

Fashioning Statements of Sovereignty and Self: The Language of Gloves in Early Modern Elite Society

Jane Rae

Building on the work of scholars who have turned to the glove as a valuable primary object to study, this paper considers two artefacts: Mary Queen of Scots' embroidered glove gifted to Marmaduke Dayrell before her execution, and The Ditchley Portrait of Elizabeth I. By referencing visual and material culture, it explores our reception of these artefacts through the lens of the material object – the glove – posing questions that provide a more nuanced understanding of sartorial presentations of power and self-agency in elite early modern society. This discourse elevates the role of the glove in The Ditchley Portrait to an important symbol of power and realism for an aging monarch, increasingly presented in ethereal terms. In contrast, moving from a representation to an original, this paper considers Mary Queen of Scots' glove, its veneration to 'relic' status, and the transformative relationship between object and owner. Whether we consider the three-dimensional object, or its two-dimensional representation in art, there is a synergy from the convergence of object and owner that makes the corporeal and the material inseparable and which engenders gloves with a language of their own.

More commonly associated with utility and aesthetics, for centuries the glove has also been adopted as a symbol of power, purity, and protection, as well as an expression of self, yet it is often overlooked and obfuscated in historical studies. It is an object that is inherently contradictory; ubiquitous, yet autobiographical; an impediment to intimacy, yet sensual in its appearance; an instrument of aggression - 'laying down the gauntlet' – as well as conciliation, through the ritual handshake. In early modern portraiture, the glove, though diminutive in size, was an important symbol of status. As an alternative representation of power, the glove thought to have been worn by Mary Queen of Scots at her execution in 1587, was gifted to Marmaduke Dayrell, Master of the Household and Clerk of the Avery at Fotheringay Castle, as a token for his 'faithful devotion to her

Highness' service'.¹ Its prosthetic appearance, imbued with the residual identity of its owner, is a powerful statement of self and a potent reminder of the significance of the afterlife of objects.² Building on the work of scholars who have turned to the glove as a valuable primary object to study, this paper examines two artefacts: Mary Queen of Scots' embroidered glove housed in Saffron Walden Museum (Figure 1) and *The Ditchley Portrait* of Elizabeth I at the National Portrait Gallery (Figure 2). By referencing visual and material culture, it employs an interdisciplinary approach, exploring our reception of these artefacts through the lens of the material object – the glove – posing questions that provide a more nuanced understanding of sartorial presentations of power and self-agency in elite early modern society. This discourse elevates the

¹ 'Catalogue Information, Mary Queen of Scots Glove, Ref SAFWM : 70524 / LN 2078' (Saffron Walden Museum, 2023).

² Chris Gosden and Yvonne Marshall, 'The Cultural Biography of Objects', *World Archaeology*, 31.2 (1999), 169–78. As Gosden and Marshall observe, the relationship between persons and objects is not static. It is a continually transformative relationship.

role of the glove in *The Ditchley Portrait* to an important symbol of power and realism for an aging monarch, increasingly presented in ethereal terms. In contrast, moving from a representation to an original, this paper considers Mary Queen of Scots' glove, its veneration to 'relic' status, and the transformative relationship between object and owner.



Figure 1: Embroidered Leather Glove (Mary Queen of Scots), 1587. (© Saffron Walden Museum)

Although gloves were a staple in daily apparel for centuries, their potential for historical enquiry is still in its infancy. Their obfuscation is partly as a result of the diminished role of the glove's sartorial status; as Rebecca Unsworth observes, they are 'a rather maligned accessory'³, eclipsed by an interest in other more popular items of adornment. However, there has been a renewed interest in scholarly circles and Anne Green's recently published cultural history of gloves attributes this revival in part to the ascendancy of the glove in high fashion.⁴ The glove's semiotic inferences are receiving greater

