing, culture and identity in early modern England: creating a new tool for research', *Textile History*, vol.34, no.2, 2003, pp. 229–234.
- Richardson, C, (ed.), *Clothing Culture, 1350–1650*, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot, 2004.
- Roe, FG, 'The Last of Sir Henry Lee. Champion to Queen Elizabeth and Master of the Armoury', *The Connoisseur*, vol.110, no.485, 1942, pp. 3–12.
- Rosenberg, E, *Leicester Patron of Letters*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1955.
- Rutt, R, *A History of Hand Knitting*, BT Batsford Ltd, London, 1987.
- Salter, E, *Six Renaissance Men and Women. Innovation, Biography and Cultural Creativity in Tudor England c.1450–1560*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 2007.
- Saunders, A, 'A Cloke not made so Orderly': the Sixteenth-Century Minutes of the Merchant Taylors' Company, *The Ricardian*, vol.13, 2003, pp. 415–419.
- Sayle, RTD, *Lord Mayors' Pageants of the Merchant Taylors Company in the 15th, 16th & 17th Centuries*, The Worshipful Company of Merchant Taylors, London, 1931.
- Scarisbrick, D, *Ancestral Jewels*, Andre Deutsch, London, 1989.
- *Rings: Symbols of Wealth, Power and Affection*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1993.
- *Tudor and Jacobean Jewellery*, Tate Publishing, London, 1995.

- *Rings: Jewelry of Power, Love and Loyalty*, Thames and Hudson, London, 2007.
- Sebastian, LB, *An Old City Company: A Sketch of the History and Conditions of The Skinners' Company of London*, The Skinners' Company, London, 1906.
- Selwood, J, *Diversity and Difference in Early Modern London*, Ashgate, Farnham, 2010.
- Shepherd, R, 'Republican anxiety and courtly confidence: the politics of magnificence and fifteenth-century Italian architecture', in M O'Malley and E Welch (eds), *The Material Renaissance*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2007, pp. 47–70.
- Shulman, R, 'Sumptuary Legislation and the fabric Construction of National Identity in Early Modern England', *Constructing the Past*, vol.8, iss.1, article 8, 2007, pp. 72–86, online accessed 4 May 2011, <<http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/constructing/vol8/iss1/8>>
- Sicca, CM, 'Fashioning the Tudor court', in M Hayward and E Kramer (eds), *AHRC Research Centre for Textile Conservation and Textile Studies. Third Annual Conference 11–13 July 2006. Textiles and Text: Re-establishing the Links between Archival and Object-based Research. Postprints*, Archetype Publications Ltd, London, 2007, pp. 93–104.
- Sitwell, HDW, 'The Jewel House and the Royal Goldsmiths', *The Archaeological Journal*, vol. CXVII for the year 1960, London, 1962, pp. 131–155.
- Skidmore, C, *Death and the Virgin Elizabeth, Dudley and the Mysterious Fate of Amy Robsart*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 2010.
- Sleigh-Johnson, N, 'Aspects of the tailoring trade in the city of London in the late sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries', *Costume*, no.37, 2003, pp. 24–32.
- 'The Merchant Taylor's Company of London under Elizabeth I: Tailor's Guild or Company of Merchants?', *Costume*, no.41, 2007, pp. 45–52.
- Smuts, RM, 'Art and the material culture of majesty in early Stuart England', in RM Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart Court & Europe Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 86–112.
- Somers Cocks, A, *An Introduction to Courtly Jewellery*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1980.
- Sparrow Simpson, W, *Chapters in the History of Old St Pauls*, London, 1881.
- Spence, RT, 'A Royal Progress in the North: James I at Carlisle Castle and the Feast of Brougham, August 1617', *Northern History*, vol.27, iss.1, 1991, pp. 41–89.
- Staniland, K, 'Clothing and textiles at the court of Edward III 1342–1352', *Collectanea Londiniensia: Studies in London Archaeology and History Presented to Ralph Merrifield. London and Middlesex Archaeological Society Special Paper No. 2*, 1978, pp. 223–234.
- *Medieval Craftsmen. Embroiderers*, British Museum Press, London, 1991.
- Starkey, D, 'Culture: the age of the household', in C Haigh (ed.), *The Cambridge Historical Encyclopedia of Great Britain and Ireland*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985, pp. 188–192.
- Stern, E, 'Peckover and Gallyard, two sixteenth-century Norfolk tailors', *Costume*, no.15, 1981, pp. 13–23.
- Stewart, H, *History of The Worshipful Company of Gold and Silver Wyre-Drawers and of the Origin and Development of the Industry which the Company Represents*, Gold and Silver Wyre-Drawers Company, London, 1891.
- Stone, L, 'The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy', *The Economic History Review*, vol.18, iss.1–2, 1948, pp. 1–53.
- *The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558–1641*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1965.
- Stone, LC, *English Sports and Recreations*, The Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, 1960.