attention, to the extent that they have been engendered with a 'language' of their own which goes far beyond the practical and the decorative. This discussion of symbolism offers continuity with Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass' exploration of the glove's status as an object of 'fetish' arising from the conflation of person, object, and power.⁵ Expressions of power are also connected to the material aspects of gloves in terms of craftsmanship, design, manufacture, and function, relating to sartorial practice, early modern cultural and trade exchanges within Europe, as well as decorative symbolism through embroidered motifs. Indeed, the significance of the materiality of gloves and the gender dynamic is often overlooked, and Daybell et al. highlight the 'dialogic' nature of these aspects of the gloves' object biography challenging perceptions of normative gender roles in the creation, consumption and presentation of gloves.⁶ Abigail Gomulkiewicz finds that male merchants and courtiers in Elizabeth I's court actively engaged in the practice of dress gift giving, supports this argument and she cites the example of the presentation of a pair of gloves to Elizabeth I on the occasion of her visit to University of Cambridge in 1578.⁷ The correspondence between Dr Richard Howland (Master of St John's College, Cambridge and who served in the office of the Vice-Chancellor) and Lord Burghley illustrates the significance of the glove as gift worthy of presentation and reception by a monarch.

Long before their sartorial apex, gloves were an instrument in brokering power. They

³Rebecca Unsworth's book review of 'Anne Green, *Gloves: An Intimate History*', *Costume*, 56.2 (2022), 266–67. <<https://doi.org/10.3366/cost.2022.0234>>.

⁴ Anne Green, *Gloves: An Intimate History* (London: Reaktion Books, 2021).

⁵ Peter Stallybrass and Ann Rosalind Jones, 'Fetishizing the Glove in Renaissance Europe', *Critical Inquiry*, 28.1 (2001), 114–32.

⁶ James Daybell and others, 'Gender and Materiality in Early Modern English Gloves', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 52 (2021), 571–606.

⁷ Abigail Gomulkiewicz, 'The Gender Dynamics of Dress Gifts from Elizabethan Men at the Court of Elizabeth I', *Gender & History*, 33.2 (2021), 346–64 <<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12512>>.



Figure 2: Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, Queen Elizabeth I (*The Ditchley Portrait*), 1592, oil on canvas, 95in x 60in. (© National Portrait Gallery, London)

represented land transfer and royal approval, as well as initiating conflict, and the idiomatic 'laying down or 'taking up' of the gauntlet are now part of common parlance. Their legal and liturgical uses are also well documented, associated with probity and purity.⁸ It wasn't until the fifteenth century in Italy that they gained popularity as a fashionable item of apparel among the elite, symbolising wealth, and status. Evelyn Welch notes that their conspicuous appearance in portraiture, as well as household inventories, is indicative of their importance as an expression of rank.⁹ This fashion for sartorial display migrated to British shores and coincided with the profusion of sumptuary laws in the sixteenth century. The decline of the feudal system and an emerging merchant class with increased wealth necessitated the introduction of statutes governing consumption, including dress. Elizabeth I passed several *Statutes of Apparel* during her reign and in 1574 issued a Royal Proclamation relating to 'the excess of apparel and the superfluity of unnecessary foreign wares'.¹⁰ Ostensibly an instrument to protect domestic industries and to curb wayward morality – a general 'disorder and confusion of the degrees of all states' – the sumptuary laws introduced a means of codifying status in society by what people wore.¹¹ The statutes linked usage to rank and were very specific about what fabric and embellishments could be worn by both men and women, from their bonnets to their pantoffles, and even their caparisoned horses; as

Amy Licence observes, 'dress became another facet of Tudor performance'.¹² While the elite were recognisable by their dress, so too were the lower classes and the 1571 *Cappers' Act* required the wearing of a cap on the Sabbath and Holy Days. By exempting those of higher rank the act operated as a class identifier. The sumptuary laws imposed social ordering on a society whose lingua franca was visually based and the glove, through its material and immaterial associations, became a staple accessory among the elite.

The Ditchley Portrait is indicative of this highly visual world and presents Elizabeth I as a preternatural force, bedecked in elaborate garb with a pair of unobtrusive, gauntlet-style gloves in one hand and a fan in the other. It is a fantastical composition that features many emblematic devices and symbolic details and reflects an 'inner vision of the idea of monarchy'.¹³ It was painted by Marcus Gheeraerts in 1592, just two years after Edmund Spenser's publication of the *Faerie Queene*, in which Elizabeth I is represented as various ethereal creatures – the Faerie Queene Gloriana, a beautiful maiden Belpheobe, and the maiden queen Lucifera. The portrait situates Elizabeth as another female deity, the Goddess Fortuna, standing on a globe against a mutable background of both calm and stormy skies. Her feet, barely visible, leave the viewer with a sense of the subject being disembodied and disconnected to the earthly world, as though

⁸ Mike Redwood, *Gloves and Glove-Making*, Shire Library, 812 (Oxford: Shire, 2016), p. 9. See reference to Samuel Beck's *Gloves: Their Annals and Associations – A Chapter of Trade and Social History* in which he says, 'on the bench gloves denote probity, in the church purity'.

⁹ Evelyn Welch, 'Art on the Edge: Hair and Hands in Renaissance Italy', *Renaissance Studies*, 23.3 (2009), p.260.

¹⁰ 'Proclamation against Excess of Apparel by Queen Elizabeth I', The British Library (The British Library) <<https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/proclamation-against-excess-of-apparel-by-queen-elizabeth-i>> [accessed 23 February 2023].

¹¹ 'Proclamation against Excess of Apparel by Queen Elizabeth I'. Ibid.

¹² Amy Licence, *Woodsmoke and Sage: The Five Senses, 1485-1603: How the Tudors Experienced the World* [Electronic Resource] (Cheltenham: The History Press, 2021), p.52.

¹³ Roy C. Strong, 'Elizabethan Painting: An Approach Through Inscriptions - III Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger', *The Burlington Magazine*, 105.721 (1963), p. 177.

part of a greater planetary force. It is as if Spencer's *Faerie Queene* has been resurrected: '...Oh goddesse heavenly bright! Mirrour of grace and Majestie divine'.¹⁴ As James Jewitt reminds us, there is no documentary evidence of the portrait's commission, and we must therefore decipher its meaning from the starting point of the tournament at Ditchley on which the painting is based.¹⁵ Its allegorical theme of forgiveness to Sir Henry Lee (Master of the Armoury and Champion of the Tilt) is in connection with his relationship with Anne Vavasour and Ewan Fernie refers to the spectacular tournament that took place at his Oxfordshire Estate in Ditchley as 'partly intended to deflect her [Elizabeth's] displeasure in this relationship'.¹⁶ The Latin inscriptions on the painting, meaning: 'she gives and does not expect, she can but does not take revenge, and in giving back she increases', echoing the theme of the theatrical entertainment at the Ditchley Accession day and Lee's ostentatious efforts to maintain his Queen's favour.¹⁷

The Ditchley Portrait is another facet of the courtly spectacle envisioned by Lee; it is a product of Gheeraerts' and Lee's imagination and as such, it would seem logical to assume that every detail of the painting would be carefully considered in terms of its part in the tableau. However, the gloves in the portrait are rarely featured in critical appraisals and are overshadowed by discussions of the dominant

imagery, for example, the armillary sphere earring, the globe, and the richly embellished dress. The perception of the glove's role in this theatrical presentation as a minor artistic prop is therefore plausible, particularly as there were additional influences at play, namely the existing portrait formula employed by artists and the potential for cross-pollination of technique and style between Gheeraerts the Elder and Gheeraerts the Younger. We know that Elizabeth I welcomed the opportunity to showcase her hands – indeed the report written in 1577 by Giovanni Michiel, late Ambassador to Queen Mary and King Philip, describes Elizabeth as having 'fine eyes and above all a beautiful hand of which she makes a display'.¹⁸ Her hands are usefully employed in many paintings; for example, in the portrait by Quentin Metsys the Younger (1583) she famously holds a sieve in her left hand referencing the Roman Vestal Virgin, Tuccia¹⁹ and in the *Darnley Portrait* (1575) she holds a luxuriant gold handled fan of ostrich feathers.²⁰ In *The Ditchley Portrait* her hand is posed in an unnatural position and its shape much closer to that of the artist's mannequin; the ring, third and fourth digits are clasped around the gloves and the little finger extended obliquely. It is an unnatural pose, but unnatural hand gestures, such as the syndactyly hand gesture observed in Renaissance paintings, were not uncommon and perhaps more about fashion in portraiture than

¹⁴ Edmund- Spenser, *The Faerie Queen*: [Electronic Resource]: *The Shepherds Calendar: Together with the Other Works*, Early English Books Online (London: Printed by H.L. for Mathew Lownes., 1611) <<https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/2264226690>> [accessed 23 February 2023].