- Strong, RC, 'Queen Elizabeth, the earl of Essex and Nicholas Hilliard', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.150, no.673, 1959, pp. 145–149.
- Strong, R, *The Elizabethan Image*, Tate Gallery Publications, London, 1969.
- *The English Icon: Elizabethan & Jacobean Portraiture*, The Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art, London, 1969.
- *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits Vol. 1 Text*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1969.
- *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits Vol. 2 Plates*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1969.
- *The Cult of Elizabeth. Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1977.
- Stubbes, P, *The Anatomie of Abuses: Contayning A Discoverie, or Briefe Summarie of such Notable Vices and Imperfections, as now raigne in many Christian Countreyes of the Worlde: but (especiallie) in a verie famous Ilande called Ailgna.*, Printed by Richard Jones, London, 1583.
- Strutt, J, *A Complete View of the Dress and Habits of the People of England, from the Establishment of the Saxons in Britain to the Present Time. Vol. II*, The Tabard Press Limited, London, 1970 (1842).
- Sutton, AF, *The Mercery of London: Trade, Goods and People, 1130–1578*, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot, 2005.
- 'The Women of the Mercery: Wives, Widows and Maidens', in M Davies and A Prescott (eds), *London and the Kingdom: Essays in Honour of Caroline M. Barron*, Shaun Tyas, Donington, 2008, pp. 160–178.
- Tait, H, 'Insignia of the Order of the Garter', in J Hollis (ed.), *Princely Magnificence Court Jewels of the Renaissance, 1500-1630*, Debrett's Peerage Limited/Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1980, pp. 96–98.
- Tarrant, N, *The Development of Costume*, Routledge, London, 1994.
- Taylor, L, *The Study of Dress History*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2002.
- *Establishing Dress History*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2004.
- Thackery, A, 'Nicholas Hilliard. Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester', in K Hearn (ed.) *Dynasties. Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530–1630*, Tate Publishing, London, 1995, p.124.
- The Medici Archive Project, 'Baroncelli, Tommaso di Bartolomeo', *The Medici Archive Project*, online accessed 30 September 2012 <<http://bia.medici.org/DocSources/Home.do>>
- Thornbury, W, *Old and New London: Volume 1*, Cassell & Company, London, 1878.
- Thornton, RK and TG Cain (eds), *A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning: Together with a more Compendious Discourse Concerning ye art of Limning*, Mid Northumberland Arts Group, Ashington, 1981.
- Thrupp, SL, *The Merchant Class of Medieval London [1300-1500]*, University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 1962.
- Unwin, G, 'The Merchant Adventurers' Company in the Reign of Elizabeth', *The Economic History Review*, vol.1, no.1, 1927, pp. 35–64.
- Veale, EM, *The English Fur Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, London Record Society, London, 2003.
- Vincent, S, *Dressing the Elite. Clothes in Early Modern England*, Berg, Oxford, 2003.
- *The Anatomy of Fashion. Dressing the Body From the Renaissance to Today*, Berg, Oxford, 2009.
- Waldman, M, *Elizabeth and Leicester*, Collins, London, 1969.