¹⁵ James R. Jewitt, "Eliza Fortuna": Reconsidering the Ditchley Portrait of Elizabeth I', *The Burlington Magazine*, 156.1334 (2014), 293–98.

¹⁶ 'Lee, Sir Henry (1533–1611), Queen's Champion', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/16288>>.

¹⁷ Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, Queen Elizabeth I ('The Ditchley Portrait'), 1592, NPG, 2561.

¹⁸ 'Venice: May 1557, 11-15 | British History Online' <<https://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol6/pp1041-1095>> [accessed 12 March 2023].

¹⁹ The 'Sieve Portrait' is part of the collection at the Pinacoteca Nazionale in Sienna in Italy. The theme is associated with a Vestal Virgin who proved her chastity by carrying water in a sieve.

²⁰ Part of the Primary Collection at the National Portrait Gallery, <<https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw02075/Queen-Elizabeth-I>>.

anything else.²¹ Notable too is the fact that Gheeraerts the Elder painted Elizabeth with her left hand in an almost identical pose a decade earlier. Additionally, Roy Strong observes that the calligraphy on the cartouche and the sonnet are identical to that employed in Gheeraerts' *Lady in Fancy Dress*.²² Artistic expedience, therefore, might well be at play, however, refocussing our attention on Elizabeth's closed left hand, holding a pair of gloves offers an additional layer of interpretation to the portrait. While Elizabeth's maturity is reflected in her face, her hands, reflect ageless beauty, a purity as it were, expressed through lithe fingers that are smooth and pale. Despite the unnatural pose and flawless skin, the visceral presentation of Elizabeth I's hands, which is a quality of many of Gheeraerts' portraits, creates a very strong link between the corporeal and the objects in her hand.²³ That she carries a pair of gloves is discernible by the overlapped fingers [six in total]. Stallybrass and Jones' discussion on the unpairing of gloves suggests that paired gloves retain their functionality, whereas the presentation of a single glove, detached from its partner, gives it an altogether different identity, veering towards the original definition of a 'fetish' object imbued with greater powers.²⁴

While the allegorical goddess figure of Elizabeth is far removed from the earthly world to the extent that Elizabeth's human form is subordinate to the overall theme, the exposed

hands with paired gloves are a powerful expression of realism.²⁵ As a prop in the representation of an ageing monarch, they present a strong statement of power and control, anchoring the disembodied celestial queen to her earthly dominion. Given Elizabeth I's considered use of fashion as a means of asserting her role as head of state and the gloves' contribution to the visual rhetoric of *The Ditchley Portrait*, they deserve more than a footnote in scholarly interpretations.²⁶

Within the early modern dress ensemble, the shoe and the glove are the most closely identifiable with the human form, uniquely fashioned through utility by the wearer. However, the glove is arguably the most corporeal because of its proximity to the hand. As *The Ditchley Portrait* so clearly demonstrates, the hands and the face [and décolletage] were the only visible parts of the body. The hands were thus key transmitters of non-verbal communication and the glove, by extension, was a potent representation of identity. It is this intangible, associated identity that compels interest in Mary Queen of Scots's glove at Saffron Walden Museum. While Stallybrass and Jones suggest that gloves in museum collections are 'stripped of their ability to transform the recipient with the power of the absent hand', it can be argued that this material absence has created an immaterial power that invokes a strong response when encountering the object.²⁷

²¹ Davide Lazzeri, Fabio Nicoli, and Yi Xin Zhang, 'Secret Hand Gestures in Paintings', *Acta Bio Medica: Atenei Parmensis*, 90.4 (2019), 526–32 <<https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v90i4.7134>>.

²² Strong, p.157.

²³ Note the treatment of the 'flesh' in this famous portrait. Tate, 'Portrait of Captain Thomas Lee', Marcus Gheeraerts II, 1594', *Tate* <<https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/gheeraerts-portrait-of-captain-thomas-lee-t03028>> [accessed 24 February 2023].

²⁴ Stallybrass and Jones.

²⁵ Kate Cregan, 'Early Modern Anatomy and the Queen's Body Natural: The Sovereign Subject', *Body & Society*, 13.2 (2007), 47–66 (p. 60) <<https://doi.org/10.1177/1357034X07077775>>.

²⁶ Janet Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd: The Inventories of the Wardrobe of Robes Prepared in July 1600* (Leeds: Maney, 1988). The meticulous records that Elizabeth I kept of her wardrobe are indicative of the status of clothing in her presentation of monarchy.

²⁷ Stallybrass and Jones, p.118.

When displayed at Saffron Walden Museum (Figure 1), there is an imagined haptic quality to the glove, that is indelibly marked through its contact with the skin and ridged fingertips of its owner. There is a strong desire in our reception of the object to connect with the owner and to imbue it with an emotional value that gives it an almost ‘supernatural’ power. Unlike other objects in museum collections, items of apparel are uniquely disembodied, and the case of Mary Queen of Scots’ glove, this de-contextualisation elevates its status to that of a sacralised object.

The decorative and material aspects of Mary Queen of Scots’ glove and the glove featured in *The Ditchley Portrait* warrant further scrutiny. On the morning of Mary’s Queen of Scots’ execution, nineteenth-century historian J. A. Froude in his *History of England*, gives an account of Mary in a black satin robe with black jacket, trimmed with velvet and white veil.²⁸ The black robe and jacket once removed on the scaffold revealed a petticoat and body of crimson satin, with the addition of crimson sleeves. Froude paints a vivid scene of the executioners in black garb contrasted to Mary Stuart swathed in ‘blood-red from head to foot’.²⁹ Of course, red was the liturgical colour of the catholic martyrs and as Clare Hunter makes reference, Anne Boleyn also adopted to wear a red kirtle (petticoat) at the time of her execution.³⁰ The glove that was reportedly handed to Dayrell by Mary Queen of Scots is made from kid leather and lined with crimson red satin, consistent with Mary’s apparel; it is elaboratively embroidered with silk wire and a narrow band of the crimson silk lining has been turned to form an exposed decorative binding embellished with gold lace (See Figure 3).



Figure 3: Detail from Embroidered Leather Glove (Mary Queen of Scots), 1587. (© Saffron Walden Museum)

The glove is a statement of power and status, reflecting the prescriptive sumptuary laws: ‘none shall wear in his apparel any...sylke or cloth mixte, or imbordered with Golde or Sylver’; the wearing of ‘scarlet, crimson and blewe’ was also restricted to the highest ranks of nobility and the clergy.³¹ The gauntlet-style leather gloves held in Elizabeth’s left hand are far less decorative. They are painted to replicate fine leather. Their russet appearance blends with the palette from Elizabeth’s dress and the russet choice of colour – symbolic of prudence – is consistent with the theme of majesty. They are not decorative, and while gloves during this period were not gendered, as has been observed in the many elaborately embellished gloves worn by men in portraiture, they convey a sense of utility, pragmatism, and strength.

That Mary Queen of Scots should wear such a highly decorative pair of gloves as her last visual statement is not surprising given her relationship with needlework. Clare Hunter’s exploration of Mary Queen of Scots’ embroideries in her book *Embroidering Her Truth* draws attention to the fundamental role of

²⁸ James Anthony Froude, *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth* (London: Parker, 1856), pp.99–259 <<http://purl.ox.ac.uk/uuid/123d19180c72483e80a659a3b1aea305>> [accessed 17 February 2023].

²⁹ Froude, p.254.

³⁰ Clare Hunter, *Embroidering Her Truth: Mary, Queen of Scots and the Language of Power* (London: Sceptre, 2022).