- Wallis, P, 'Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England', *The Journal of Economic History*, vol.68, no.3, 2008, pp. 832–861.
- Wallis, P, C Webb and C Minns, 'Leaving home and entering service: the age of apprenticeship in early modern London', *Continuity and Change*, vol.25, no.3, 2010, pp. 377–404
- Walsh, C, 'The Social Relations of Shopping in Early-Modern England', in B Blondé, P Stabel, J Stobart and I Van Damme (eds), *Buyers and Sellers Retail Circuits and Practices in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, Turnhout: Brepols, Turnhout, 2006, pp. 331–351.
- Wardle, P, 'The King's embroiderer: Edmund Harrison (1590-1667): Part I', *Textile History*, vol.25, no.1, 1994, pp. 29–59.
- 'The King's embroiderer: Edmund Harrison (1590-1667): Part II', *Textile History*, vol.26, no.2, 1995, pp. 139–185.
- 'Divers necessities for his Majesty's use and service': Seamstresses to the Stuart Kings', *Costume*, no.31, 1997, pp. 16–27.
- 'John Shepley (1575-1631), Embroiderer to the High and Mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales', *Textile History*, vol.32, no.2, 2001, pp. 133–155.
- Warnicke, RM, 'Anne [Anne of Cleves] (1515–1557)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004, online accessed 2 April 2013 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5558>>
- Warsh, MA, 'Enslaved Pearl Divers in the Sixteenth Century Caribbean', *Slavery & Abolition*, vol.31, no.3, 2010, pp. 345–362.
- Weiss Gallery, *English Portraits 1530–1650*, The Weiss Gallery, London, no date.
- *English Portraiture and the Northern Tradition 1550–1680*, The Weiss Gallery, London, 1987.
- *English and North European Portraits 1535–1715*, The Weiss Gallery, London, 1992.
- *Illustrious Company. An Exhibition & Catalogue of Early Portraits 1545–1720*, The Weiss Gallery, London, 1998.
- *The Courty Image. Early Portraiture 1550–1680*, The Weiss Gallery, London, 2002.
- Weiss, M, and R Strong, *Tudor & Stuart Portraits 1530–1660*, The Weiss Gallery, London, 1995.
- Welch, E, 'Public Magnificence and Private Display Giovanni Pontano's De splendore (1498) and the Domestic Arts', *Journal of Design History*, vol.15, no.4, 2002, pp. 211–221.
- *Shopping in the Renaissance*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2005.
- Williams, A, and A de Reuck, *The Royal Armoury at Greenwich 1515–1649. A History of its Technology*, Trustees of the Royal Armouries, London, 1995.
- Williams, N, *All the Queen's Men. Elizabeth I and Her Courtiers*, Cardinal, London, 1974.
- Williams, P, 'Court and polity under Elizabeth I', in J Guy (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy*, Arnold, London, 1997, pp. 356–379.
- Williamson, GC, *George, Third Earl of Cumberland (1558–1605). His Life and His Voyages*, The University Press, Cambridge, 1920.
- Willan, TS, *The Muscovy Merchants of 1555*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1953.
- Wilson, D, *Sweet Robin: A Biography of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester 1533–1588*, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1981.
- *The Uncrowned Kings of England: The Black Legend of the Dudleys*, Robinson, London, 2005.
- Wilson, J, 'The noble imp: The upper-class child in English renaissance art and literature', *The Antiquaries Journal*, vol.LXX, no.II, 1990, pp. 360–379.
- Wingfield Digby, G, *Elizabethan Embroidery*, Faber and Faber, London, 1963.

- Woolgar, CM, *Household Accounts From Medieval England. Part 1. Introduction. Glossary. Diet Accounts (i)*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992.
- *Household Accounts From Medieval England. Part 2. Diet Accounts (ii). Cash, Corn and Stock Accounts. Wardrobe Accounts. Catalogue*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1993.
- Yarwood, D, *English Costume From the Second Century B.C. to the Present Day*, BT Batsford, London, 1961.
- Yungblut, LH, *Strangers Settled Here Amongst Us. Policies, perceptions and the presence of aliens in Elizabethan England*, Routledge, London, 1996.

### Websites:

- Historical Portraits Image Library, 'Portrait of Sir Thomas Radcliffe, 3rd Earl of Sussex (1526/7-83) 1580s', online accessed 29 November 2011, <<http://www.historicalportraits.com/Gallery.asp?Page=Item&ItemID=521&Desc=The-Earl-of-Sussex->>>
- Los Angeles County Museum, Polish Tailor's Cutting Guide, catalogue number AC1992.243.1, online accessed 12 May 2011 <<http://collections.lacma.org/node/173816>>
- Oxford English Dictionary*, second edition 1989, online accessed 23 October 2011, <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/88717>>
- Sotheby's, 'Old Master & British Paintings Day Sale, London 9 December 2010, Catalogue, Lot 247', online accessed 29 November 2011, <<http://www.sothebys.com/en/catalogues/ecatalogue.html/2010/old-master-british-paintings-day-sale-110037#/r=/en/ecat.fhtml.L10037.html+r.m=/en/ecat.lot.L10037.html/247/>>>
- The Burrell Collection, Glasgow, Arms of the Earl of Leicester (tapestry) 47.2, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://collections.glasgowmuseums.com/starobject.html?oid=40941>>
- The Holinshed Project*, online accessed 20 September 2011, <<http://www.cems.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/index.shtml>>
- the museum network, 'Portraits and Portraiture an eLearning resource for teachers and pupils at Key Stages 1 & 2', online accessed 28 September 2011, <<http://www.museumnetworkuk.org/portraits/artworks/waddesdon/img7.html>>
- The National Archives, Kew, Access to Archives Part of the UK archives network, *Longleat House, Dudley Papers*, online accessed 12 December 2012, <<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=2238-du&cid=-1#-1>>
- Victoria & Albert Museum, London, Margaret Layton's bodice T.228-1994, online accessed 15 September 2011, <<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O11095/jacket/>>>
- Victoria & Albert Museum, London, Portrait of Margaret Layton E.214-1994, online accessed 15 September 2011 <<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O69443/painting-margaret-layton-formerly-laton/>>>
- Victoria & Albert Museum, London, Arms of the Earl of Leicester (tapestry) T.320-1977, online accessed 12 December 2012 <<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O78831/arms-of-the-earl-of-tapestry-unknown/>>>