³¹ ‘Proclamation against Excess of Apparel by Queen Elizabeth I.’

textiles, not just as political devices, or a means of autobiography, but as a source of comfort and agency: 'by 1569 Mary was much in need of the solace of sewing...without her embroidery she had nothing to do but 'weep and pray'.³² The design of the glove given to Dayrell includes roses, foliage, and trees, as well as a bird with a long tail, pictured in flight. That her final act of self-agency should be conveyed through an object embroidered with a symbol of freedom is consistent with other motifs that she chose to embroider, including the regenerative phoenix or the cat and mouse, representing Elizabeth and Mary's power struggle. She famously stitched a panel in 1569 featuring a grapevine and a pruning knife with the Latin motto *Virescit Vulnere Virtus* (virtue flourishes by wounding) and gifted this to the Duke of Norfolk; this symbolic culling of dead branches undoubtedly referencing fertility and illegitimacy within the Tudor branch.³³ While it was commonplace to divest oneself of one's material effects before the long walk to the scaffold, the glove is particularly potent. Indeed, in 1649, the gloves of Charles I were believed to have been given to William Juxon, Bishop of London on the day of his execution. The Museum of London has recorded these as mementos gifted to his companions including a handkerchief, fragments of a cloak, and a silk sash. In Robert Wynkfield's account of Mary Queen of Scots' execution he records that 'all things else were that had any blood was either burned or washed clean, and the executioners sent away with money for their fees, not having any one thing that belonged unto her...beads, Paternoster, handkerchief – each particle of dress was burnt in the presence of the crowd'.³⁴ This very deliberate negation of

any trace of Mary affords the surviving glove a greater sense of sacralisation.

The two artefacts presented here illustrate that the presentation of power symbolised through the glove in early modern elite society is both mutable and nuanced. In *The Ditchley Portrait*, the locus of power shifts between the creative directors of Elizabeth's projected power – Gheeraerts and Lee, and the subject herself, majestic and deified. Ostensibly, Elizabeth can assert little agency when presented in this theatrical tableau, however her conspicuous grasp of the leather gloves is a strong statement of power and control by an ageing monarch. Mary Queen of Scots' gift of her glove to Dayrell is a poignant gesture of self-agency right up until the moment of death and William Pietz' visceral description of objects as 'external organs' is particularly relevant, with the glove embodying the Catholic Queen.³⁵ Whether we consider the material three-dimensional object, or its two dimensional representation in art, there is a synergy from the convergence of object and owner that makes the corporeal and the material inseparable and which engenders gloves with a language of their own. The evolving transformative relationship between object and owner necessitates that this language is revisited and reinterpreted. Given the contemporary experience of monarchy and power, and the abundant images of Queen Elizabeth II sheathed in white, Cornelia James gloves, there is much to explore that articulates the importance of the glove as a statement of sovereignty, in individual and collective terms.

³² Claire Hunter, *Embroidering Her Truth: Mary Queen of Scots and the Language of Power* (London: Sceptre, 2022).

³³ Mary Queen of Scots and Elizabeth Talbot, The Marion Hanging, 1570, VAM (on permanent loan to Oxburgh Hall, Norfolk <<https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O137608/the-marian-hanging-hanging-mary-queen-of/>> [accessed 17 February 2023]).

³⁴ Froude, p.256.

³⁵Pietz in Stallybrass and Jones, p.116.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Gheeraerts the Younger, Marcus, *Queen Elizabeth I (The Ditchley Portrait)*, 1592, Oil on canvas, 95 in. x 60 in. (2413 mm x 1524 mm), NPG, 2561

Gheeraerts II, Marcus, *Portrait of Captain Thomas Lee*, 1594, Oil on canvas, 2305 × 1508 mm, Tate T03028

Mary Queen of Scots Glove, Ref SAFWM:70524/LN 2078, (Saffron Walden Museum, 2023)

'Proclamation against Excess of Apparel by Queen Elizabeth I', *The British Library* (The British Library) <<https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/proclamation-against-excess-of-apparel-by-queen-elizabeth-i>> [accessed 23 February 2023]

Secondary Sources

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

'Catalogue Information, Mary Queen of Scots Glove, Ref SAFWM : 70524 / LN 2078' (Saffron Walden Museum, 2023)

Cregan, Kate, 'Early Modern Anatomy and the Queen's Body Natural: The Sovereign Subject', *Body & Society*, 13.2 (2007), 47–66 <<https://doi.org/10.1177/1357034X07077775>>

Daybell, James, Svante Norrhem, Susan Broomhall, Jacqueline Van Gent, and Nadine Akkerman, 'Gender and Materiality in Early Modern English Gloves', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 52 (2021), 571–606

Froude, James Anthony, *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth* (London: Parker, 1856) <<http://purl.ox.ac.uk/uuid/123d19180c72483e80a659a3b1aea305>> [accessed 17 February 2023]

Gheeraerts the Younger, Marcus, *Queen Elizabeth I (The Ditchley Portrait)*, 1592, Oil on canvas, 95 in. x 60 in. (2413 mm x 1524 mm), NPG, 2561

Gomulkiewicz, Abigail, 'The Gender Dynamics of Dress Gifts from Elizabethan Men at the Court of Elizabeth I', *Gender & History*, 33.2 (2021), 346–64 <<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12512>>

Gosden, Chris, and Yvonne Marshall, 'The Cultural Biography of Objects', *World Archaeology*, 31.2 (1999), 169–78

Green, Anne, *Gloves: An Intimate History* (London: Reaktion Books, 2021)

Hunter, Claire, *Embroidering Her Truth: Mary Queen of Scots and the Language of Power* (London: Sceptre, 2022)

- Hunter, Clare, *Embroidering Her Truth: Mary, Queen of Scots and the Language of Power* (London: Sceptre, 2022)
- Jewitt, James R., “Eliza Fortuna”: Reconsidering the Ditchley Portrait of Elizabeth I, *The Burlington Magazine*, 156.1334 (2014), 293–98
- Lazzeri, Davide, Fabio Nicoli, and Yi Xin Zhang, ‘Secret Hand Gestures in Paintings’, *Acta Bio Medica : Atenei Parmensis*, 90.4 (2019), 526–32 <<https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v90i4.7134>>
- ‘Lee, Sir Henry (1533–1611), Queen’s Champion’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/16288>>
- Licence, Amy, *Woodsmoke and Sage: The Five Senses, 1485-1603 : How the Tudors Experienced the World [Electronic Resource]* (Cheltenham: The History Press, 2021)
- ‘Proclamation against Excess of Apparel by Queen Elizabeth I’, *The British Library* (The British Library) <<https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/proclamation-against-excess-of-apparel-by-queen-elizabeth-i>> [accessed 23 February 2023]
- Queen of Scots, Mary, and Elizabeth Talbot, *The Marion Hanging*, 1570, 2270mm x 2940mm, VAM (on permanent loan to Oxburgh Hall, Norfolk <<https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O137608/the-marian-hanging-hanging-mary-queen-of/>>
- Redwood, Mike, *Gloves and Glove-Making*, Shire Library, 812 (Oxford: Shire, 2016)
- Spenser, Edmund-, *The Faerie Queen: [Electronic Resource]: The Shepherds Calendar: Together with the Other Works*, Early English Books Online (London: Printed by H.L. for Mathew Lownes., 1611) <<https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/2264226690>> [accessed 23 February 2023]
- Stallybrass, Peter, and Ann Rosalind Jones, ‘Fetishizing the Glove in Renaissance Europe’, *Critical Inquiry*, 28.1 (2001), 114–32
- Strong, Roy C., ‘Elizabethan Painting: An Approach Through Inscriptions - III Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger’, *The Burlington Magazine*, 105.721 (1963), 149–59
- Tate, “Portrait of Captain Thomas Lee’, Marcus Gheeraerts II, 1594’, *Tate* <<https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/gheeraerts-portrait-of-captain-thomas-lee-to3028>> [accessed 24 February 2023]
- Unsworth, Rebecca, ‘Anne Green, Gloves: An Intimate History’, *Costume*, 56.2 (2022), 266–67 <<https://doi.org/10.3366/cost.2022.0234>>
- ‘Venice: May 1557, 11-15 | British History Online’ <<https://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol6/pp1041-1095>> [accessed 12 March 2023]
- Welch, Evelyn, ‘Art on the Edge: Hair and Hands in Renaissance Italy’, *Renaissance Studies*, 23.3 (2009), 241–68